

July 25, 1968

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY,
1968**HON. JAMES J. HOWARD**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 16 years ago today—July 25—Luis Muñoz Marín, one of the greatest statesmen ever developed under the American flag, proclaimed the coming of age of a people who had pulled themselves up to a dignity hitherto unattained anywhere in the Caribbean. They already had taken giant strides in transforming their island from "a stricken land" into a showcase for underdeveloped nations. Now, with Muñoz' proclamation of the birth of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or, as our Latin cousins proudly call it, the "Associated Free State," Puerto Rico assumed a status unique in the history of American territorial government.

Under the new constitution, which went into effect on July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico became as autonomous in local affairs as any State on the mainland. And although the island still was not incorporated into the Union, its people enjoyed privileges never accorded the incorporated Territories of Alaska and Hawaii: they continued to have the right, first granted them by the Congress of the United States in 1947, to elect their own Governor; and they were still exempt from paying Federal income taxes. At the same time, they continued, cheerfully, to bear the responsibilities of their U.S. citizenship, first acquired in 1917. Sixty thousand Puerto Ricans, of whom 54,000 were volunteers, served in the American Armed Forces during the Korean conflict.

Patriotism, of course, has not been exclusive with the island's soldier sons, the Puerto Ricans as a people consistently have demonstrated a deep and abiding pride in their Americanism. I have been impressed by reports of visitors to the island that Puerto Rican taxi drivers—who, like their counterparts in the States, are omniscient—would be willing, almost to a man, to sacrifice the economic advantages that accrue from Commonwealth status if only they could be accorded the simple, and final, glory that statehood would endow.

Most qualified observers, however, hesitate to advocate any immediate change in the present system of government. Puerto Rico enjoys a prosperity, in terms of per capita income, that is unprecedented in Latin America, and boasts a gross "national" product that is matched in annual growth by only half a dozen other areas in the entire world. In 1967 the gross product increased by 11.2 percent over the figure for the preceding year. The rising purchasing power of the Puerto Rican people is reflected

in the fact that the island constitutes the fifth largest market of the United States.

The continuing economic boom, however, is based in no small measure upon tax exemptions granted by the Commonwealth to mainland industrial firms establishing plants in Puerto Rico, and upon the absence of all Federal income taxes upon both individuals and corporations. Statehood, of course, would eliminate such aids and incentives; and whether the island's economy could sustain such a loss, either now or in the near future, is highly questionable.

But whatever the future holds for Puerto Rico, its people have evinced, continually, an enviable reverence for the flag of the United States, regardless of the number of stars carried in its blue field. Today we tender our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico a special salute as we join in the celebration of an event unique in our common heritage.

THE FAITH THAT HAS MADE
AMERICA GREAT**Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Dr. M. S. Harvey, formerly of Bloomington, Ill., and now pastor of the First Methodist Church of Akron, Ohio, wrote an interesting and thoughtful message for his Parish Visitor on June 27 of this year. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PARSON'S PEN

There's something that needs to be said about this country. I have had it up to here with persons who are trying deliberately to tear my country apart and it is way past time to throw at me that tired old wheeze about being a flag waver. You are right, I'm a flag waver, and I have the right to be one the hard way, I have had it with a group of punks wallowing in self pity, who make a display of deploring their birth into a world which they say they didn't make. I didn't make the world I was born in either. And neither did the men I know who are worthy of great respect. They just went about and made something out of it.

I have had it with hippies, brainless intellectuals, writers who can't write, painters who can't paint, teachers who can't teach, administrators who can't administer, on certainers who fancy themselves sociologists. I've had it with those cerebral giants who think it is smart to invite drug advocates to lecture in their classrooms. I've had it with people who are setting about in my America deliberately to rip up mankind's experiment in decency.

What I would like to say to all of these is "if you think you are going to tear down my country's flag and destroy the institution my friends and members of my family have fought and died for, you are going to have to climb over me first." It's about time we went

back and knelt in the snows of Valley Forge with George Washington, our founding father, and recapture the vision, the dream, the faith that has made America great.

Faithfully yours,

M. S. HARVEY.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON
ITALIAN MIGRATION**HON. FRANK J. BRASCO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson was presented with three reproductions of 15th century sailing vessels by the American Committee on Italian Migration—ACIM—"in appreciation of his seeking passage and signing the Immigration Reform Law which has abolished the national origins quota system." The law became fully effective on Monday, July 1.

The presentation ceremonies took place in the White House. Twenty prominent Americans of Italian extraction, representing more than 6,600,000 Italo-Americans, participated in the ceremonies.

President Johnson in accepting the three 15th century caravels, hailed the American Committee on Italian Migration for working hard to bring about this landmark act which will work to enrich the heart of America. In recognizing the ACIM as a dedicated group, and in accepting the 15th century sailing vessels, the President added:

It will remind me always that together we have helped to preserve the American dream—and more than that—we have opened its promise equally to all men everywhere.

Before the ceremonies, many Congressmen, U.S. Senators, and State Officials attended a luncheon in the New Senate Office Building. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, was the host.

The three caravels given to the President are reproductions of the most common ships used between 1450 and 1550 by the great explorers of the Christopher Columbus era. It is said that man came to know more of his planet in that period than in all the previous history of mankind.

All three models are of handcarved wood and were made, piece by piece, about a century ago.

Juvenal Marchisio of Brooklyn, judge of the family court of the State of New York, and national chairman of ACIM, stated:

This new law abolishes a long-time stigma of prejudice and discrimination and crowns with success an educational campaign for immigration reform that has been conducted by the American Committee on Italian Migration since 1952.

The Most Reverend Edward E. Swannstrom, executive director of the Catholic Relief Services and a member of the board of directors of ACIM, cited the

July 25, 1968

"great humanitarian achievements" of the new law, which alleviates painful situations of divided families, especially for countries such as Italy, Greece, and Portugal that had previously oversubscribed quotas.

The Reverend Joseph A. Cogo, C.S., national executive secretary of ACIM, pointed out that notwithstanding the generous granting of visas in the last 2½ years, there still remains for Italy a backlog of about 100,000 brothers and sisters of American citizens, some of whom have been waiting to migrate since as far back as 1955. He said:

Only emergency legislation of some type will effectively wipe out such a backlog and thus place Italy on a truly equal level with all other countries after July 1st.

In looking back at the results of this Act after two and one-half years of operation, our first reaction is one of optimism and satisfaction. About 75,000 Italians have already gained entrance into the United States. They have been reunited with members of their families and now can enjoy a better opportunity in life, often through their special skills.

While we take pleasure in acknowledging these positive results, we must express our disappointment at the problems still to be resolved.

These problems are:

First. A backlog of about 100,000 brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who are still waiting to obtain visas, some for as long as 12 years.

Second. As a consequence of this heavy backlog, there will be no visas available beginning today, July 1, 1968, for sixth preference applicants—skilled workers—from Italy because all of the visas allotted will be preempted by the applicants in the higher categories.

The Reverend Cogo emphasized that ACIM will seek emergency relief for the "brothers and sisters" backlog, which would open again the possibility of migration of skilled Italian workers. He said:

We intend to be vigilant to protect our just gains and to solve the problems that remain.

E. Howard Molisani, first vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, also expressed his concern over the fact that after today, no skilled Italian workers will be able to obtain a visa. He said:

All visas in the Italian quota, in fact, will be pre-empted by relatives, and especially by brothers and sisters.

Many in our industries have always relied on immigrants from Italy who are well known for their varied skills. The clearance of brothers' and sisters' lists would automatically insure a continuing flow of skilled men and women into this country.

ACIM, which is represented nationally by 102 chapters located in key areas throughout the country, carries out a function of "watchdog and spokesman" on immigration matters, particularly as it affects Italian migration, in order to safeguard the gains of the new reform immigration law and to correct remaining difficulties.

Judge Marchisio announced also the opening of an ACIM branch office in Naples, which is Italy's major port of embarkation, to give assistance to prospective immigrants prior to their arrival here. The organization is also en-

gaged in a program of guidance and assistance to immigrants after their arrival here, in order to effect a prompt and smooth assimilation into the life-stream of America.

The smallest one of the caravels presented to the President was made by an artisan from the Genoa region. It is a replica of a fast, easy-to-maneuver ship of the type used by Columbus. The boat has broad bows, narrow high poop, four masts, and lateen sails. It is 30 inches high, 30 inches long, 14 inches wide, and it weighs 6 pounds, 11 ounces.

The medium-sized vessel is a "caracca" made by a Neapolitan artisan. It shows Neapolitan craftsmanship and Spanish naval tradition. This ship stands 28 inches in height, 32 inches in length, and 14 inches wide. It weighs 6 pounds, 11 ounces.

The largest one is a Venetian "cocca" and the artisan is believed to be from that region. Its height is 34 inches, length 46 inches, width 16 inches, and it weighs 7 pounds, 11 ounces.

President Johnson's full message follows:

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN MIGRATION

Nearly three years ago, on one of the proudest days of my Presidency, I stood at the foot of the Statue of Liberty and signed into law the Immigration Act of 1965.

Today that Act takes full force. The lamp of liberty has never shown brighter. The golden door to immigration has never stood wider.

Every American can be proud today. Because we have finally eliminated the cruel and unjust national origins system from the immigration policy of the United States. We have righted a long-standing wrong.

