

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:
H.R. 10637. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:
H.R. 10638. A bill to amend section 39-201 of the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McFALL:
H.R. 10639. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:
H.R. 10640. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 10641. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:
H.R. 10642. A bill to amend an act approved May 23, 1908, relating to the disposition by the Secretary of Agriculture of moneys obtained from the sale of materials from national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASSMAN:
H.R. 10643. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H.R. 10644. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:
H.R. 10645. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to carry out the activities of Federal Committees for Development Planning in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:
H.R. 10646. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny-Cumberland Parkway in the States of Virginia, Kentucky, West Virginia, and

Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:
H.R. 10647. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:
H.R. 10648. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:
H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:
H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:
H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the district constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ADAMS):
H.J. Res. 611. Resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:
H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution amending the Gulf of Tonkin resolution to provide for the adjudication by the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,
224. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to increased appropriations for research

and development in weather forecasting, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:
H.R. 10649. A bill for the relief of Jean Claude Sam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10650. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ingrassano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 10651. A bill for the relief of Pietro Filippazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 10652. A bill for the relief of Yip Shing Butt, his wife, Kum Wah Chan Butt, and their minor daughter, Siu Wah Butt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 10653. A bill for the relief of Gee Pui Shung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:
H.R. 10654. A bill for the relief of Violetta Guanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:
H.R. 10655. A bill for the relief of Arthur Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H.R. 10656. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aya H. Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 10657. A bill for the relief of Michele D'Aleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10658. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

99. By the SPEAKER: Petition of New York State Federation of Women's Clubs, Schenectady, N.Y., relative to unnecessary Federal spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

100. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Lester M. Andrew, Tristin, Calif., and others, relative to establishment of a Support Our Servicemen Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today and to pay tribute to a man who was the founder of the Greyhound Bus Co., and could literally be called the father of our modern bus transportation system, Mr. Edwin Carl Ekstrom of Corpus Christi, Tex.

"Mr. Ed," as he was affectionately known to his friends, was born in Ludington, Mich., on March 19, 1889, and

died in Corpus Christi, Tex., on May 8, 1967. During that span of 78 years his life was distinguished by remarkable achievements and personal greatness. He was a quiet man; he shunned publicity, devoting his energies to making himself expert in the business he loved and helped create. A partial chronicle of the greatness and achievements of Ed Ekstrom would take more space than is possibly available. Suffice it to say that he was truly an outstanding man representing a great business: as a man of fine character and an outstanding American, he set an example in the transportation industry that will not soon be surpassed. His dedication, his tenacity and his determination was source of inspiration to all who knew him. The world is a better place for his having lived. This, indeed, is the richest legacy that any of us could hope to leave.

Mr. Ed was born the son of Swede-Finns who emigrated from Finland in the early 1880's and settled in Ludington, Mich., later moving to Hibbing, Minn., where he completed his grammar school education in 1901. Due to dire circumstances, it was necessary that he should work to help support his family, so during the next 2 years he was employed as a tallyboy in an underground mine, located about 3 miles from Hibbing, then was transferred to their office as a supply clerk. He worked as a bookkeeper and accountant in Hibbing where he became acquainted with the men who later developed jitney service into transcontinental bus service. Ekstrom kept books for these jitney drivers who hauled ore from town to town in the Minnesota ore fields. When one of the original six jitney drivers died in 1917, Ekstrom bought into the company which at that time was

transporting passengers between Hibbing and Duluth, Minn.

The firm was known as the Mesaba Transportation Co. and charged a 15 cent fare for a 3-mile trip from Hibbing to Alice. The bus company pioneers finally split up in 1923 and Ed Ekstrom moved to Madison, Wis., where he bought a bus line running from Madison to Fond Du Lac, and named it the Eastern Wisconsin Co.

Ekstrom then moved to Michigan and opened the Safety Motor Coach Lines which ran from Grand Rapids to Muskegon. This later turned out to be the nucleus of the Greyhound Lines and it was later extended to Chicago.

It was in 1926 that the now famous Greyhound name was born. Frank Fageol, builder of the first twin coaches for Transcontinental Lines, sold Ekstrom 52 buses, a figure that was unheard of at this time. For this sale, Fageol presented Ekstrom with a white greyhound dog which was promptly named "Bus." "Bus" soon became the symbol of the Safety Motor Coach Lines, and was used extensively in its advertising program, although Ekstrom never bothered to register it as a trademark while he owned the firm. The dog was killed a few years later when it was struck by a car in San Antonio.

Ekstrom was a pioneer in snow removal on the route north of Muskegon, which he kept clear with his own plows, in order to see that the regular schedules that he had set up were maintained. Together with this, he also established a permanent system of stations, garages, and other equipment, in order to keep pace with his expansion program.

In 1928, Ekstrom sold out to one of the original jitney drivers, C. E. Wickman, and a group of his associates. Wickman not only took the greyhound name, but also the famous blue and white color scheme of the buses which are now seen all over the country.

Ekstrom then moved to San Antonio in 1928, where he organized the Red Ball Transportation Co., which later became the Southland Greyhound Lines, soon becoming tied in with the one operating farther north. The operations spread out over almost all of Texas, and 2 years later, Ekstrom again sold out to Wickman. Ed then became associated with the Yellow Taxi Co. in San Antonio during the depression years of 1931 and 1932, but he again sold out and moved to Corpus Christi. It was in Corpus Christi that Ed Ekstrom bought out the Central Power & Light Co. Bus System, and the Colunga Bus Lines, as well. Ekstrom also owned the Nueces Mack Co. Truck Sales and the Nueces Mack Leasing Co. He sold these shortly after he sold the Nueces Transportation Co. to the city of Corpus Christi in late 1966.

Mr. Ed was not only an outstanding example of initiative and perseverance in the world of business and transportation; he was an outstanding civic leader as well. He was a member of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, an original member of the Area Development Committee, and a vestryman of the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd.

He was a benefactor of the Carmelite Day Nursery and served as chairman of a fund drive in 1965 to raise funds to construct a new building which has since been named in memory of him.

Last September 22, Ekstrom was cited by his city council for contributions to the community during the years that he owned and operated the bus system. They praised him for his part in making the city of Corpus Christi lovelier, and particularly for making life better, both individually and collectively by his financial contributions in time of crisis, and his liberal donations to hospital and child care programs and facilities.

Although he gave a substantial portion of his income away, Ed Ekstrom did not want applause or acclaim, he was merely trying to give aid to the needy throughout America without any reference to race or creed. He deplored greed in every form and felt that money's worth could only be measured by the good it could do. Loved and respected by his friends and associates, it was often said of him, "the pattern was lost when they made Ed."

It is because of men like Ed Ekstrom that our free enterprise system stands as a shining example of limitless opportunity and good will not only to the people of these United States, but also to all other people in the world today. Ed was a stalwart defender of the American way of life, and gave his all to see that it was maintained. He held all of his employees in respect, and they, in turn, gave their respect to him. In one of the bulletins that he sent to his employees, he pointed out the necessity of cooperation if there is to be success in business. He told his employees to do their best at all times, and to "Smile; results will amaze you if you heed this tip."

