

lege Placement Council, and sent to 1,000 colleges and universities, urging that school officials block attempts by small groups to obstruct campus job recruitment.

Also on November 21, there appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer a column by Roscoe Drummond entitled "United States Is About Fed Up With War Dissenters." I include his column in the Record at this point, along with the item "College Recruiter Blocking Hit," which also appeared in the Inquirer of the same date:

UNITED STATES IS ABOUT FED UP WITH WAR  
DISSIDENTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The violent, illegal, vulgar, anticivil rights tactics of the Vietnam protesters are overstraining the Nation's tolerance. More and more people are showing that they have had enough of this kind of thing and won't stand for it much longer.

College officials, many professors and student leaders who, in the name of preserving free speech, have long tolerated the vicious attempts to deny free speech on campus and off, are deciding to call a halt.

It comes none too soon. It will have overwhelming public support.

Congress has been as indulgent as the college authorities, but now even the Congressional critics of the Vietnam War are beginning to see that there can be too much of a bad thing.

Sen. Frank E. Moss (D., Utah), for example, is urging a new type of bombing pause—a moratorium on "bombing" President Johnson with a daily salvo of "vicious, insidious, and sadistic attacks."

"I steadfastly champion the civil rights cause," Moss told the Senate. "But the attacks I deplore are neither civil nor right."

That's exactly the point. Nobody from President to page boy is denying anybody the "right to dissent."

What cannot be tolerated in a free society, in a democratic society, in a decent society, is the attempt of the dissenters to use violence and disorder to deny to others the "right to assent."

We can't allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with preserving the civil rights of the minority that we permit the lawless minority to violate the civil rights of the majority.

This is why the patience of the Nation with the antics of the antifree speech, antidemocratic, violent war protesters is wearing thin. And with good reason.

It is amply evident that the primary purpose of the antiwar pickets and placards is not just to affirm their views but to make it impossible for others to speak theirs. They don't want to promote the dialogue of a free society; they want to stop the dialogue; they want to close off free speech. They surround public halls to prevent people from assembling.

They storm an automobile carrying the Vice President.

Some student dissenters resort to force and violence to prevent other students from being interviewed for employment by representatives of companies that produce war materiel, or by the CIA, or by military recruiters.

They hoot and howl at Dean Rusk to prevent others from listening to him.

And in New York the other night these high-minded practitioners of violence hurled paint, bottles, and other missiles and shouted obscenities and taunts at those who wanted to attend a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association at which the Secretary of State was the guest—and at the police who were trying to protect a peaceable assembly.

It would have been peaceable except for those who claimed they were for peace and whom a New York Times editorial described as "rampaging . . . junior-grade storm troopers."

The time to call a halt on this kind of thing is at hand and Harvard University is showing that it is ready to do it. In putting 70 students on probation for "forcible obstruction" of a job recruiter, President Nathan Pusey said: "This kind of conduct is simply unacceptable, not only in a community devoted to intellectual endeavor, but, I would assume, in any decent, democratic society."

Let's not forget that there is no constitutional guarantee of "free" assembly; the guarantee is of peaceable assembly.

#### COLLEGE RECRUITER BLOCKING HIT

BETHLEHEM, PA., November 29.—The College Placement Council urged colleges and universities on Monday to block attempts by small groups to obstruct campus job recruitment.

The statement from the nonprofit corporation representing the Regional Placement Associations of the United States and Canada comes in the wake of a growing number of student demonstrations nationwide.

#### CAMPUS PROTESTS

In recent weeks small groups sparked by militant student organizations have protested campus visits by recruiters from certain companies and government agencies.

In some cases recruiters have been held captive in interviewing rooms and automobiles for up to eight hours and students have been blocked from taking interviews.

#### TO 1,000 COLLEGES

The statement by the CPC sent to the presidents of more than 1,000 colleges and universities served by the organization, asks that the rights of seniors to interview prospective employers on campus be protected.

"The students are the ultimate losers when on-campus recruiting is obstructed," Raymond H. Stockard, director of placement at the University of Rhode Island and current president of the Council noted in the statement.

#### THE PRESIDENT REVERSES HIS FIELD

(Mr. ROBISON (at the request of Mr. ZWACH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's sudden—and unexpected—shift in favor of Federal spending restraint will not do much to relieve the fiscal "credibility gap" from which his administration has suffered and may, indeed, magnify it, but at least it ought to serve to break the deadlock that has so far prevented Congress from considering the Johnson surtax proposal on its merits; and I believe that such consideration is long overdue.

This should not be taken to mean—or to imply—that I am in favor of that surtax proposal, for I shall first want to see in what form it emerges, if it now does, from the House Ways and Means Committee, as well as to have more concrete information concerning the President's rumored offer to cut Federal spending dollar for dollar of additional revenue raised, and then to relate both matters to our domestic economic problems as the same may have been altered

by Britain's decision to devalue the pound.

As to that latter fact—which seems to have caught our Government at least partially by surprise—it seems to me it should stand as a lesson for us in that it again demonstrates that no government, no matter how great and powerful, can forever live beyond its means. As the Wall Street Journal said, editorially, yesterday:

Federal finances are in a shocking state, and Britain's step is a reminder that grave distortions cannot be left forever uncorrected.

As a Republican—and as one House Member who has taken an active part in the Republican effort to obtain some commitment from the President for restraint in Federal expenditures—I do not consider Mr. Johnson's change of attitude as a victory of any sort unless it be victory for realism, and even that may have come too late for the American people who will apparently, now, have to bear the brunt of both soaring inflation and near-record high interest rates regardless of the ultimate congressional decision concerning a tax increase. And, in my view, we have come to this unfortunate state because of an equally deplorable lapse in leadership and responsibility on the part of the current administration which, long before this, should have "seen the handwriting on the wall" and taken positive action to avert the impending fiscal crisis we now face both at home and abroad.

Of course, the House has been stubborn in its attempt to force an attitude of restraint upon the President that it, itself, has time and again proven to be incapable of adopting—and both Houses of Congress must accept the blame for that latter fact—but there has simply been no excuse for the kind of institutional breakdown between Congress and President that this has precipitated and I believe Mr. Johnson, to borrow his own recent phrase, "will live to rue the day" when he permitted this to happen for, no matter how you cut it, his is the larger responsibility.

There can, equally, be no excuse for the manner in which, this year, the normal appropriation processes have been dragged out, or for the great uncertainties that unfunded Federal agencies have had to face, or for the "payless pay-days" Federal employees have had to cope with—none of which conditions would have happened if the President, for some unknown and unfathomable reason, had not seen fit to cut his own line of communications with his own nominal leaders in the Congress.

With the advent of Thanksgiving, I think we can all be thankful that such lines of communications have now been at least partially restored and I, for one, am perfectly willing to see Congress now stay in session for the balance of this year in order to consider and to take responsible action toward doing what we can, late though the hour be, toward straightening out the tangled fiscal affairs of this Nation whose strength—let us remember—does not rest on military prowess alone.

FOIA b