Today any man, anywhere in the world, can hope to begin a new life of freedom and greater opportunity in America. No longer will his color, his religion, or his nationality be a barrier. The only preferences will be for those who already have relatives here, those who have exceptional abilities in the arts and sciences, or those who possess skills America needs.

No longer will only three nations supply 70 percent of America's immigrants. No longer will an arbitrary quota system divide children from their parents, separate brother from brother. No longer will the people of one nation be less welcome here than those of another.

This landmark act will work to enrich the heart of America—the people themselves. All who, over the years, have dreamed and labored for its achievement can take great satisfaction this morning.

No group has worked harder or with more dedication than the American Committee on Italian Migration. I accept the recognition you offer me today, and will treasure it forever.

It will remind me always that together we have helped to preserve the American dream—and more than that—we have opened its promise equally to all men everywhere.

THE SOVIET UNION AND
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the soundest speeches heard in this

land in recent years was presented on July 20, 1963, in Memphis, Tenn., to the Tennessee American Legion Convention on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

This address was delivered by the Honorable James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., and called upon the Legionnaires to become active in restoring law and order in America.

Mr. Stahlman also hailed the American Legion as an everlasting bulwark against all enemies of this great country, foreign and domestic. He wisely called upon the Legion to help provide the leadership and guidance necessary to reverse trends in the country toward what he described as "permissive anarchy."

This publisher of one of America's greatest newspapers stressed in his address the need for leadership and cited great leaders of the past to drive home his point. He urged the veterans to "use their ballot with intelligence and sound judgment."

Mr. President, Mr. Stahlman went right to the heart of some of the key issues of the day—law and order, political panders, campus hoodlums, racial revolution, and gun-bill hysteria. He has spoken with courage, and his message needs to be heard by every American.

It is warnings such as this address which cry to be heard in our land today. It is proposals and solutions such as offered here which need to be acted upon. It is a time for leadership, and here we have an excellent example of the type of leadership so desperately needed in America today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper report and a copy of this address 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 Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, July 20, 1968]

STAHLMAN URGES AMERICAN LEGION TO AID FIGHT AGAINST PERMISSIVE ANARCHY

MEMPHIS.—James G. Stahlman, president and publisher of The Nashville Banner, hailing the American Legion as "an everlasting bulwark against all enemies, foreign and domestic," today urged the 50th anniversary convention of Tennessee Legionnaires here to "keep up your vigilance" and to "support every agency whose function it is to preserve law and order."

Keynoting the three-day convention, Stahlman, a veteran of both World Wars, urged the Legion delegates to "use your ballot with intelligence and sound judgment, in favor of candidates best qualified for leadership at all levels of government, for the greatest need today is leadership."

Telling the Legionnaires of Sir John Dill, chief of the British Imperial General Staff, and the day he watched as Sir Winston Churchill penned his famous speech vowing a British fight to the finish with Adolf Hitler, Stahlman said:

"This is the type of determined leadership, of supreme courage, of just one clear voice to summon the American people from their lethargy back to sanity and to unify, if this nation of ours is to survive."

"The quality and character of that leadership may determine the future of America and the civilized world for a thousand years and beyond."

Warning of the dangers of permissive anarchy, Stahlman called on The American Legion to aid in the fight for more respect

July 25, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 6925

for authority in the home, in the schools, on campuses and in the churches.

After the address, Stahlman was presented the Legion's 50th Anniversary Award by Department Commander Ivo W. Sanders, Loudon attorney, and Joe F. Hudgens, 50th Anniversary chairman for Tennessee.

The text of Stahlman's address follows:
Mr. Commander, distinguished guests, ladies of the American Legion Auxiliary and fellow Legionnaires:

For the second time I have been honored by the privilege which you have extended me to talk to the annual convention of the Department of Tennessee.

Nineteen-sixty-eight is the golden anniversary of the American Legion. I note with pardonable pride that I am on the eve of my fiftieth year of continuous membership in this great organization. I am doubly grateful to you and am extremely glad to be with you. My time has been limited because your time is not unlimited, so I'll step out on the double, with the hope that I shall transgress neither your graciousness nor your patience.

While I speak to you as a fellow-Legionnaire, I wear no medals for heroism under fire, but I have one distinction which few, if any, veterans possess. Because "The Book" said I should weigh 127 pounds when I actually weighed 119, I was twice dismissed from the Second Officers Training Camp at Fort Oglethorpe and as a result I hold three separate honorable discharges from the United States Army in World War I. I am probably the only self-admitted surviving buck private of that conflict, late of the 383rd Infantry. Add to these my service as an officer in the Tennessee National Guard and for 20 years in the United States Naval Reserve, with four years on active duty in World War II, you have my feeble claim to military fame. Like all of you, I have simply tried to serve my country.

HEIRS OF BRAVE MEN

You are the heirs of the men whose blood stained the snows with Washington at Valley Forge. You are the same breed of Tennessee squirrel shooters who, at Andrew Jackson's command, decimated Pakenham's red-coats from behind the cotton bales at Chalmette. You are the counterpart of those who charged the heights at Chapultepec and those who marched and fought under Lee and Grant in that later tragic fratricidal strife. You are the legatees of the First Tennessee Infantry who stood with Colonel W. C. Smith in the Philippines and of the Fourth Tennessee with Cordell Hull in Cuba.

Many of you saw distinguished service in the 30th Division or in other units of the AEF and the United States Navy in World War I. Many of you likewise served under Eisenhower, Nimitz or MacArthur in World War II. You younger men won battle stars and scars at Inchon and Pusan, and still some of an even younger breed may be here who have returned from the war in Southeast Asia, still in progress.

As men and women who have demonstrated their love of country and their willingness to serve it, I am certain that you are more than ordinarily concerned for our country and its future. It is well that we should be concerned, for it behooves all of us to use our collective judgment and joint determination to bring about the changes necessary in our own affairs if we are to preserve our democratic processes, our governmental institutions and the freedoms which we too often take for granted, which can so readily pass from us.

Let's take a look at some of the things which have produced these forebodings.

"ACCENT ON YOUTH"

If I am qualified to judge one trend which has been in vogue for quite some years, I would assert my firm belief that there has been entirely too much "accent on youth." This is not to derogate the young, for I

recall only too well my own devilish mischief when I was an adolescent.

All too infrequently, in my opinion, there is too little accent on maturity.

There is likewise too little accent on respect for authority—in the home, formerly emphasized by the proper application of the back side of a hair brush to our own back sides, by parents who had not been brainwashed by Dr. Spock or hornswoggled and browbeaten by their own defiant, unruly offspring.

In the school—where teachers were not afraid of being fired from their tutorial duties because they were occasionally required to apply a ruler or a switch to some recalcitrant student, for his own good, for the preservation of decorum in the classroom and in some more recent instances, for the protection of their own lives from youthful switchblade maniacs bent upon mayhem and sometimes murder.

CAMPUS HOODLUMS

On college and university campuses—where intellectual slobs and hairy hoodlums are undeterred by faculty leftist sympathizers and administrators cowed by fear of phony charges of violation of "academic freedom" and the equally ridiculous assumption of "student rights," to disrupt, disgrace and destroy hallowed and respected institutions of higher learning, simply for the hell of it.

It might be well to suggest a return to those intellectual disciplines which for so long were an established fundamental in our higher educational processes, now discarded in favor of the New Left's doctrines of unrestrained activism and dissent. Dissent? Yes? But never overdone to the detriment of institutions, accepted democratic processes and large, but less vocal segments of society.

At the collegiate level it might not be amiss and could prove quite profitable, if not convincing, for proper investigative authorities to delve into and endeavor to ascertain the source of direction and financial support for such organizations as Students for a Democratic Society, Southern Student Organizing Committee, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Conference Educational Fund, directed by the notorious subversives, Carl and Anne Braden, and kindred groups dedicated to disruption and destruction of the fundamentals in our political, educational, economic and sociological apparatus.

In the churches—where a super-liberal clergy consider the teaching of the old-time religion as modern heresy and the preachment that God is Dead as today's Sermon on the Mount.

There has been far too little accent on respect for civil authority and obedience to the laws of God and man. Some Courts, from the highest to the lowest, have helped downgrade the law as the protector of person and property, tot he point where police, grand juries and attorneys general find themselves bound in legal frustration which sometimes produces a laxity in rigid application of the statutes.

LAW AND ORDER BASIC

In my concept of law and order, there is and can be no racism. Respect for and observance of the law applies to every man, woman and child, regardless of color. And the obligation to preserve order lies upon the white man, as well as the black.

There is no room in our enforcement agencies for timid souls as spineless as a wet noodle or as gutless as a bull butterfly.

It is most heartening, however, to have two outstanding Federal judges speak out, loud and clear, through this gap. The first is the distinguished jurist occupying the U.S. District judgeship in Middle Tennessee, the Honorable William E. Miller. The second is Federal Judge Francis J. W. Ford of Boston. In sentencing a convicted draft dodger, Judge Miller sounded a strong note with his declara-

tion: "It is not given to individuals to decide for themselves what laws they will and will not obey."

At the conclusion of the trial of Dr. Benjamin Spock, Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin, Jr. and two others convicted of conspiracy, in counseling young men to violate the draft law, Judge Ford said: "There is no freedom to conspire to violate a law of the United States with impunity. Persons cannot rightfully engage in conduct in violation of the law either to state their desire for peace or in attempts to change national policy."

Thank God for Federal judges like Miller and Ford!