Ed Ekstrom is survived by his wife, Ethel; a son, Edwin Carl Ekstrom, Jr.; a daughter, Mrs. Paul S. Peck; a brother, Harold Ekstrom, all of Corpus Christi. Four sisters: Mrs. Howard Smith, and Mrs. Arthur Luchs, both of Glen Ellyn, Ill.; Mrs. Mark Wilson of Rochester, Minn.; Mrs. Frank Rauschel of Chisholm, Minn.; and two grandsons: Carl and Randal Peck.

We may never leave a legacy such as was left by Edwin Ekstrom, and we are in his debt, for truly the world is a better place for his having lived.

Fino Seeks Change Making Commutation Expenses Tax Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to allow taxpayers to deduct commutation expenses.

There is no reason that commutation expenses—a necessary part of holding remunerative employment to so many people—should not be treated like other

business expenses and made tax deductible.

Under the tax laws as they now stand, commutation expenses may in certain odd circumstances be deductible, but those ordinarily incurred are not. The typical commuter gets no tax relief with respect to the large amounts of money spent by him each year reaching the place of his employment. This expense, to my way of thinking, is very clearly a business expense—particularly where you have the situation in which a company almost dictates an executive's choice of residence. I think that it is high time that the Congress gave this tax break to the hard-pressed middle-income taxpayer.

National Teacher Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is the National Teacher Corps.

The newscast follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The National Teacher Corps was created two years ago to pioneer in the development of better teaching techniques to help the youngsters from poverty-stricken families.

The formation of this special group was frankly an experiment. It was in no sense a criticism of the splendid men and women who teach in the nation's public schools. On the contrary, it was designed to provide special help for those elementary school teachers who are working under the handicaps usually found in city slums and rural slums as well.

The growth and development of this country is bound up with the progress made in educating our youngsters. In most civilized countries, the male school master had come to be traditional. So Europeans were amazed that in the developing public school system of the United States, most of the teachers were women. They predicted that American children, coddled by their female teachers, would grow up unable to cope with the harsh realities of adult life.

The prophets were wrong. Our dedicated lady school teachers were such a success in teaching the three R's that the little Red Schoolhouse became a symbol of all that is good in America. And the youngsters trained in those schools became known both for their character and their initiative.

But today's teacher must do more than teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. Where the majority of children come from poor families, the teacher in the lower grades must be health consultant and guidance counselor as well.

American educators were among the first to appreciate that hidden health defects very often caused children to fail in school. So regular health check-ups were started and it was soon found that the so-called backward boy or girl was suffering from poor eyesight, poor hearing, or some other physical defect which could be corrected by proper medical treatment.

But this enlarged role for the primary

grade teacher is very difficult when classrooms are over-crowded and the work load is heavy. This is where the Teacher Corps comes in. A special team composed of an experienced teacher and college graduates with special training is sent in to help the regular teacher. This team helps carry the teaching load, and the members of the group do much more to help the children.

In North Carolina, one teaching corps is serving oatmeal breakfasts before classes to hungry youngsters. In Tennessee, the children had no playground and the members of the corps built one for them. In one rural community, it was found that many children suffered from speech defects. Local doctors were persuaded to give them free corrective treatment.

In the city slums, the task of the Teacher Corps is far more complicated. The temptations of a big city are many and the youngsters who grow up without proper guidance may easily fall into a life of crime. And the job of present-day educators is to teach good citizenship as well as the elementary subjects of grade school education.

The Teacher Corps is still in its infancy. The dedicated young men and women in its ranks are learning as well as teaching. They are trying to find the surest way of converting under-privileged children into useful citizens.

Thank you for listening.

Representative Henry P. Smith III Lauds Advances Made by Hooker Chemical Corp. in the Field of Fire-Retardant Chemistry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting story behind a recent announcement by a Department of Defense procurement agency regarding the awarding of contracts for some 16,000,000 yards of cotton oxford cloth for use as tent liners. It is especially interesting, in my opinion, because of two words included in the specifications which the successful bidders must meet—fire resistant.

The facts behind this story are known to me because they so intimately involve a company which has achieved a number of significant technological developments in the very sophisticated field of fire-retardant chemistry. Hooker Chemical Corp.'s firmly established predominance in this field results from many years of experience in developing and supplying industry with products and systems which reduce or eliminate fire hazards in a wide range of applications.

There is no need to dwell here on the grim statistics published annually by the National Fire Protection Association, or the Public Health Service. Fire does kill or maim thousands of people every year, many of them children. The tragedy of it all is that much of this crippling and killing could be prevented or significantly reduced.

Some years ago Hooker management decided to support research efforts aimed

at utilizing its proficiency in fire-retardant chemistry through the development of chemical systems that could be used in textiles, such as cotton fabrics used in manufacturing protective work garments. Working closely with leading mills, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans, La., Hooker did develop chemical systems for treating fabrics which set new standards for durable fire retardancy.

It is to the credit of the American free enterprise system that others also worked and continue to work on providing compounds or materials that will help alleviate this flammable fabrics problem. Hooker, which pioneered in this effort, continues to this day to work on it. Notable progress has been made.

There's comfort to be derived in the knowledge that the Department of Defense is providing the best in fire-resistant tenting, mattress ticking, and flight suits for our service personnel. However, it is not just in the military field that milestone applications have been achieved. There are a good many more commonplace and mundane uses for this technology than tenting liners, such as fire-retardant blankets, bed linens, cubicle curtains, work garments, and even sweat shirts. These products are now available or could be produced by leading mills and suppliers under various labels, many of them as the result of Hooker's efforts.

It is to be hoped that steady progress will continue to be made in those continuing efforts aimed at speeding the day when consumers generally can look for and expect to find those same two words—fire resistant—on a growing range and variety of everyday clothing and household fabrics.

World Crisis in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time of crisis when, without responsible leadership, war will inevitably continue its rampage in the Middle East, the United States should act firmly to preserve peace and security. An encouraging step in this direction was Ambassador Goldberg's support of the peace resolution in yesterday's meeting of the United Nations.

I now strongly urge the President of the United States to use the great influence and prestige of this Nation to protect the international rights of all nations to open waterways, particularly the right of Israel to free access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

I further urge the President to continue the presence of the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean as a display of this Nation's resolution. This country, having served as midwife during the birth of

Israel as a free and independent nation, now has a moral responsibility to protect her rights as such. As a sovereign nation, Israel can expect to have free access to international waterways.

I sincerely pray that the forces of reason and moderation will stop the present conflict. When the fighting has ceased, it is my earnest hope that the Israeli nation will have a guarantee that her future rights to the Gulf of Aqaba will remain forever inviolate.

Culver Urges Official Recognition of Eastern Orthodox Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last week, a significant event took place in the State of Iowa as Rev. Alexander George, pastor of St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church in Cedar Rapids, delivered the invocation in the Iowa General Assembly.

Father George was the first Orthodox priest in Iowa history to offer these opening prayers, and on that occasion, Iowa became the 37th State to so recognize the church as a major faith.

It is past time, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Government gave its formal recognition to the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is already in fact—if not in form—a major faith in our Nation.

I reintroduced legislation earlier this year—House Resolution 410—to accomplish this objective by requiring that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

According to the latest Yearbook of American Churches, there are over 3 million Eastern Orthodox Christians in the United States today. And since in the Orthodox Church only heads of households are counted as members, the total is probably well over 6 million with women and children included.

That same yearbook lists 5,585,000 members of the Jewish community, 44,874,371 Roman Catholics, and 66,854,200 Protestants in the United States.

Yet we automatically consider only "three major religious faiths"—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

However, there is a growing recognition of the important position of Orthodoxy in the United States:

The Armed Forces use the letters "EO" on dog tags to identify Eastern Orthodox Christians.

A representative of the Eastern Orthodox faith has been invited to participate in recent Presidential inauguration ceremonies.

Legislatures of at least half the States have enacted resolutions officially designating Orthodoxy as a separate fourth major faith.

Enactment of House Resolution 410 would not require any direct public expense. It would not ask any major effort

by the Government. But it would give the full and proper recognition to Orthodox Christians which they have a legitimate right to expect.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of House Resolution 410, and urge the prompt consideration of the matter in the House of Representatives:

H. RES. 410

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in the United States and throughout the world; and

Whereas Senate bill 106, Eighty-fourth Congress, led to the designation of the Eastern Orthodox faith as a separate religious faith in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas several Federal agencies have omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate; and

Whereas more than half of the States in the United States through their legislators have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox faith has millions of communicants throughout the world including several million in the United States; and

Whereas where anything is said concerning the major faiths, usually the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths are referred to; and

Whereas it therefore follows that a religious distinction is being made in omitting the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is contrary to the prevailing principle of democracy and freedom of religion in this country; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in this country; and that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths now limited to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

A Letter to a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] issued a very interesting and provocative newsletter which will be mailed this evening to some of his constituents in the Seventh Congressional District.

I believe that the letter from the gentleman from Wisconsin to his constituents should be called to the attention of all Members of this body and insert it in the RECORD at this point. The letter referred to follows:

JUNE 7, 1967.

DEAR FRIEND: June is the time of year for report cards. As our young people graduate or as they are advanced from one grade to the next in their educational careers, they are presented with an accounting of how well or how poorly they did in their efforts to obtain a good education.

Government should be no different. It seems to me that this is a good time to issue a "report card" on the progress being made by the Johnson Administration and its three to two Democratic majority in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Of course, as Chairman of the Republicans

in the House of Representatives, my grading may be questioned by some. But I do not believe the facts which are presented on pages two and three of this letter can be disputed.

AGRICULTURE

With parity at a depression-time low of 72, compared with 80 in 1960, farmers are in near-revolt. Imports of dairy products, mink pelts, wool and meat—eased by Administration policies—are driving prices down. Production costs, meanwhile, keep mounting, forcing more and more farmers off the land. Since 1960, the total number of farmers declined by nearly four million. Yet Department of Agriculture employees continue to increase, with one for every 26 farms in the country today compared with one per 39 farms in 1960. The Administration's solution? More of the same control and quota policies that led to the problem in the first place.

COST OF LIVING

Since 1960, the cost of living has shot up 10.5%, eroding the savings and pension plans of millions of older citizens and wiping out income advances of the younger ones. Inflation is like a national sales tax which affects everyone. Today's dollar is worth 45¢ compared to the one of 1941—and \$2.22 is required to buy what \$1 would have bought 25 years ago. What's the Administration's solution? More spending. More deficits. This year, the deficit could go as high as \$29 billion and a large tax increase may be unavoidable. This means more inflation, not less. Since 1963, the Johnson Administration has spent some \$40 billion more than it took in—mostly on domestic programs. Since 1960, defense spending, goaded by the war in Vietnam, jumped 68% while domestic spending skyrocketed 97 percent.

CREDIBILITY

From the President on down, the Administration's spokesmen have lost the confidence of the American people and the press in what they say and do. War statistics and cost estimates for example have been withheld, twisted, or reshaped. The American Society of Newspaper Editors among many others has publicly complained about this record. The Administration's answer seems to be more press agents. The General Accounting Office estimates that nearly 7,000 publicists are presently on the federal payroll—the largest number ever employed by an Administration—to "sell" Administration programs to the American people.

CRIME

Since 1960, crimes of all types in this country jumped an amazing 46%, the largest increase in any comparable period in history, while the nation's population increased only 8%. In other words, crime rose nearly six times faster than the population. In the past year, crimes shot up 11% across the country and a startling 27% in the nation's Capitol. Crime is estimated to cost the nation \$50 billion annually. The Administration's solution appears to be merely more Crime Commissions, study groups and categorical grant programs. Last year the President vetoed the only anti-crime bill Congress enacted and opposed the Republican-sponsored anti-riot measure.

FOREIGN POLICY

Around the world, U.S. prestige has dipped sharply since 1960. American citizens abroad are attacked, embassies sacked, missions stoned, and U.S. flags burned. Yet, the Administration continues to pour foreign aid into these nations in a seeming effort to buy the friendship and respect it appears unable to earn. In Vietnam, U.S. forces now number over 450,000 and are expected to reach half a million shortly. Casualties mount daily, now totaling some 10,000 American dead and 60,000 wounded. We now have a Middle East Crisis and the possibility of other crises in

Latin America and Africa. There is no clear indication of what our foreign policy is and no attempt to put the Soviet Union—the principal instigator and supporter of these wars—on the defensive in the court of world opinion.

At home and abroad, the situation continues to grow worse. Though progress has been made on some fronts, the records in these major fields of public concern certainly do not add up to very high marks when measured in terms of the results we have witnessed so far. It is good, I think, in a Democracy for the Minority Party to continually review the actions and measure the results of the programs of the party in power so that the public can be informed. Only in this way can better programs and better approaches be devised for the massively complex problems that face our society.

This past month was an extremely busy one for your Congressman. As the ranking Minority Member of the Committee which provides all the funds for the health activities of our federal government, I spent several days in Geneva at the Twentieth World Health Assembly. The picture at left was taken during a general session which both Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) and I attended as members of the U.S. Delegation.

The Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations Bill was also passed by the House of Representatives during the month of May. As the ranking minority member, it was my responsibility to manage the bill during debate on the Floor of the House. Though my amendment which provides that the new \$16.5 million Food and Drug Research Laboratory cannot be built in the Washington area was challenged by a Democratic Congressman from this area, the House overwhelmingly supported my position. This insures that the Laboratory will be built at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

This month, the House will act on the massive Defense Appropriation bill which finances our activities in Vietnam and also provides all the money for the national security needs of our country. The bill this year will contain well over \$70 billion and will occupy much of my time for the remainder of this month.

Best regards

MEL LAIRD.

Remarks of the Honorable Jerome Waldie at the Democratic Volunteer Committee Convention in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech that was made by my friend and colleague, the Honorable JEROME WALDIE, of California, at a convention in Los Angeles, on Saturday, June 3, of the Democratic Volunteer Committee and all elements of the official Democratic Party.

American history has frequently demonstrated that our strongest and best Presidents are often those who have been exposed to the most hostility and abuse of the people.

The reason is perhaps best explained by an old proverb: "Behold the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out."

Our best Presidents—most of whom need less to say, were Democrats—have made progress for this magnificent Nation of ours by using the same anatomical methods as the turtle.

The saving grace, of course, is that while we abuse "That Man in the White House," we seldom fail to re-elect them.

All of which is to say that the strident and harsh voices of scorn, abuse and vilification directed at President Johnson indicate that he is doing his job—and doing it well.

Let me make something very clear: I am not speaking of those who criticize American policy *responsibly* and *compassionately*. I am speaking of those who trade on fear and hatred.

The racists abuse President Johnson for being the President who has done more for civil rights than any other President in our history.