If recent decisions of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the law forbidding the burning of draft cards, and another supporting the right of police to search the person of reasonably-suspect characters, it would appear that at last, Nine Old Men have heard the voice of the people and the will of the Congress. It's about time.

POLITICAL PANDERERS

Add to all these the sycophantic holders of public office who pander to the whims and quail before the threats of the bully-boy leaders of ungrateful recipients of the nation's largesse.

Now no honorable citizen, black or white, would deny legitimate and proper relief to the poor and needy, but even the Congress recognizes that much of our welfare programs have failed, not because of the unwillingness to provide or for insufficient funds, but because of wholesale maladministration, proven corruption, the misuse of funds, wasteful projects, ill-conceived, with the resultant creation and maintenance of an ever growing class of indolent deadbeats who have come to believe that the world or somebody owes them a handsome living, for which, up to now, they have displayed no willingness to work.

It's time to take the dolts off the dole.

It is at this point that we arrive at our own present intolerable state of national peril, produced by those political, professorial and pulpit pried pipers of permissive anarchy, with all its disastrous concomitants.

We have seen our cities put to the torch, looting run rampant and murder become a way of life.

NO NATIONAL "SICKNESS"

Don't let me hear any of you complain of suffering from a guilt complex. Hogwash! And if you fall for the guff about our national "sickness," let me tell you that there is no public sickness which can't be quickly cured by hard work, patience, tolerance and charity, coupled with an honest, earnest, rigid enforcement of the laws already on the books.

And you may add to that—a return to personal and political morality, the tenets of common decency, and full recognition of the rights of the other fellow too frequently trespassed by the howling mob.

These and other attributes might then help restore that character without which neither this nation nor any other can ultimately survive.

Now don't let anybody tell you that the three assassinations which have shocked peoples everywhere were the isolated acts of deranged individuals. Each of them fits into an overall pattern which no commission, however sacrosanct, can, with honesty, brush over with a rationale of verbal shellac, too thin and too transparent to hide the evidence of alien direction and finance.

It has been, is now, and always will be my firm conviction that Lee Harvey Oswald was the Marxist agent of Fidel Castro. I am equally convinced that Sirhan Sirhan was the Arab stooge of Communist design, and it should take no crystal ball to categorize the case of James Earl Ray.

PATTERN OF REVOLUTION

The result of these three slayings was the production of national and international racial and political turmoil, fitting into a program of global revolution which could contribute to ultimate Communist world domination.

If this be Red baiting, witch hunting, or looking for pink spooks under the bed, make the most of it. Call it what you will, it cannot be disguised. To me it is as clear as God's sunlight. It makes no difference from where the signs emerge. If revolution should succeed it will little matter whether it were incubated in Cuba, Red China, North Vietnam or Soviet Russia. It will bear the single label of the hammer and sickle and its wreckage will be total and irreparable.

We are now engaged in another war, half a world, almost five years, countless casualties, and billions of dollars away. But before I go any further I might tell you that I have two grandsons, the eldest just about ripe for Sam to beckon with that long finger of his. There are two things I can tell you with certainty about both these boys—if either one ever entered a plea of "conscience" against service in the armed forces of this country, I would forever disown him as my own flesh and blood. And if he ever burned a draft card, I would be the first to take him by the scruff of his neck and haul him into the Federal Court to receive his just desserts as a traitor to his country and a disgrace and dishonor to his heritage.

To the "Hell, No, we won't go!" of anti-war rebels, the Legion promptly and effectively has countered with its ringing "Damn right, we'll fight."

OBLIGATIONS OF YOUTH

This is the time of all times for the youth of this nation to accent for themselves a redemptive recognition of their individual and collective responsibilities: to revere the Lord, God almighty, love this nation, respect its flag, obey its laws and serve it faithfully and honorably wherever and whenever military or civil duty may call.

May God give an overwhelming majority of them the wisdom and the courage to take this stand, they are not only the last best hope of America, they are also the last best hope of earth.

Neither I nor my newspaper favored military entry into Vietnam. We vigorously opposed it from the outset, as "McNamara's War." Remember him? He is the whiz kid who produced the Edsel. He is the fellow with the computerized brain, who fathered the ill-fated TFX. He is the great strategist who ignored the Joint Chiefs of Staff and hamstrung "Westy" Westmoreland and his thousands upon thousands of American men who have fought, bled and died in the rice paddies, the mountain passes, the rubble of Saigon and in the skies over Vietnam. He is the man who tried to destroy the National Guard and the Ready Reserve. Remember him? He is the fellow who was booted upstairs to the World Bank, after liquidating Uncle Sam's military superiority in the air, on the sea and in space. This country will not soon recover from McNamara's bungling, too long permitted and acquiesced in by the President and his administration.

WAR NOT LYNDON'S BABY

But remember this! Vietnam was not Lyndon Johnson's baby. It was left on his doorstep. Now HE knows, and most of you who know me and my newspaper know, that we didn't support his candidacy in 1964 and we haven't supported many of the President's domestic programs. We are still not enamored of some of them and we are quite fearful of the prospective results of some others.

But there is one thing that Lyndon Johnson knows, and that is that my newspaper and I, unlike some members of the United States Senate, once the war was joined, have

supported him in his efforts to bring the war to an honorable conclusion and a lasting peace.

If there is one thing which this nation should have learned by now it is that we can't buy friendship and respect. We can't put out every fire and we can't have everybody's bacon. It's high time, however, that we started saving our own.

SOME THINGS TO STOP

It's time we stopped frittering away our substance in hopeless global boon-doggling. It's time we stopped trying to make over other nations in our own image. It's time we started improving the image of Uncle Sam, both at home and abroad. And in my opinion one of the first steps in that direction would be to stop meddling with everybody else's business.

As men and women who love this nation as I do, men and women who have worn the uniform, who revere the flag and who are not ashamed to sing "The Star Spangled Banner," you know the obligations which the rights of citizenships impose upon us as individuals and as Legionnaires in the mass.

You were true to your oath to preserve and protect this nation, taken when you were sworn into the service, no matter which war. That oath is equally binding upon you in times of peace. And never within our lifespan has this nation so badly needed your love, your devotion, your fullest duty.

HYSTERIA OVER GUNS

Keep up your vigilance. Support every agency whose function it is to preserve law and order. Tell your congressmen and your senators that American citizens are entitled to protect their persons and property with their own fire arms if necessary and that no gun law passed in a period of national hysteria should remove that right. Especially in the face of threatened revolution. Ban on mail order sale—positively! Registration—doubtful. Licensing—No! Confiscation—never!!

At the same time let the Congress know that it should pay no heed to the demands from certain quarters for the abolition of ROTC units in our colleges and universities. These groups are the only source of trained officer personnel needed by all branches of our military, which the national academies cannot possibly furnish.

Turn a deaf ear to demagogues and blather-skites. Make certain you use your ballot with intelligence and sound judgment, in favor of candidates best qualified for leadership at all levels of government, for the greatest need today is leadership.

On that all-important subject I would like to read you a short chapter from one of the most thrilling books I have ever read, entitled "Of Spies & Stratagems." It was written by Dr. Stanley P. Lowell, one of Bill Donovan's most valuable officers in the OSS.

He wrote:

I will never forget March 18, 1943, when General Donovan asked me to represent him at an intimate birthday luncheon for Sir John Dill, Chief of the British Imperial General Staff.

After liquors, someone said, "Sir John, I think you owe us a story. What has been the most unforgettable day of your distinguished career?"

"That is easy to select," he said. "I'm an Ulsterman and that means an army life for us. The Boer War, Indian and African service, but my career appeared ended when I publicly opposed the remilitarization of the Rhineland and Chamberlain's appeasement at Munich. Then, in May 1940, Winston Churchill came to power and picked me to head up our armed forces.

"Barely three weeks later he phoned me to fly to France with him and General Ismay. We knew things were in poor shape over there. In Paris we met with Marshal Petain, General Weygand and Premier Paul Reynaud. They threw the bad news at us.

"Churchill asked, 'Aren't you going to resist in the South of France?'

"'No. It's impossible.'

"'But you'll keep the African colonies and fight from there, won't you?'

"'No. We surrender them.'

"'But the fleet, Darlan will put to sea and deliver it to us—that will be saved?'

"'No. It's complete surrender to Hitler. After the way you British abandoned us by running home at Dunkirk, you left us no other choice.'

SIR WINSTON SHOCKED

"'So France is deserting us completely!' Churchill exclaimed.

"'Just as you did to us,' answered Petain.

"The Prime Minister rose. We were driven to our Flamingo and flown back to London. Not a single word was spoken on the return flight, and I was too deeply upset to care much if our escort of Hurricanes showed up or not.

"'I'm all alone tonight, Sir John,' he said. 'Come keep me company at 10 Downing Street.' It was late and we washed a sandwich down with some brandy and soda.

"'Sir John,' he said as he walked about the room, 'I have no choice but to address Parliament in the morning. I'll have to tell them and the nation that France has gone over to Hitler lock, stock and barrel. You and I know it's impossible to defend this island against the full force of that Austrian bastard. It's Napoleon all over again, but Napoleon never had the German air force, and we have few guns and less ammunition. This may be the last night of the British Empire—it may be.'

"I could have wept for him and for Britain. At last he said, 'There are two things we can do, Sir John. Write the speech that will actually ask Hitler for terms of surrender—or go to bed and sleep on it. I propose to sleep. Goodnight, Sir John. My man will show you to your bedroom. See you at breakfast.'