The reactionaries and far right-wingers abuse him for being the President who has most strenuously advocated social reforms in our domestic structure. And the far-out left wing abuses him for our Nation's stand against Communist aggression.

Personally, as far as these groups are concerned, I think we would all congratulate the President on the excellent enemies he has made.

But I do believe it is time that the great majority of responsible Americans—and, in particular, members of our own Democratic Party—take a more active role in rallying to the President's cause against the hateful and insulting *personal* attacks that defame his integrity, honesty, patriotism and sincerity.

The President has emphasized the necessity for preserving freedom of speech—without excepting from that protection, the speech of those who are little more than rabble-rousers or demagogues. But the President and the Nation has the right to expect responsible dissent.

For, as the President said recently, "dissent is a two-way street." There must be a responsible dialogue on the issues, if the dissenters are to serve the best interest of the Nation.

It is one thing to oppose our policies in Vietnam. But is quite another to collect funds for the enemy or burn our flag.

And let me add quickly, that it is one thing to strongly protest the conduct of some of the dissenters, but it is quite another to seek to abridge their basic rights of freedom of speech or of lawful assembly.

Short of unlawful behavior, we—all of us who call ourselves Americans—must urgently insist for the dissenters the right to be heard.

I emphasize this very fundamental point because I believe that there has been a dangerous escalation of bad judgment by both the far left and the far right.

We have paid a high price in the past for such uncontrolled, irresponsible behavior. We have seen the sad results that occur in a climate of hatred and blind emotionalism.

Have we forgotten so soon the shame of our treatment of Japanese Americans during World War II?

Have we forgotten the nightmare of the McCarthy period?

Have we forgotten the horror of President Kennedy's murder?

These terrible events have one common denominator—they occurred during the periods of hatred, distrust and disunity.

The meaning of all this is clear: it is high time for the Democratic Party to end its bickering and local wranglings and stand with the President in these difficult times.

I know that there are some Democrats who so strongly oppose Vietnam that they have turned a deaf ear on pleas for support for the President or his policies. Let me address them for a moment.

Our Nation prides itself on upholding

a bipartisan foreign policy. The agreements entered into by previous Administrations—whether Republican or Democratic—are upheld by subsequent Administrations, regardless of party.

President Johnson has honored an agreement that he himself did not make. This is as it should be. For the word of a great Nation must never be doubted by friend or foe.

He has honored our commitments in Vietnam. And he will honor our commitments in the Middle East.

It is difficult to speak about Vietnam without sounding like a hawk or a dove. Yet, the truth is that neither hawks nor doves truly reflect the President's policy in Vietnam.

We want peace in Vietnam—not military occupation of a conquered Nation. And the President has only one objective for Vietnam—a peaceful and honorable settlement.

Those who actively protest against our involvement in this conflict accurately convey our Nation's distaste for the necessity of war.

I can tell you that not one of these peace-marchers or draft card burners detests this war as much as President Johnson does.

And no one in the world is working harder or is more anxious to find a peaceful settlement.

Let me say to my sincere friends who believe the President has conducted the Vietnam war without restraint, patience or reason that of those entities in our Government who have most to say about the conduct of the war, the President is the *only* one who advocates and exercises reasonable restraint. There are actually only three groups vested with any part of the responsibility to escalate, de-escalate or hold the line in Vietnam. The President, as Commander-in-Chief; the Pentagon, representing the military; and the Congress. Clearly, the Pentagon believes escalation to the ultimate is required; equally clearly, the Congress, *overwhelmingly*, and particularly since last November, advocates a far more "hawkish" stance in Vietnam than has occurred to date. The President, then, is the *only* person of those who can make these decisions, to advocate and, fortunately, to compel, a policy of reasoned restraint in the application of our unbelievable military power.

I have heard from deeply concerned people the accusation that the President is personally responsible for the war in Vietnam. I have heard the obscene charge that the war is "Lyndon Johnson's War." I have heard the equally obscene charge that the President continues this war for his own personal and political gain. Frequently, the same person concludes with the solemn prediction that the President will be defeated because of the Vietnam war—that his popularity has severely declined because of his policies in that war.

I reply to these critics that there is an inconsistency of considerable proportions in that charge.

If it is true that the Vietnam war represents a loss in political support to the President, how can it similarly be true that he seeks personal gain from the war?

Obviously, the presence or lack of political popularity resulting from the war plays no part in the determination of Administration policy. Equally obviously, the President's policy, rightly or wrongly, is predicated on his deep conviction that the Nation's and the World's best interest are served by repulsion of aggression whenever and wherever it occurs.

Such motivation governed President Truman when he confronted aggression in Korea; when he confronted similar aggression in the Berlin blockade.

Such motivation governed President Kennedy when he confronted aggression in Cuba and in Vietnam.

And such motivation governed President Eisenhower when he began the confrontation with aggression in Vietnam.

Reflect for a moment, how the course of history might have been changed had similar motivation been present when Hitler tested the resolve of the democracies in Europe prior to World War II—when Mussolini tested that resolve and found it wanting in Ethiopia.

Consider how the history yet to be written might read had the motivation to meet aggression not been present in Korea; in Cuba; in Vietnam—and now in the Middle East.

I believe this Nation, as the most powerful and responsible Nation in the Free World, will continue to be tested by the other World. I dread the day when their probes, wherever they occur, result in finding an absence of resolve on the part of this Nation to meet their challenge.

It is not always easy to be a citizen of the most powerful free Nation in the World. It might be personally easier to be a citizen of a small nation with responsibility to no one—but it also would not be as challenging nor would it be as satisfying. At the risk of sounding "jingoistic," I am proud to be an American—I believe in this country—I want it to continue a great Nation. I am convinced under the leadership of men such as Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and now Johnson, there is every reason to hope and believe its greatness will not diminish.

Address by Postmaster General at Seton Hall University Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to submit for the attention of our colleagues the noteworthy address delivered by the Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postmaster General of the United States, at the commencement exercises at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., on June 3, 1967.

An honorary degree of doctor of public service was conferred upon the Postmaster General in recognition of his distinguished and dedicated service to our Nation.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE SETON HALL UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Let me begin by congratulating you who are graduates of this Class of 1967. You and your fellow graduates from colleges and universities across the nation make up the largest graduating class in the history of American higher education. There are one-half million young Americans in the Class of 1967, composing one-fifth of all Americans in your age group, and representing the best that our society has yet produced.

Though it is popular with the older generation to look with dismay at the younger generation, I am convinced from my observation that today's college graduate is on the whole undoubtedly more earnest, more informed, more free of the dead weight of old illusions, more passionately committed to truth and justice than any of his predecessors.

And you should be better. You have grown up in an unusually trying period in our his-

tory. Never before have the penalties of a major mistake of miscalculation in our foreign policy loomed so large; and never before have the answers been so obscure, stubborn, and unyielding to both good will and good sense. Never before in history has there been a nation with as much military and economic power as the United States; and never before in history has it been so necessary to show restraint in the use of that power. And never before has a nation met problems of racial and economic justice so successfully. Never before has a domestic revolution—and that is precisely what we have experienced—been compressed in so short a time.

You have grown up in a time when men look back nostalgically to the days when the mere flexing of our national muscle, even though it was an infinitely smaller muscle, was enough to produce the action we desired.

You leave this fine school armed with knowledge and filled with hope and purpose. But one of your first tasks, and perhaps your first disenchantment, will be to realize that the nostalgic men with their vast reserves of old memories exercise powerful influence, and that your good intentions are simply not enough. Each new generation of American college graduates forms a collective St. George who faces the dragon of shopworn but easily and widely accepted ideas. Some generations know what they must do, realize that this is the destiny with which they have a rendezvous, and slay the dragon with the weapons of truth and of conviction.

Other generations start equally well armed. But the lance rusts away from the corrosion of compromise, and the edge gives up its once keen temper to the enervating heat of the ivy-covered cottage of selfish contentment. Your days at Seton Hall may be defined as a period when you could move at a fast gallop over a smooth path to the bright horizon. They were days of great expectations for yourself and expectations of others for you—all to be fulfilled at an unspecified time called "someday." Well, you are graduating, and your name on that sheepskin signals the arrival of "someday."

The transformation of someday into now—means that you are being offered the role of St. George. And there are dragons in abundance waiting for you. The torch has passed to this new generation of Americans—a generation so eloquently described by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as one "... born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

At home there is the struggle for full achievement of racial justice. In recent years we have come very far, very fast in this area. The four major Civil Rights laws passed in this decade signal the fact that at least we are honoring the check issued by Thomas Jefferson and endorsed by Abraham Lincoln. We have come far, but in a sense we have only exhausted all the simple ways. For achievement of racial justice can no longer be confined to questions of civil rights alone. It is no longer so easy—and it is no longer so distant.

Today also the world continues to suffer from the chronic illness of a peace that is not peace and a war that is not war. The Class of 1967 may well complain of the legacy of inflamed international antipathies which faces it. About that legacy I can only say—it could be far worse. We destroyed the most evil and inhuman tyranny since Attila. We avoided stumbling into atomic holocaust. And we can take pride in passing along to you a world which gives the latent strength

of democracy a grudging but nonetheless genuine respect.

The concern of this generation of college students with the course of our foreign affairs is a sign of health and vigor. For America is a nation that grows through dissent; and only through critical examination of old policies can we find better ones. So, I would ask you not to permit your growing domestic involvement with building a career to turn your eyes away from questions of foreign affairs. Foreign policy is too important to be left entirely to the experts—and a truly American foreign policy must reflect the real aspirations of America.

By the same token, however, I would ask that you build your criticism on the foundation of real knowledge of the world in which we live. The greatest, and potentially most dangerous, fallacy of all in dealing with foreign nations is to confuse what *should be* with what *is*.

Other nations should recognize our essential objectives. But some do not. Other nations should see that we have no desire for territory or expansion. But some do not. All nations of the world should cooperate in the common interest rather than fight over selfish interest. But, as we see, there is often far more conflict than cooperation.

This is not the world we would make—but this is the world as it is. In such a world, as President Johnson observed:

"We must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint. We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power. We must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong, and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength; and the just can be strong in the defense of justice." That is what our President has said.

And this is the foundation of our policy, not alone in Vietnam, but wherever the virus of terror and aggression threatens to rupture the membrane of freedom.

There is much that you can do to help us move more firmly toward a world of peace and of mutual trust—but only if you clearly see that willingness to compromise differences is matched by vigilance in safeguarding our essential freedoms.

That truly is the test.

I would also like to make a specific comment about the problem of finding a durable peace in Southeast Asia and of some of the less considered reactions to the President's search for peace in that troubled area. As you recall, the Sermon on the Mount says, "Blessed are the peacemakers." It doesn't say anything about *peacelovers*. There's nothing special about a *peacelover*. Even a loud one. It's easy to be a *peacelover*. But it takes considerable thought, energy, imagination, diplomacy, and, in the world in which we live, sometimes force to be a *peacemaker*. The President needs help in making peace. He's asked for it, but sometimes he can only hear the anguished cries of *peacelovers*.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant recently proposed some steps that could be taken to make peace. The President was quick to support his initiative. But North Vietnam wasn't. Ho Chi Minh shot down General Thant's proposals. As you may know, the President has also made it plain that he will respond favorably to almost any action from Hanoi that indicates a desire for negotiations. But the only reaction so far has been a beautifully contrived piece of psychological warfare that seems to have taken in some gullible people—that we should just stop bombing the north and someday, perhaps, there might be some kind of response—maybe.

The economic problem that you face is far different from the bleak prospect that often made other graduating classes contemplate an advanced degree. But in a way even the task of graduates who leaped out into the gray landscape of the depression was easier than your own. Because then the problem was how to survive in an economy of scarcity. Though not a pleasant situation, at least it wasn't new. Others had been coping with problems of scarcity since the beginning of organized society.

But now, we are in a new economic dimension. Traditional reactions to economic problems no longer suffice, simply because the problem today is no longer that of scarcity—but of abundance. We need new responses. We must bridge the gap between private affluence and public necessity. We must assure the opportunity of better distribution of our enormous wealth without sapping the incentives that made that wealth possible. And we must seek a continuance of the expanding economy—because only through the resultant expansion of opportunity will we be able to wipe away the remaining vestiges of poverty and of unemployment.

Thus, you have a whole new set of problems facing you, problems that need fresh solutions—and finding those solutions will move us into a world of opportunity and challenge undreamed of by any other generation.

In a very real sense our economy is expanding because of the force of democratic education. Our American educational system based on equal opportunity is perhaps one of the greatest social developments of all time; and during the last few years we have made greater progress in education than ever before in our history.

This progress is a direct reflection of the passionate belief of President Johnson that this mighty nation cannot and should not rest until every American has access to superlative education. This sentiment is not new. We have all realized the importance of widely available quality education in a democracy. But never before has a President succeeded in translating this aspiration into the law of the land.

But, though we have new laws, a vastly increased availability of funds, and a national commitment to quality education to all, how well these laws will be executed, how creatively the money spent, how successfully the commitment implemented depend in the final analysis on leadership in the States.

Certainly, New Jersey is fortunate in this regard.

You have a Governor who sees clearly, has always seen clearly, that human history is the record of the race between education and catastrophe.

He has left no doubt about his intention to have education win the race in the State of New Jersey. He has left no doubt not because of words, but through a series of brilliant actions. These include establishment, just last year, of the first Department of Higher Education in the history of New Jersey. Governor Hughes clearly perceives that higher education, quality education, is the key to the affluent individual and the affluent State.

Under the leadership of your Governor, State aid to local school districts nearly doubled in the past two years—from \$120 million to over \$228 million.

Still another reflection of that leadership was the fact that the State of New Jersey assumed responsibility, for the first time, for the public operation of two medical schools, one right here at Seton Hall, which is now the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Through these and other actions your State government has fully committed itself to quality education.

This record, this creative record, is one more reminder of what so many seem to for-

get so soon: that political institutions exist for one purpose only, to solve problems. They have not been created to hinder solutions.

Your generation is in the enviable position of being alive at a time when American history is in the process of making a gigantic, unprecedented swing. We are moving into a unique kind of society, away from a strident conflict over needs, to meaningful cooperation in determining how we can best meet those needs.

Already new Federal programs to aid education are helping to create a fresh kind of interaction among traditional levels of government and helping to form fresh political associations designed on regional or problem areas.

This is a creative building process that reflects the vigor of our political institutions—which shows beyond doubt that they are not political dinosaurs destined for oblivion, but flexible forms capable of growth and evolution.