LAST NIGHT OF EMPIRE

"He may have slept—he took a part bottle of brandy with him—but I know I didn't. The end of the British Empire was coming tomorrow!

"At breakfast—perhaps our last as a free people—I was sober and glum. Winston Churchill ate everything set before him. Finally, he pushed his chair away at an angle and said, 'Sir John, I have to tell Parliament the bad news—I can't avoid that, but I do not have to suggest negotiating with those Nazi madmen.

"Yes, France has fallen, the United States is pacifist and won't help us, but, all alone, by God, we'll fight 'em on the beaches, we'll fight 'em at the hedge rows, we'll fight 'em on our village greens!' He paused, 'By heaven, that's damned good, Sir John.'

"He pulled a pad of paper out of his breakfast jacket pocket and started writing down the greatest speech since your Gettysburg address. That, gentlemen, was my most unforgettable day."

An unforgettable day for myself was this sixty-second birthday for Sir John Dill. He had told us of a day on which the freedom of mankind had balanced on one man's courage.

CLARION CALL TO DUTY

This is the type of determined leadership, of supreme courage of just one clear voice to summon the American people from their lethargy, back to sanity and to unity, if this nation of ours is to be preserved. The quality and character of that leadership may determine the future of America and the civilized world for a thousand years and beyond.

Decision day is here; Stand up!!

May the bugle call of honor drown out the raucous bull-horn of sedition!

I am certain that their will be no "conscientious objectors among the loyal, courageous and patriotic members of the Amer-

July 25, 1968

E 6927

ican Legion, for you continue to serve as an everlasting bulwark against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

To you I raise my hand in respectful salute.

TAX INCREASE IS NOT STOPPING INFLATION

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration now admits that the tax increase it so ballyhooed will not stop the current inflationary wage-price spiral in this country. Prices are still rising at a 4-percent annual rate and wages are going up at a 6- to 7-percent annual rate.

The President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability says more wage and price restraint is needed soon. The committee proclaims that the economy is still on a "dangerous road."

The road will continue to be dangerous until such time as the administration can exercise meaningful fiscal restraint by restraining excessive governmental spending. Unfortunately, this administration seems unable and unwilling to take such action.

Following is an article from the Wall Street Journal of July 22, 1968, entitled "Price and Wage Discipline Urged by White House—Stability Panel Sees Economy as Still Endangered; Fears Loss of Tax Rise Benefits," which bears on these points:

PRICE AND WAGE DISCIPLINE URGED BY WHITE HOUSE; STABILITY PANEL SEES ECONOMY AS STILL ENDANGERED—FEARS LOSS OF TAX RISE BENEFITS

WASHINGTON.—The deflationary benefits of the tax increase will be largely lost unless there's more price and wage restraint soon, President Johnson's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability warned.

Opening a campaign with a letter to several hundred business and labor leaders, the panel proclaimed that the economy is still on "a dangerous road" and called for "the utmost restraint" in price and wage decisions to give the tax boost a chance to work.

Officials made clear that they're especially concerned that price rises will follow any labor settlements for steel, aerospace, ports, coal, airlines and railroad crafts, fields in which contracts expire or reopen in coming months. The pricing of new auto models, one added, also will be of "critical importance."

The panel was created by Mr. Johnson early this year and told to focus on long-range impediments to price stability while remaining aloof from intervention in immediate wage and price developments in specific industries. Its members, all of whom endorsed the letter, are Treasury Secretary Fowler, Commerce Secretary Smith, Labor Secretary Wirtz, Budget Director Charles Zwick, and Chairman Arthur M. Okun of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mr. Okun serves as coordinator.

Because of the tax increase and related Federal budget limitations, an official said he is confident that in the months ahead the upward pressure exerted on wages and prices by the demand for goods and services will ease. But, he said, there are "significant cost increases which haven't yet been translated into higher prices," as well as some consumer price index rise which hasn't yet been

translated into wage boosts. Business leaders and "selected labor leaders," he said, sought the fiscal restraint through fighting for the tax bill. He was now, the official said, asking them to show again such "willingness to sacrifice short-term gains" for long-run stability.

Now that the Government is no longer adding broad inflationary pressures through huge budget deficits, the official said, it's both more feasible and more important for business and labor to work against inflation. The time isn't ripe yet, aides made clear, to return to the old "guideposts." These called for stable prices and wage boosts that didn't exceed the annual average increase in productivity (output per man-hour) of about 3%. "We know darn well that prices aren't going to stop in their tracks," a high official said, "so that the productivity guide on wages is something we will have to go back to gradually."

The key word now is simply "less," the high official said, explaining that the most important thing is to start having price and wage increases that are smaller than those in the June quarter. Prices were rising then at a 4% annual rate, the letter noted, while wages were advancing at a 6% to 7% annual rate. "The public interest is clearly violated by any price increases that widen profit margins, and wage settlements that extend the recent disturbing pattern," the letter stressed.

The actual performance of prices and wages will determine how long the "fiscal and monetary brakes" will have to be kept on, the official said, adding that the economic slowdown the nation is undertaking through the tax increase "in itself isn't a desirable thing," and officials would like to keep it "as short and mild as possible."

PAUL HARVEY COLUMB ON SECULAR INVOLVEMENT OF THE CHURCH

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in a recent edition of the *Williamson, W. Va., Daily News* there appeared a thought-provoking column by Paul Harvey on the harm that some activist clergymen are doing to the church through their intervention in secular affairs.

Mr. Harvey points out:

Historically the church injected itself only where issues of morality were debated.

Today's activist churchmen presume to prescribe law, diplomacy, welfare and civil rights.

Mr. Harvey contends that such extra-religious activity might be defensible if it strengthened the church. On the contrary, he says, church membership which soared in the 1950's is stagnating in the 1960's.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

SECULAR INVOLVEMENT IS STAGNATING THE CHURCH

(By Paul Harvey)

Every generation of students at some time violated the rules; this generation is the first to repudiate the rules.

Our generation violated moral standards; today's young reject the standards themselves.

A generation ago jobless men might have demanded jobs, this generation many demand to be paid—work or not.

Clergymen, long the accepted authority on right and wrong, now preoccupy themselves with right and left.

Some branches of Judaism have practiced activism far longer than the Christian faiths which have recently interested themselves in extra-religious activities.

Rabbi Arthur Hertzberger is himself an activist, advocating withdrawal from Vietnam and so on.

But he concedes it is not good for the churches to get thus involved in secular matters. "The very moment that clerics become more worldly the world goes to hell all the faster."

Paradoxically, much of the clergy is turning away from what we used to call "fundamental religion" at a time of increasing hunger for it.

There is a human craving for something transcendent. Religious tradition for thousands of years knew the meaning of life and the purpose of death and the individual's proper place in the here and in the hereafter.

Now a vacillating, contradicting, codeless "modern church" has compounded our confusion and left, in the place it once filled, a vast, dark emptiness.

Church involvement in civil affairs is not unprecedented. During the Buchanan Administration the churches were divided over the issue of slavery.

But historically the church injected itself only where issues of morality were debated. Today's activist churchmen presume to prescribe law, diplomacy, welfare, civil rights. The World Council of Churches in convention in Sweden this year overwhelmingly supported young men who resist the draft "for particular wars."

If churches were made stronger by this extra-religious involvement, it might be defensible. On the contrary, church membership, which soared in the 1950's, is stagnating in the 1960's.

Of America's adults 49 per cent regularly attended church in 1955; today 44 per cent do.

A Gallup Poll shows 10 years ago 69 per cent of Americans thought "religion is increasing its influence." Today 57 per cent say it is "losing its influence."

Prof. Will Herberg of Drew University believes that the explosion of new scientific knowledge—the vetoing of old scientific truths—has caused doubt about religious and humanistic preconceptions. We've lost our rudder.

So the hippie protests that each of us has a right "to do his own thing."

That's what Hitler was doing.

A LOOK AT WELFARE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the *RECORD* two informative articles written by F. O. Jacobs, which appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* this week:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, July 22, 1968]

WELFARE CRISIS: SUBSIDY FOR SEPARATION

(By F. O. Jacobs)

Much has been heard in the past few months about our rising welfare crisis. This in itself is good because, as Daniel Moynihan

July 25, 1968

has pointed out, the problem has been maturing for years behind a shield of silence, silence especially from the social workers most familiar with the field. Unfortunately, the public debate to date has only scratched the surface of that shield. We shall certainly not be able to sweep it away altogether here—the facts are too obscure, the basic research shockingly sketchy. But we can ask some of the hard questions and sort out the implications of what is known and of the major reform proposals.

One of the first blasts to arouse public attention to the crisis in "welfare" came last year at a Congressional hearing in which Mitchell Ginsberg, then commissioner of the New York City Welfare Department, denounced the present system as "bankrupt." Since then statements, articles and reports have rolled out, variously identifying the main problem as the demeaning of clients, the stinginess of the system, the vast growth of the outlays and caseload, the elimination of incentive. We seem at this point to be thoroughly confused as to whether our crucial problem is a disastrous growth in the proportion of our society "going on relief" or precisely the contrary, that relief is too stingy and goes to too few.