In a democratic society, the power of the individual expressed through the ballot box is the ultimate power. And it is a very real, tangible and effective power. As educated Americans, it is not only desirable, but it is your duty to play an active role in the political process. Through public service you can magnify your education and turn the knowledge you have acquired here at Seton Hall into active programs for the betterment of America, to change the hearts and minds of men, for the creation of a more perfect society.

Another great Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, once said:

"The vision of America will never change. America once, when she was a little people, sat upon a hill of privilege and had a vision of the future. She saw men happy because they were free. She saw them free because they were equal. She saw them banded together because they had the spirit of brothers. She saw them safe because they did not wish to impose upon one another. And the vision is not changed.

"... America will move forward, if she moves forward at all, only with her face to that same sun of promise."

If Woodrow Wilson were alive today, I think he would agree that you still possess that vision and that your eyes are directed toward the sun of promise.

Science has found ways to extend the length of our lives.

But only the individual can control the scope and the depth of his life.

The prescription for such a life is ready at hand: Commit yourself fully and commit yourself without reservation.

I ask you simply to lift your eyes, I urge you to reach for the stars... for you have a rendezvous with excellence.

John F. Kennedy "Prominent American" Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1967, Boston, Mass., was proud to host leaders from the political, business, and academic worlds who gathered to pay tribute to our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

On the occasion of the birthdate of

this truly great American, the U.S. Post Office Department issued the 13-cent postage stamp to be used for international mail to honor his memory.

The principal speaker at the luncheon for the dedication of the stamp was Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien who vividly described Kennedy the man, the politician, and the statesman.

From the lips of one of his closest friends came this story and tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT THE CEREMONY DEDICATING THE JOHN F. KENNEDY "PROMINENT AMERICAN" STAMP, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 29, 1967

I have very mixed emotions in dedicating this new stamp honoring President Kennedy.

I am proud and pleased, of course, for it is fitting that this latest monument to his memory be a postage stamp, since the postal service is the channel most often used by the American people to communicate with each other—and John F. Kennedy was a master communicator who touched the mind and the heart with the brilliance of his thought and his wit.

The denomination of this stamp was purposely chosen to permit it to be used on international mail. This, too, is appropriate, for John F. Kennedy's life and the tragic nature of his death seemed to reach out over barriers of race, and ideology, to brush aside old suspicions, and to touch men sharply and directly. For a moment the world was united through grief, and the loss was felt equally and shared as deeply in Dublin and Durban, in Moscow and Monrovia.

He was our man for all seasons, and for all peoples. And this stamp will be used 50 million times a year, a silent traveler through the world reminding all who see it of a great and noble spirit.

And so it is gratifying for me to dedicate this stamp.

Mixed with that gratification is a feeling of sadness.

Last fall I travelled to Runnymede, England, and I visited the Kennedy Memorial there. The inscription on that memorial reads: "This acre of English ground was given to the United States of America by the people of Britain in memory of John F. Kennedy, born 29 May, 1917, President of the United States 1961-63, died by an assassin's hand 22nd November, 1963." And then the most famous lines of his Inaugural Address. So on this day John Kennedy would have been 50 years old. And our sadness comes from the realization that long before its proper span, a giant tree was felled in the forest of our land, and has left an open place against the sky that will long remain.

In the three and a half years since his assassination, there have been dozens of books, thousands of articles, millions of words written about President Kennedy.

Almost all have tried to serve his memory well. They have tried from the same sense of loss that we feel, from the need to remind ourselves of the uniqueness of a splendid human being.

Along with many of you here today, I knew John Kennedy intimately. We worked with him closely, and saw him in moments of great stress as well as great success. However, having that experience and that knowledge, I am sometimes befuddled about the way he is depicted. Some have tried to recreate his image as a modern day Sir Galahad, wearing the invincible armor of righteousness, slaying all the dragons, with a charmed sword, marching toward victory unhindered.

I do not wish to argue about, and certainly not lower, the stature of John F. Kennedy in our history.

I do not even wish to disagree with those

well-meaning Americans who seek always to make him larger than life.

For we seem to live in a cynical age, marked by lack of values and a dull sense of drift, anchorless on a dark and angry sea. Some of our young people seem consumed with hate for their own nation or their own personalities. They burn their flag with fire or their minds with drugs. So, in a time such as ours, when there are men proclaiming uneasily that "God is Dead" it is important and it is useful to honor a hero.

But in this hero building, there lies a dangerous element. Not only is it a wasteful and a ridiculous excess to add another hue to the rainbow, perfume the violet, and paint the lily—but in the case of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the real man, the real human being and, yes, the real politician, are all submerged somewhere beneath the slowly accumulating weight of all those millions of feather-like words.

I say Kennedy the politician purposely. In our culture the word "politician" has somehow taken on an accumulation of barricades. We have always suffered from a national split personality about politicians. The politician was someone we wished somehow we could do without. And when we found we couldn't do without him, he was accepted only grudgingly.

Our Constitution was called by Gladstone "the most remarkable work... to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke... in its application to political affairs." This Constitution was the product of politicians working together, hammering out creative compromise, holding us together when so many forces existed that might have torn us apart.

Our national folklore is full of jokes about politics and politicians, all of which would seem to indicate that an honest, effective, dedicated politician is the human equivalent of the square circle.

And yet men like Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Daniel Webster, John Adams were politicians. The men in John Kennedy's *Profiles in Courage* were politicians. John Kennedy, himself, was certainly a politician.

And he was a working politician. He began his career the hard way and the right way. His political career opened with a tough campaign in the Eleventh Congressional District. It was said then, "He doesn't even need to campaign. He can go to Washington now and forget the primary and election."

But John Kennedy wanted to campaign. And so he put in 18-hour days bounding up the rear stairs of those three deckers in Charlestown, knocking on doors, telling the voters who he was and what he thought he could do in Washington.

Well, the rest is history. And despite the hero worship, it never came easily. Throughout his political career he had to do the equivalent of climbing the stairs of those Charlestown three deckers.

He had overcome the barrier of his religion. And he faced that issue directly and won.

He had to overcome the rumors that he was in failing health. And, despite a body that often was wracked with pain, he was a man of determination who proved again the power of mind over body.

He had a long and grueling struggle through the Presidential primaries.

And his campaign against Mr. Nixon was in the same tradition—fighting, working, travelling, little sleep, always on the move.

Since that grim November day three and a half years ago, there have been many monuments and memorials built to grace our land and honor his name.

We now have a Cape Kennedy instead of Cape Canaveral, and a Kennedy Space Center. We have a Kennedy Memorial Highway that helps connect Washington to the outside world. We have Kennedy memorial

bridges and dams and roads and airports to dignify our nation. Just last Saturday we had the launching of a new aircraft carrier—the Kennedy. We now have this postage stamp that will remind so many millions overseas of John F. Kennedy.

But, though it is fitting and proper that we build physical reminders of his greatness, I think he would have preferred to be remembered for the product of his political genius. "By their fruits ye shall know them," the Book of Matthew tells us.

And I think we should therefore assess John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the way that he would have preferred: through the political events that he brought about.

Let us never for one moment overlook his accomplishments—accomplishments that are a splendid record of political action aimed at helping people in their most basic and vital aspirations, their hopes for peace, for prosperity, for progress, for a future for themselves and their children.

Let us not forget that the Alliance for Progress was launched by John F. Kennedy.

Let us not forget that he proposed The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which recently reached fruition in the Kennedy Round of negotiations, and which was the most important piece of legislation affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall Plan.

Let us not forget that he initiated action that revitalized our economy . . . got America moving again . . . and created millions of jobs.

Let us not forget that he resisted Communist blackmail over Berlin and faced down, prudently but firmly, the terrible confrontation over the missiles in Cuba.

Let us not forget that he saw that a threat to freedom and American interests was growing in the Pacific as it receded in the Atlantic. As early as October 1961, President Kennedy said firmly that ". . . the United States is determined to help Vietnam preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins, and build a better life through economic growth."

Let us not forget that John F. Kennedy was a compassionate man—perhaps best reflected in his call for a national program to combat mental retardation.

Let us not forget that he enlisted early in the fight for civil rights.

Let us not certainly ever forget that the world took a major step away from the brink of war with the conclusion of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty he fought so hard to create.

And then we saw him in a car on a street in Dallas—he waved, one last time. And the flame was gone.

But his work, though still not completed, his dreams though still not fully realized, were not abandoned.

The Congress—under the leadership of Speaker McCormack and with the help of our own Massachusetts Congressional delegation here with us today—has worked together with President Johnson to build the kind of worthy memorial to John F. Kennedy—a memorial in the form of the greatest surge of progressive legislation in the nation's history coupled with the greatest economic boom in this or any other country.

John F. Kennedy was a hard-fighting politician, with solid, concrete goals. And we must remember him because of what he stood for.

A century ago, Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote:

"I find the great thing in this world
Is not so much where we stand,
As in what direction we are moving . . .
We must sail sometimes with the wind
And sometimes against it—
But we must sail, and not drift, nor lie at anchor."

President Kennedy often quoted these words. They expressed his philosophy. And they pose a challenge to us who survive him.

To those of us who served his cause, who followed his leadership, what is that challenge: It is not to permit ourselves to drift, never to depart from his program of compassion. It is the unfinished agenda, the programs of the Kennedy Administration and the Johnson Administration.

My friends, we can serve his memory best not by looking passively at monuments in marble and steel or issuing postage stamps, but by working together for a better America and a better world, where there is peace preserved, freedom guarded, mankind exalted, and where the chains and fetters that keep man from achieving his God-given potential are struck away, and we are free to be what it is in our power to become.

John F. Kennedy often quoted from a poem by Robert Frost that expressed his understanding that we cannot stand still and admire achievement, no matter how compelling it might be. "The woods are lovely, dark and deep," he said. "But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep, And miles to go before I sleep." He did not go the many miles he might have, and so it is up to us to keep those promises for him—for they are, after all, promises made to ourselves and our children—promises of a better America.

We can achieve those promises, and reach those goals through the political process—and it is to John F. Kennedy the politician that I wish to dedicate this stamp.

World Poverty and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1967

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY spoke at Johns Hopkins University on the subject "World Poverty and World Peace." In a most informative speech, the Senator points out that world peace is not possible when nations are poor and people are miserable. He says:

If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life must be satisfied.

And, the Senator urges a long-range foreign aid program to help these underdeveloped countries through the stages of development. He says:

Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long range program, with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to share Senator KENNEDY's address with my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

WORLD POVERTY AND WORLD PEACE

(Address by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, May 2, 1967)

The critical struggle for freedom and humanity, over the next ten and fifteen years, is going to come in the underdeveloped nations, where two-thirds of the world's people live in abject poverty. The task will be to help bring them a decent standard of life, and some hope for their future.

In the last eight years, there have been over 170 outbreaks of serious violence in various parts of the globe, aimed at overthrowing the existing governments. Almost all of them have taken place in lands where the income per person is under \$300 a year. Of the 38 poorest countries in the world, with incomes of less than \$100 a year, 32 of them have suffered significant wars and conflicts.

If you seek the underlying causes of the war in Vietnam, one will be poverty. Even the tensions between India and Pakistan and between the Arab countries and Israel, founded as they are in religious differences or territorial questions, are intensified by poverty. When nations are poor and people are miserable, there will be insurgencies and violence; and governments will mount adventures of aggression against other countries, to divert their own peoples' attention from their hopeless lives.

If we hope to avert Vietnams in the future, if there is ever to be a greater measure of peace and stability in the world, the legitimate aspirations of the 1.5 billion people of the underdeveloped countries for a better life than they have must be satisfied.

At the present time, the process is not going well. Despite all the foreign aid, despite the significant attempts poor nations have made to develop themselves, there has been no measurable improvement in the lives of most of these people. In some countries, the standard of life has deteriorated over the last few years. The poor nations of the world face a harsh decade. There is the prospect of widespread famine in Asia and Africa, because production of food has not kept pace with their swelling populations. They face the near certainty that their exports will not be able to pay for what they must import, since the commodities that give them the bulk of their export earnings are declining as a share of the world market. The gap in living standards between the poor nations of the world and the rich grows greater. Last year, the national income of the United States increased by \$40 billion. This increase was more than the total national incomes of the 700 million people in India and the nations of black Africa.

INDIA AS AN EXAMPLE

To illustrate the difficulties and the dangers, I would cite India. For years we have been told that India is the crucial testing ground of whether a poor nation can develop under conditions of freedom. After three five-year plans, after immense efforts by her planners and her people, the results, in human terms, have been very disappointing. The economic growth of India since 1946, when adjusted for population, has been 1 per cent a year. For the average Indian, this has meant an increased income of 70 cents a year. India today has 12 million unemployed workers. A bitter famine has spread to 60 million people in two large states. As a result of the recent Indian election, in which a major issue was economic discontent, the majority of India's states have rejected the ruling Congress Party, two in favor of left-wing governments. This is just a taste of what could come if the pace does not improve.

THE CYCLE OF REVOLUTION

We cannot ignore the cycle by which development failure breeds insurrection and revolution. It could involve us as deeply as we are involved today in Vietnam. Let us feel these countries and their problems are remote, just think of the difficulties we would be in if, at the same time we were fighting in Vietnam, widespread anti-American revolutionary movements were overturning governments by force in Latin America and Africa.

This danger increases, year by year, but the efforts to meet it do not. The total

amount of public development capital moving from the developed to the undeveloped countries of the world, for the last six years, has remained static at the level of a little over \$6 billion. Support in the United States for an adequate foreign aid program has slackened. Since 1962, the foreign aid budgets proposed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have been cut, in Congress, by 10 to 20 per cent a year. This year, the outlook is even grimmer. Last year's foreign aid budget was saved from a 30 per cent cut by a margin of only two votes. Thirty-three of the Congressmen who voted against the cut were defeated in last November's election.

AN OUTDATED RATIONALE

And so we must greatly increase, and improve our foreign aid program and we must begin by recognizing that the current rationale for American foreign aid is out of date. Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, the man who led the Republican Party out of isolationism, once advised President Truman that to gain acceptance for the revolutionary idea of foreign aid, he would "have to scare hell out of the country." We have continued to do this for eighteen years. One secretary of state after another, in testimony and public statements, have tried to sell foreign aid to the American people as the way to stop the spread of Communism. Of course, we wished to build healthy economies; of course, we wanted friendly nations to maintain their independence; of course, it was the right and moral thing to do; but behind all these was the persuasive argument that foreign aid, by fighting Communism with money, could avoid the need to fight it with troops.