A CHANGING VIEWPOINT

The same ambiguity may be found in "The Crisis in Welfare," a recent article by Mr. Moynihan that appeared in "The Public Interest." He begins in the spirit of a standard liberal tirade against the conservative Congressional "enemies" of the welfare poor who dared to attach various restrictions and reforms in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program to last year's Social Security bill. In midflight the point of view switches to that of the earlier Moynihan, the disturbed observer of the breakdown in Negro family life, and the admission is made that our overriding problem is not rising economic need, stingily met, but the rapidly accelerating use of "welfare" as a substitute for the fulfillment of parental support obligations.

Let us begin with the most essential facts: "Welfare" has finally intruded itself upon public attention because, far from declining with the trend toward full employment in the 1960s, it has swung into an unprecedented accelerated growth. By far the largest part of this growth has been in the AFDC program. Although total national growth has accelerated, the local distribution of this growth has been anything but uniform. Certain cities and areas have experienced truly explosive welfare growth (New York since 1963-64 is one) while in many others, such as Chicago and Pittsburgh, for reasons that are often far from clear, caseloads and outlays have been stable or have even been slightly reduced.

What makes this development so alarming, of course, is the fact that it has paralleled a fairly steady trend toward declining rates of unemployment among Negroes as well as whites—and thus directly reverses the clear, positive relationship between AFDC dependency and the rate of unemployment that persisted until the 1960s.

It follows that the bulk of the present growth of welfare, that is the growth of AFDC, is not a symptom of falling earning power among the poor. At most, the rise of "home relief" to unified families as a marginal supplement to earned income might be attributed to a lag in minimal earning power relative to increasingly generous relief standards.

The real social pathology in the welfare crisis is found in the (much larger) AFDC area.

There are only two major causes from which such a result could follow: A radical shift to the state of the support obligations of employed or employable fathers (that is, increasing eligibility through increasing desertion and illegitimacy); or a radical in-

crease in the average proportion of eligible separated mothers and children who take advantage of their AFDC eligibility. Quite possibly both causes have been at work.

Certainly efforts have been made (by welfare unions, antipoverty groups etc.) to promote greater exploitation of eligibility in the past few years. Yet, in the absence of empirical proof of the impact of this effort it is difficult to believe that earlier inhibitions against accepting AFDC were so pronounced in the slums of our large cities as to prevent a large proportion of those really eligible from taking advantage of it. Throughout the late '40s, '50s and early '60s the AFDC family was a commonplace to the residents of the low income neighborhoods of cities like Chicago and New York. Any inhibitions were probably directed not so much against accepting AFDC once a separation had occurred as against the act of separation or desertion itself.

CRUMBLING FAMILY STRUCTURE

Furthermore, although it is also difficult to believe that a change as radical as that under way in New York could depend entirely upon increasing breakdown of family structure, independent statistics on the proportion of illegitimate births in New York show precisely the sort of accelerating rise since about 1964 that would be consistent with an explanation based on this factor. (It is alarming that we cannot be more definite about this vital question. Yet the relevant statistics for a reasonably certain answer are simply not available. The fact, incidentally, that they have not been collected even by the city governments most vitally affected is by no means the smallest defect in our administration of welfare.)

A third possible cause is the shift of population from Southern farm and village to Northern city, where welfare is more easily obtained as well as more generous. But although this has contributed to a trend rise in dependency since World War II that has steadily exceeded the growth of population in the country as a whole, it hardly accounts for the phenomenon we are concerned with, the sudden acceleration of the mid 1960s. In New York City the available studies of recent population movement strongly suggest that migration from the South and from Puerto Rico began to slow sharply at just about the time (1964) that New York's welfare budget entered its exponential climb.

Considering these facts it is reasonably certain, despite the lack of direct measurement, that a large part of the explanation must lie in the factor of increased eligibility. This implies an increasing propensity to regard "welfare" as a convenient or even a respectable substitute for the fulfillment of paternal responsibility—and to this change our existing welfare system has almost certainly contributed.

It is commonly thought that the existing welfare system encourages the breakup of families only because eligibility for AFDC requires the absence of the husband. But while this is true of many states, mostly rural or Southern, it is not true of many others, including the larger urbanized areas, that have accepted the option of Federally supported temporary AFDC for families with unemployed breadwinners (22 states), or that offer "general assistance" or "home relief" from local funds at the same standards as AFDC. In such areas a hard-pressed father can supplement his earnings by an allowance that expands with the size of his family. Yet this has not prevented the growing breakdown of families evidenced by the massive growth of AFDC.

The fact is that the AFDC system (and, as we shall see, any income support system geared to the family or household unit) creates strong economic incentives toward separation, and against marriage or remarriage. Whether these incentives will be generally resisted, or will lead to a sharp change in be-

havior is an empirical question. But from an economic standpoint AFDC—as currently administered—provides a subsidy for separation, or, what amounts to the same thing, a tax on marriage.

If a man's earnings are near the margin of welfare eligibility, say about \$3,500 in New York City, he and his family receive nothing from the state. Their total income would be the \$3,500 earned. If he deserts his wife and children—or successfully pretends to do so—they are eligible to receive (in money and various forms of "real" aid) about \$2,500 or more from AFDC. Assuming his earning power remains the same, their total income rises to \$6,000, or more than 70%.

Alternatively, consider the effect on the AFDC mother already separated or divorced from her husband or one who has never married. Marriage or remarriage to another man in the marginal earning bracket would result in a well nigh crushing financial penalty through the withdrawal of AFDC. If she confines herself to friendship, she and her companion may have a joint income of about \$6,000. If they are so imprudent as to marry it will drop to his earnings alone, again, about \$3,500.

Thus a new social pattern begins to form among the poor: The more common it becomes, the more acceptable and normal. Ultimately marriage and self-support begin to look like luxuries or an expression of impractical idealism to those whose earnings power is near the welfare margin. The normal course increasingly becomes to adapt one's way of life so as to obtain AFDC plus a share in the earned income of male friends.

STRAIN ON MORALITY

Moreover, to directly prevent this abuse of welfare involves the messy and demeaning business of spying for a "man in the house," which seems so despicable. Yet, to wait for a formal marriage or even a clearly revealed common law marriage before removing AFDC clients from the rolls is to put a strain on traditional morality that is quite evidently cannot bear.

Of course a middle- or upper-income recipient could also convert his wife and children into paupers by deserting them, but the \$2,500 or so they would receive from welfare would represent a progressively smaller percentage gain in total family income. The relative subsidy for separation is far greater for the poor than for the rest of society.

This hard economic fact should be taken into account before ascribing the difference in family stability among the poor purely to moral or cultural factors.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 23, 1968]

WELFARE CRISIS: TOWARD REFORM (By F. O. Jacobs)

It might well be argued that the availability of AFDC does not really offer a subsidy for separation, because a man will be compelled to support his family whether he leaves it or not. This is a vital point.

The answer is that enforcement in practice is sporadic and mild. This is due in part to the fact that the AFDC wife has nothing like the economic incentives to find and prosecute her deserting mate that a middle-class woman would feel. It is also due to the ease with which man can repeatedly disappear in a vast country that has no system of address registration.

But an effort to delve into the murky situation in New York City suggests that enforcement of any kind is lagging progressively further behind the exploding caseload in that city. The yearly number of hearings in Family Court regarding support orders (more than one hearing may concern a given case) has, astonishingly, remained approximately constant since 1958, despite the three and four fold increase in AFDC families.

Probably even more important, however, is

July 25, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 6929

the fact that the support orders habitually rendered by New York judges—and many others—are mild in the extreme. The judges follow the superficially "practical" precept that it is better to set a low figure, which will be honored, than one reasonably related to support requirements, which may inspire efforts at evasion. The results are judgments of \$5, \$10 or \$15 a week.

The judges also tend to relate their support orders to the apparent or actual low earnings of the defendants and their relatively high cost of maintaining separate households for themselves. Yet a man who knows his dependents are on AFDC is clearly less likely to make the same efforts as one who feels himself compelled to support them. He is much freer to drift, to disdain so-called "dead end" jobs, even, in many cases, to fall into dependence on his wife's welfare check or on the earnings of other women.

THE STATE AS FATHER

It is one of the ironies of our recent history that the modern urban AFDC system, which would threaten to undermine the family structure of any group in the low-income class, found this class increasingly occupied by Negro families. The attachment of the father to such families has always been relatively precarious, for reasons that go back to the inhumanities of the slave system. But even so, the present rampant breakdown of this attachment required the gradual disintegration of received values. It is not surprising that at least a generation should pass after the introduction of the present system (in the 1930s), before the idea that it is quite acceptable to substitute the state for the father as the mainstay of family life could begin to be the new lower-class norm.

As events would have it, other principal social changes under way operated only to reinforce the value-decaying impact of the AFDC system. Consider two factors: First, the technical changes in agriculture plus perverse subsidization policies that jammed unskilled rural Negroes into urban core areas from which the industry that might have absorbed many of them at reasonably high wages was in the process of withdrawing in search of less costly space. Second, the emotional "backlash" of the new relatively liberated generations of Northern Negroes arising from past servility toward a prejudiced white majority. The related alienation from, and tendency to make a scapegoat of "white society" reinforced the temptation to transfer personal responsibilities to governments emotionally identified with that society.

If we view the matter frankly then, it appears unlikely that our current welfare explosion is explicable without reference to a widespread collapse of elementary familial values taken for granted by almost every society. The humanitarian liberal faith of the past generation that direct, reasonably generous relief of the poor would not seriously weaken their efforts at self support has been disappointed, at least for this generation.

PRINCIPLES OF REFORM

But facing this bitter fact honestly, rather than hiding it, is the beginning of any true liberal reform. The lines along which a fundamental solution should be sought follow directly from our analysis. The opportunity to abandon the support responsibility must be drastically curtailed, and the size of the relative subsidy for separation must be reduced, if possible in a way that will help diminish the psychic alienation of Negro Americans.

Yesterday's article pointed out that AFDC's family-dissolving tendency arises from the fact that the household, rather than the individual, is the unit of aid. By splitting the household the amount of aid can be greatly increased. It follows from this that the proposed "negative income tax," (in which total household income, rather than the specific earnings of wife and children,

would decide eligibility to receive a "negative tax") would do nothing to alter this basic impact.

What the negative income tax would do is little more than equalize the standards of welfare nationally, presumably at or close to the higher state levels, and, of course, eliminate the foolish separation requirement already absent in New York and most Northern states. It would have one other significant virtue. It would promptly create a sliding scale of aid that would decline fractionally as earned income expanded. A crude version of this reform has recently been introduced in New York, but most welfare at present declines a dollar for every dollar earned and thus creates a drastic disincentive to efforts at self support.

The advantages of a negative tax are important, even if they do not get at our most serious dilemma. It would benefit both the nation as a whole and the hard-pressed Northern cities to eliminate the perverse migration incentives created by sharply unequal state welfare standards. The perversity is ironically illustrated by the fact that, at present welfare standards, New York City has no "poverty" as Federally defined. If income and housing subsidies at the New York level were provided rationally in more spacious areas, decent housing rather than congested slums and better job opportunities would become directly attainable rather than a distant hope.

Nevertheless, the negative income tax would not touch the basic problem of family dissolution. Indeed, it would be likely to make it worse insofar as the payments exceeded the average national AFDC standard.

Another proposal, advanced in part because it is strong where the negative income tax is weak, is a system of allowances (such as exists in Canada and most of Europe) for all families proportioned to the number of dependents or children.

The allowance would be based upon the individual rather than the family unit. It would simply be added to earned income. Hence, a family could not increase its total income from earnings plus this allowance by separating. Further, the receipt of such allowances would raise marginal families somewhat relative to the standard of AFDC and thus reduce its attraction.

This proposal does then, in principle, attack the essential problem. But to what degree? To fully eliminate the incentive to separation would require dependent allowances equal to the present AFDC standards, say \$2,500 for a wife and two children, or about \$800 per person. But this would imply the reshuffling of about a quarter of total personal income in the nation. Even if the allowances were held to one-fourth the present New York welfare standard (say, \$200 per year for each dependent in the population, including wives) they would still amount to about \$28 billion per year and, in this event, the relative AFDC gain from separation would remain three-fourths intact. Actual allowances abroad and the figures actually proposed (e.g., by Moynihan) are much smaller still, and even less likely to be significant.

EXTENDING HOME RELIEF

The deeper objection to family allowances, however, is not based on their seemingly fantastic cost. Most of the money contributed by the middle class would, after all, return to it in the allowances. But for the lower-income groups, the allowances would constitute, essentially, merely an extension of the "home relief" already available to residents of large cities if their earnings fail to expand with the size of their families. The fundamental question is whether a larger and more universal subsidy related to procreation is the best way in which to alter our system of income supports, considering especially the probable scarcity of new funds.

Another approach would be to relate the income subsidy not to number of children but rather effort at self support—that is, to insure employment at better than current minimum wages by means of a labor-cost tax-credit for employers. In such a system the maximum credit should be given for wages paid at the minimum legal rate set, with progressively smaller credits over a limited range of higher wage rates.

This step would do far more than merely raise minimal incomes relative to welfare standards; it would finally eliminate the persistent unemployment stemming from our "traditional" thoughtless practice of imposing minimum wage rates without a compensatory subsidy to re-equate labor demand and supply. If it were desired, the subsidy could be paid directly to low-wage employees. But apart from being more cumbersome, this would necessitate abolition of existing legal wage minimums to produce the same expansion of employment.

The current alienation and cynicism of Negro youth, who are swelling the ranks of half-employed, absent AFDC fathers, is vitally related to the persistently disastrous rates of unemployment among precisely this group. It may well be that pride induces many Negro young men to abandon their dependents to AFDC in preference to applying for "home relief" with them. This is, of course, self-deceiving, but the underlying impulse toward self support can be understood and harnessed.

Still, an employment subsidy, like any feasible family allowance, could do no more than marginally reduce the relative gain obtainable from splitting up the family unit. This is unlikely to be sufficient: The hard fact is that the necessity of a far more determined and effective enforcement of support responsibilities cannot be escaped by any practical system of income support.

It is necessary to be quite unyielding about this. Enforcement is the natural substitute for the negative sanction of the disgrace and guilt that inhibited desertion when desertion meant leaving one's dependents to virtual starvation. It must become common knowledge that a deserting breadwinner will be found. The cost of doing this must be balanced against the preventive effect, not the direct support recovered. Further, he must be required to pay, not according to what he currently has left over after providing a separate residence for himself, but essentially according to the minimum need of his dependents. In many cases he will be able to meet this challenge by increased employment effort or by returning to a common household with these dependents. If, with the best effort, he cannot, he has the opportunity to receive supplemental relief. Practically speaking, the support required must be sure enough and heavy enough to make it clear that separating is a way to lower—rather than raise—the standard of living.

NOTHING TO LOSE

Finally, an important stimulant to our AFDC boom is the simple fact that, at present, AFDC mothers have little or nothing to lose. It is a peculiarly American illusion that to make AFDC relief conditional upon acceptance of available employment would be a terrible blow to the welfare of the children.

In fact it would improve the morale of the entire family, encourage the mother to avoid separation or to remarry and (not such a contemptible aim) reduce the exploitation of the working taxpayer. Our states have so far foolishly reneged in providing the nurseries and day care centers that would make a practical reality of this requirement, which often exists in theory. The 1967 Social Security amendment pressing states to institute this requirement and to undertake the related reforms is eminently sensible—one of the few hopeful signs in the current welfare tragedy.

In sum, the most promising path for new forms of income maintenance is in association with employment. A nationally standardized system of support for those who cannot work would solve the significant problem of perverse mobility incentives. These reforms, combined with a far more determined enforcement of support responsibilities and a policy of requiring and enabling relief mothers to work, should give us a fighting chance to reverse the social disgrace typified by New York's gigantic new class of public dependents.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOVIET UNION TOWARD CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 18, 1968, edition of the State newspaper, of Columbia, S.C., contains an editorial entitled "Back in Orbit."

Editor Bill Workman devotes this editorial to the Soviet Union's attitude regarding Czechoslovakia. He points out that the message from Moscow to Prague is very clear—the Soviet Union has no intention of permitting one of its satellites to escape from orbit.

Despite the obvious position of the Soviet leaders, there are many in official Washington who prefer to hope that the satellites will eventually become free agents that can be won over to our side. Bill Workman does an excellent job of refuting this belief, and reminds his readers of the potential of the Russian Army for keeping satellites on course.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BACK IN ORBIT

Though Soviet troops have done the hesitation step in their waltz out of Czechoslovakia, the prospect of Russian intervention, a la the Hungarian Revolt, seems slight. But, then, the Czechs have not revolted as did the Hungarians in 1956. Their protest has been cautious and restrained—and equally intolerable in Moscow's eyes.

It seems clear that Prague understands the message. The Warsaw Pact maneuvers, which served as cover for the temporary military occupation of Czechoslovakia, have been terminated, and the tanks and troops are going. But Prague understands why Moscow chose to march about 24,000 Soviet soldiers into Czechoslovakia at this precise moment and why the troops stayed on for more than two weeks after war games ended.

If only it were clear that the U.S. State Department understands. For some time, Washington has clung tenaciously to the fiction that the Soviet presence in Eastern Europe has withered away. No longer do our bemused diplomats speak of Iron Curtain nations and Soviet satellites. This is the rhetoric of the Cold War. Our State Department personnel, assigned the task of building bridges, speak now of "the nations of Eastern Europe."

Yet the message from Moscow to Prague should be equally clear in other capitals. The Soviet Union has relinquished its hold on none of the territory it seized in the aftermath of World War II, when Washington

entertained equally naive views on the nature of Soviet ambitions. Though local customs and circumstances may require some variety among the satellites, Moscow requires unquestioning allegiance on matters that affect the destiny of the Communist alliance.

This appears to be where the Prague regime went wrong. It made too many concessions to the grumbling dissidents, who objected not only to the restraints imposed by the police state but also held Moscow accountable. Given the option, they would have charted an independent course. For reasons that are plain, Moscow felt that such rebellious stirrings had to be put down. Perhaps it learned a lesson in Hungary, where restlessness erupted into revolt.

Czechoslovakia's experience is instructive with respect to other satellites as well—satellites like Yugoslavia and Romania, which Washington is pleased to regard as "independent" socialist states, weaned from Moscow's orbit by the skillful diplomacy of the United States. If Moscow did not allow independence in Czechoslovakia, what reason is there to believe that it was more permissive toward its other puppets?

Reason is beside the point. Washington prefers to hope, and it continues to believe, because it wants to believe, that Moscow's satellites are free agents capable of being won over to our side. It fashions cultural exchanges on the basis of such hopes and encourages trade between East and West. And when a satellite wobbles in its orbit and confronts, as a result, the correcting power of the Russian army, Washington appears not to notice.

AN EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE SIXTH-TERM BID OF CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, as is occasionally the case, the race in Wyoming for the House of Representatives is that State's only national contest in the 1968 election year.

Her distinguished Governor, Stan Hathaway, is at a mid-term position, Senator CLIFF HANSEN, another Republican, is in the first third of his first term, and the other State-elected officers run concurrently with the Governor.

So it falls upon the shoulders of the Congressman—WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, our colleague of five terms—to carry the banner of Republicanism at the State level this year as the party sets out to give Republicans control of the House in the 91st Congress.

This campaign, which finds the active and vigorous 72 years of our friend and colleague being exploited in a vicious primary campaign, has elicited a fair amount of editorial comment in Wyoming.

A recent editorial from the Wyoming State Tribune, entitled, "Sewing Political Wild Oats," points out:

One of the minor phenomena in the year of recurrent political surprises has been what a prominent Democrat has privately described as a "major blood-letting" within the Wyoming Republican party, specifically in the congressional contest.

The editorial continues:

This has largely featured a series of attacks by John Wold, of Casper . . . in at-

tempting to unseat veteran WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, seeking his sixth term in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The other editorials from the June 21 and 28 and July 18 and 24 editions of the Sheridan, Wyo., Press, deal with the affirmative and commendable aspects of the congressional record of BILL HARRISON.

They speak for themselves, but in placing editorials in the Record, I would quote from the press editorial of June 28:

Laws that BILL HARRISON has either originated, helped sponsor, or which he steered, have involved water, have aided Wyoming's Indians, have dealt with Wyoming's lands, have aided towns, have served irrigation districts have benefited or helped solve problems on Federal reclamation projects, have helped the veterans, have aided recreational development, have helped education, and have helped oil and gas development.

Congressman HARRISON's record shows an active concern for the needs of Wyoming's people and an ability to achieve.

The record is fruitful . . . fruitful for Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, the editorials to which I have referred follow:

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, June 21, 1968]

THE WAR ON AGRICULTURE GOES ON

At the Wyoming stock growers convention, William Henry Harrison charged the Johnson administration was undermining the agricultural industry. He pointed to policies which are designed to provide American consumers with low prices for food at the expense of agriculture as a whole.

In Harrison's words, the Johnson administration is fighting an "unpublicized war on agriculture." This is carried on to reduced living costs by pushing farm prices downward particularly by keeping meat prices down at the expense of the stockman.

In a broad sense, the Harrison comments are aimed at a federal government policy which obviously is aimed at keeping the consumer happy without any regard of what it is doing to the stockman and farmer. Consumers are numerous and powerful as voters. Agriculture is no longer a powerful political factor as it was 40 years ago. This situation, however, produces a critical problem which eventually may become as acute as the racial and law enforcement problems are at present.

Low consumer prices are made possible by the production of an abundance of foods. When the abundance which American agriculture has been able to provide runs down, the problems will be more than one of price.

In a large measure, the various segments of the American economy can at least partly meet the problems of inflation and rising prices. Workers are able to press for higher wages, especially in a labor market where there are more jobs than people to fill them. Industry in most instances can raise prices, unless competition prevents. The farmer and stockman are unable to do anything about the market. He has to sell at what the market has to offer. And in recent years, that is akin to disaster.

Net farm income for 1967 was actually down from 1966 by nearly \$2 billion. The drop was from \$16.4 billion in 1966 to \$14.5 in 1967. That is a drop of 11.5 per cent in one year.

Probably no other industry could survive a drop of 11.5 per cent in income in one year, especially in times of inflation and rising costs. Farmers and ranchers are staying in business generally by going deeper into debt in the hope that the situation will change. Fortunately for the rest of America, capital assets in agriculture have been adequate to bear that additional debt burden. Farm debts have increased by \$20 billion in the last six years.

tion's announced policy is that of "non-involvement," of which more will be said later. But does "noninvolvement" mean we must keep totally silent? Can we—and are we—using the Voice of America to tell the world what is going on?

The Soviets are on the defensive and by their pressure tactics and not-too-subtle threats of armed intervention in Czechoslovakia they are showing that all their hypocritical talk about "self-determination" is an outright lie. The Kremlin will go to extraordinary lengths to keep the Communist bloc nations in line. It cannot afford to take the risk of doing nothing, lest the desire for more freedom spread not only through the satellite countries but right into the streets of Moscow and to the walls of the Kremlin itself.

Let us look at the situation: It is no exaggeration to say that the matter as far as the Soviet Union is concerned is probably the most serious it has faced since it was attacked by Nazi Germany in 1941. For all of Eastern Europe, it is the most critical since construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961.

If the Czech Government is allowed to go ahead with its proposed reforms such as freedom of the press, allowing opposition groups to form, permitting the right of assembly, and open admission of serious Government errors in the past, it will mean a tacit challenge to Communist doctrine as laid down by Moscow that would have widespread repercussions throughout the Communist world. An indication of how serious it is to the Kremlin is that the entire Soviet Politburo has gone to Prague to discuss the matter; this move came after the Czechs refused to go to Moscow. This is the first time in the history of the Soviet Union that the entire Politburo has all left Russia at the same time.

If, on the other hand, Moscow moves too harshly against Prague—and military force, like that used against Hungary in 1956, has not been ruled out—the dangers are just as great.

Moscow left no time trying to blame it all on someone else. Two Tass broadcasts from Moscow on July 19, 1968, charged the United States with involvement. One referred to "CIA-Pentagon documents" and the other said secret stores of U.S.-made weapons had been found near the Czech-West German border.

The administration has announced a policy of "noninvolvement" as far as the United States is concerned. This means offering absolutely no encouragement nor support of any kind to the Czechs. I offer for comparison two official State Department responses to questions about the Czech situation. The first was made on May 1, 1968; the second on July 19, 1968.

On May 1, 1968:

We are watching with interest and sympathy—interest and sympathy—the developments in Czechoslovakia which seem to represent the wishes and needs of the Czech people. We hope that they—the developments—will lead to an improvement in relations between Eastern and Western Europe and between Czechoslovakia and the United States.

But on July 19, 1968:

The United States has not involved itself in any way in the Czech situation. The

United believes Czechoslovakia should be free to develop its own internal arrangements.

What happened to the "interest and sympathy"? Why the sudden and obvious change in tone and policy? The above quotations appeared in an article in the Washington, D.C., Post on July 21, 1968; the author of the article, Warren Unna, had these comments:

May 1 was before the Russians and their hard-line Eastern European clients—East Germany and Poland—lined up against the Czechs.

May 1 also was before the recent spate of steps forward in U.S.-Soviet relations.

And May 1 also was further away from the U.S. presidential election campaign in which a Democratic Administration, in order to continue in office, doesn't want to be cornered with a Republican charge of "cowardice" should the Soviets decide to really move in on the Czechs.

The United States has been told to keep its hands off. We did this once before. In 1962, at the United Nations, the United States offered a resolution to dissolve the Commission headed by Sir Leslie Munro, the delegate from New Zealand, which for 6 years had been looking into the Hungarian revolt of 1956. Munro had filed four reports; the Soviet Union had violently protested all of them. On December 17, 1962, the United States offered its resolution; on December 18, it issued a further statement saying the matter should be approached from a "new angle." On December 20, 1962, the Commission was dissolved.

Just how far the administration will go this time is unknown. The Secretary of State has protested directly to the Soviet Ambassador about the Moscow radio broadcast inferring that we are involved. But it would seem the very least we can do—what we must do—is give objective, full-scale up-to-the-minute coverage of the situation, over the Voice of America. The Soviet Union is on trial and the whole world is watching. I have sent the following letter to the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Leonard Marks; his reply will be made public when it is received:

The announced, official policy of the United States Government in the present Soviet-Czech crisis is that of "non-involvement," which means, in effect, that the Government will take no steps the Soviet Union might consider "provocative" and give the Soviet Union an excuse to move against the Czechs on the grounds of "crushing imperialist intervention."

I would like to know how this is being treated by USIA and VOA. It would be greatly appreciated if you would forward to me samples of commentary on the Soviet-Czech matter as broadcast over VOA, with citations as to date and countries the broadcasts were aimed at.

Thank you very much.

WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Member of Congress.

NATIVE HIRE IN ALASKA

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on July 19, 1968, at the call of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] an

informal meeting with Federal agencies was held to discuss Alaska native hire policies. Senator BARTLETT is necessarily absent. In his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the replies that he received from the Cabinet Secretaries concerning native hire be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

MAY 10, 1968.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,¹
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A plan has been developed to advance the employment of Alaskan natives within Federal agencies. As the initial step in implementing the plan it is necessary that reaction to it, as well as certain detailed information, be obtained from each agency which has employing activities in Alaska.

Under Executive Order 11386, Federal programs affecting Alaska's economic progress are being coordinated by the Federal Advisory Council on Regional Economic Development. The economic plight of the Alaskan native is a problem directly related to economic development within the State. Therefore, the Council has established a Committee on Alaskan Native Hire to address itself to the specific problems of native employment. Although full consideration of the employment problem must include the private sector as well as State and local governments, the Committee has first studied the question in terms of additional steps Federal agencies can take as employers which would contribute toward the solution of this problem. The Committee has advanced a plan which takes into consideration the basic problem, that of bringing the "man and the job" together.

The proposal involves the development of a host-enrollee program which would supplement continuing agency Equal Employment Opportunity Program efforts in direct employment. In the plan, each agency would agree to provide facilities, instructors and support for job training for a number of Alaskan natives approximately equal to ten per cent (10%) of the agency's permanent workforce. The trainees would constitute a manpower pool for that agency which would be given priority consideration in filling vacancies as they occurred within the permanent workforce. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, would be responsible for screening and selecting trainees, providing for their transportation to training sites, arranging for suitable housing and social services for them and their families, and for providing necessary subsistence payments and other support during training. The host arrangement would be open-ended, depending on individual development as well as vacancy openings. A detailed outline of the plan, which also provides background information, is enclosed.

The proposal appears sound from every point of view. It is, of course, patterned in general upon the successful plan established by the Weather Bureau in Alaska for trainee weather observers, with certain significant variations. The investment involved would be recouped through decreases in government assistance to the unemployed as well as in an ultimate reduction in turnover costs to employing agencies. If pursued, the plan should eventually result in a substantial reduction in the need for bringing employees from "the lower 48."

Certain problems must be solved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including staffing and funding as well as arranging for joint supporting participation with other Federal

¹ A list of addresses of identical letters follows this letter.

July 25, 1968

E 6933

charming gowns of her own great-grandmother.

Frequently referred to as "the backbone of the theater," Mrs. Bostick and her husband, Hagood, have opened their hospitable home, "Dogwood" on numerous occasions to honor the theater's directors and casts of plays. Mr. Bostick has lent his own talents as an actor to a number of Town Theater productions.

Mrs. Bostick's interests in the cultural life of Columbia are by no means confined to the theater. Somehow this remarkably lady finds time and seemingly boundless energy to serve as librarian for Richland County Public Library. Under her guidance, that institution has grown from a less-than-modest beginning into one of the finest public libraries in the Southeast.

Mrs. Bostick has brought additional lustre to Columbia as a publisher of fine books in cooperation with former Columbian Fant Thornley.

Mr. and Mrs. Bostick are among the most ardent supporters of the Columbia Kennel Club and they have been instrumental in making Columbia an important center for dog owners and trainers.

Mrs. Bostick, herself, is inclined to avoid the spotlight, preferring to create the impression that whatever she has done has been largely "fortuitous."

But fortuitous circumstances arise in the lives of many of us—who fail to rise with them. Mrs. Bostick is one of those rare ones who obviously recognize "that tide, which taken at the flood" leads on to every increasing accomplishment.

Even if her contribution to Town Theater were, as she says, "largely a matter of chance," it is still rare good luck indeed for Town Theater which placed Lucy Hampton Bostick in the right place at the right time.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
July 19, 1968]

Mrs. HAGOOD BOSTICK DIES

Mrs. Hagood Bostick, for many years a leader and patron in the cultural and educational life of Columbia and of the state, died early Thursday. She had been critically injured in an automobile accident on July 5.

The funeral will be held this afternoon at 5 o'clock in Trinity Episcopal Church of which she was a member. Interment will be in Trinity churchyard.

Mrs. Bostick had been Richland County librarian since 1928. As an officer and a member of the State Library Board, she was one of the pioneers in the mission of extending public free libraries and their educational services throughout South Carolina. She had a leadership role in encouraging legislation which became the basis of the spread and improvement of library functions over the state.

In the community of Columbia, Mrs. Bostick lent her leadership and support to practically every major endeavor devoted to the interests of the arts, including the Town Theater, the Columbia Museum of Art and the Historic Columbia Foundation.

Under her direction, the Richland County Library was developed from an institution having only 16,000 volumes to one which now has 225,953 in its main city library and its four branches, Waverly, Cooper, St. Andrew's and Eastover. At the time Mrs. Bostick became librarian the library's annual circulation was 60,000 volumes. Today that circulation is more than a million volumes. One of the modern services of the library is the Bookmobile, which makes books available in rural areas.

During her long administration, Mrs. Bostick saw the library move successfully from modest quarters to the modern structure which houses it today at Sumter and

Washington Streets. She also played a leading part in the effort which led to the provision of a large new headquarters, now being constructed at Senate and First Streets, for the State Library Board.

The American Library Assn. appointed Mrs. Bostick as special membership chairman for South Carolina.

For more than 30 years she served as secretary of the Columbia Stage Society, the parent body for the Town Theater. In the same period she was a member of the board of the theater, a post she still held at the time of her death. In its early years, Mrs. Bostick accepted roles in the theater's productions and her interest in its ongoing continued through her lifetime.

She was a founding member and patron of the Historic Columbia Foundation and its restoration of the Ainsley Hall house, designed by Robert Mills. She served in an advisory capacity on various committees for the restoration of the Bostick boxwood gardens and the restoration of the Hampton-Preston house.

From 1958 through 1960, Mrs. Bostick was a member of the board of the Columbia Museum of Art.

One of her engrossing interests was the Columbia Kennel Club. She was its treasurer at the time of her death, and formerly was president. The club sponsors a large annual dog show and in this Mrs. Bostick was always a guiding figure.

She was recognized nationally as an authority on dog breeding and dog judging and often served as a judge at shows sanctioned by the American Kennel Club. She was an authority on cocker spaniels and raised them at her home, "Dogwood," on the Hampton proper on the outskirts of Columbia.

When Columbia's new private school, Hammond Academy, was organized, she was one of its founders and benefactors and served on its Board of Trustees.

Few major endeavors for the advancement of Columbia and Richland County failed to enlist the leadership talents and the material support of Mrs. Bostick.

In recent years, she even found time to conduct a discussion of books and library services on WIS-radio.

Mrs. Bostick attended Converse College and studied library science at Emory University, Atlanta, and the University of South Carolina.

She was a former president of the Players Club, a member of the Drama Club, the Assembly and a former president of the Junior League.

The former Lucy Hampton, Mrs. Bostick was the daughter of the late Frank Hampton and Gertrude Gonzales Hampton. She was a grandniece of Gen. Wade Hampton.

She descended, on her mother's side, from the family out of which was founded The State newspaper. Her mother was the sister of the three Gonzales brothers who established the newspaper February 18, 1891. The brothers were the late N. G., Ambrose and William Elliott Gonzales.

Mrs. Bostick was a member of the board of directors of the State-Record Co., which publishes The State and The Columbia Record, and entertained a deep interest in the newspapers and their institutional responsibility.

Surviving are her husband, Hagood Bostick; a sister, Mrs. Victor B. Barringer of Richmond, Va.; three brothers, Frank Hampton, Harry R. E. Hampton and Ambrose G. Hampton, all of Columbia, and a number of nieces and nephews.

Pallbearers will be McKeever Willcox of Darlington, Paul B. Barringer II of Weldon, N.C., Ben R. Morris of Atlanta, Dr. Ambrose G. Hampton Jr., A. McConnell Faucette and Kirkman Finlay, Jr., of Columbia.

For those who desire, memorials can be forwarded to the Carolina Children's Home.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, July 18, 1968]

Mrs. HAGOOD BOSTICK, COUNTY LIBRARIAN, DIES

Mrs. Hagood Bostick, Richland County librarian and long a leader in the advancement of Columbia, died early today from injuries received in an automobile accident several days ago.

Funeral services will be held Friday at 5 p.m. in Trinity Episcopal Church. The Rev. Charles Scott May will officiate. Burial will be in Trinity Churchyard.

Surviving are her husband; three brothers, Frank Hampton, Harry R. E. Hampton and Ambrose G. Hampton, all of Columbia; a sister, Mrs. Victor Barringer of Richmond, Va.; and a number of nieces and nephews.

Mrs. Bostick, the former Lucy Hampton, attended Converse College and took courses in library science at Emory University and the University of South Carolina.

The daughter of the late Frank Hampton and Gertrude Gonzales Hampton, Mrs. Bostick was the grandniece of Gen. Wade Hampton. Her uncles were the Gonzales brothers, N. G., Ambrose and William E., who established The State newspaper. Mrs. Bostick was a member of the Board of Directors of the State-Record Co., which publishes The State and The Columbia Record.

She was a member of Trinity Episcopal Church and The Assembly.

Mrs. Bostick's name is synonymous with the Richland County Public Library. She promoted free public libraries all over South Carolina, contributing to movements in other counties for the establishment of libraries.

She was the only librarian on the State Library Board which was set up by the General Assembly to assist in the establishment of free libraries. She served as secretary to that body. She was chairman of the Citizens' Library Committee which cooperates with the Library Board.

The American Library Association appointed Mrs. Bostick as special membership chairman for South Carolina. She held offices of president, secretary and also served on the executive board of the state Library Association.

Mrs. Bostick was a bulwark of the Town Theater and its artistic contributions to the community. She once played a role in its productions, was a former president of its affiliate, the Players Club and for years was a member of its Board of Directors, a post she still held at her death. Also, she was active in the establishment and sustenance of the Columbia Museum of Art. She was also one of the founders of the Hammond Academy and a member of the Board of Trustees.

The Bostick home, "Dogwood," is located on the Hampton property near the veterans hospital.

She was very interested in dogs and cocker spaniels were her favorite. She was a very active member of the Columbia Kennel Club, and the Drama Club. She was a former president of the Junior League.

file
VOICE OF AMERICA SHOULD TELL
THE WORLD THE STORY OF SO-
VIET-CZECH CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, what, if anything, is the United States doing in the present crisis between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia? The administra-