Regarding foreign aid as an instrument of the Cold War has hurt the program in many ways. It has resulted in too much aid going for military purposes, and too little for economic development. Money that could have gone to build a dam or irrigate a valley has gone to prop up a general or strengthen an unpopular regime.

We have sent most of our assistance not to the places where the opportunity for development was best, but to where the Communist threat was strongest at the time. The aid budget for this year proposes more money for South Vietnam than for all the nations of Latin America combined. In Africa, where very small investments could yield great returns, the aid program in most countries, for all practical purposes, has ceased, simply because the short-run Communist threat is considered to be on the wane. In Kenya, for example, there is a chance for important break-throughs in the new farm technology, and to build agricultural cooperatives that could be a model for the entire continent. But there aren't enough Communists in Kenya, so the aid is not forthcoming.

The anti-Communist rationale for foreign aid has led us to surround our program with political restrictions that tend to undermine some of the most important development efforts. There is no more hopeful project in Asia today than the international development of the Mekong River Basin. It promises energy for industry, irrigation, flood control and agricultural development that will greatly benefit 30 million people. The four nations of Southeast Asia, despite their political differences, are working on it together. Yet just two months ago, our government had to withdraw its support for a dam in Cambodia, a key to the entire project—because Cambodia has sent food to Hanoi, and we forbid aid for countries that trade with Hanoi.

We also forbid aid to countries that trade with Cuba, or in other ways assist the Communist "bloc." To the poor countries, all these restrictions make it look like we are using our aid as a club, to force them to support us in foreign affairs. Nations like Burma—non-Communist nations desperately

in need of assistance—have all but ended American aid because they feel their national independence is being put into jeopardy. Nations that are poor are nonetheless proud. They do not want to be wards of wealthy countries, taking their aid in return for voting for them in the UN or supporting their foreign adventures.

In all these ways, the anti-Communist rationale has hurt foreign aid in the past. We followed it because foreign aid was a new and controversial program. It was felt Americans would not support the so-called "give-ways" unless they could be linked with fighting Communism. But if the detente with Russia grows over the next ten years, and if China becomes so preoccupied with its internal convulsions that it loses interest in aggression, where will the rationale be then?

The receding of the Communist threat might well take with it the American foreign aid program—long before it has accomplished its real purposes, and at a time when it is needed more than ever.

A NEW GOAL FOR AID

So we must begin with a new rationale. Foreign aid should be designed not to combat any enemy or doctrine, not to win support for our foreign policies, when that support is really for our comfort instead of our aid. Some foreign aid will continue to have as its purpose the strengthening of the security of these nations and, indirectly, of our own. But henceforth the real goal of foreign aid should be to preserve the peace by completing the modernization of the planet.

We should adopt a well-planned, and well-enunciated strategy of development, based on the accepted principles of what nations must do and must have, to pass through the stages leading to self-sustaining economic growth. Our aid should not turn on and off, depending on how "threatened" a nation is, but be a long range program with long-term appropriations, on which the poor nations can depend, so they can plan to do their part in their development.

I would like to block out tonight five imperatives of such a strategy of development.

First, we must be patient. The French have an expression that "it takes three generations to make a Frenchman." The task of world economic modernization will take almost that long. No nation on earth, with the exception of Japan, has been able to do it in less than sixty years. We sometimes get impatient with the progress that the newly independent nations have made since foreign aid began fifteen years ago. But we should remember that fifteen years after our own independence, most of our states were in default on their obligations.

Second, we must be more generous. One of the reasons a nation like India is in such difficult straits is because, on a per capita basis, the aid to her has come to only \$3 per year. Neither we, nor the other developed nations, have really made the effort that is going to be necessary. We all pay lip service to the pledge taken in the United Nations to devote 1 per cent a year of our national production to foreign assistance. But in totaling up our contributions, we include such things as Social Security payments made to persons living abroad, and some of them include loans made at very high rates of interest. Even the six billion plus I mentioned previously is in many ways a misleading figure. In recent years, the poor nations have had to pay back almost half this much in interest and amortization on loans received in the past. Added to their increased need to import goods, this means the many poor countries are being drained, each year, of more foreign exchange than they receive as aid.

The poor nations must be able to predict, with some certainty, how much aid they will receive, so they need not abandon development projects midway for lack of foreign exchange. The best estimates are that the poor

countries could use effectively at least \$4 billion a year more than they are receiving. To make this possible, I believe that all the developed nations should agree now to achieve a transfer of at least 1 per cent of their gross national products to world development programs by 1970.

For the United States, this would mean a doubling of the present level of aid. I surely think, that for this important purpose, we can manage to spend as much, each year, as we spend on toys and cosmetics.

Third, a larger part of our aid should be given on a multilateral basis. Bilateral aid cannot be accepted in the spirit it is given. When white men offer dollars and come in to supervise how they should be spent, it causes resentment and loss of self-esteem in the poor countries. There is too much danger such aid will have, even indirectly, political strings. There is a role for bilateral aid, in countries where the leadership will not undertake solution of difficult problems without our prodding. But we must be prepared to give increasing amounts of aid through international organizations.

We need not fear that international control of our aid would bring waste or corruption—although bilateral aid has not avoided it. Organizations like the World Bank and the International Development Association have developed strict procedures and controls. They have, or could be given, sufficient personnel to supervise each project as well as we could ourselves.

I would hope that over the next ten years we could channel an increasing percentage of our aid through the World Bank, IDA, the UN development program, and the regional development banks which are now beginning to operate. To further show we believe aid should be removed from international politics, we should join with the Russians to fund a significant aid project for a nation like India—and then ask the other advanced Communist countries to join us in further programs for other poor nations.

Fourth, our other economic policies should be consistent with the aims of the aid program. Much of the aid we give is today being cancelled out by other policies we pursue. To understand this, you must realize that in purely economic terms, what foreign aid does is to increase the amount of foreign exchange a poor country has available to use to purchase the things it needs. Poor countries also try to increase their foreign exchange earnings by exporting goods and entertaining tourists. If we pursue policies that take foreign exchange away from them, we cancel the benefits of the aid.

For example, almost all of the trade policies of the rich countries of the world are stacked against the efforts of the poor to increase their trade. The Common Market with its high levies on imports of agricultural goods and many of our tariff restrictions and our import quotas are reminders of the old colonial days, when poor countries existed merely to provide cheap raw material for the industries of the mother countries.

In the early years of the 1950's, the nations of Europe, still recovering from the war, told us that trade, not aid, was their most important need. The poor nations of today are in the same position. Eighty-five per cent of their export earnings come from the sale of primary products. They cannot make progress if the few goods they can now offer the world cannot bring a decent price. They are not going to be able to develop modern industries, no matter how many power grids or factories foreign aid puts in, if they cannot sell their manufactures to the countries that use them. The modernization we seek will not take place unless and until we revise the whole web of arrangements by which rich nations make trade more difficult for the poor.

To see how severely trade policies can retard development, we need only look at Latin

America. Since 1954, we have made \$12 billion in aid available. But the money Latin America has received from exporting its coffee, copper, rubber and other commodities over the same period has declined by \$12 billion. In terms of the money available for development, all our aid, including all in the Alliance for Progress, has been wiped out.

Of the eighty underdeveloped countries of the world, almost fifty of them depend for foreign earnings on the export of one or two crops or commodities. These exports are a source of much more money for development than is foreign aid. But in recent years, these poor countries have been severely injured by the steady drop in world commodity prices. Colombia, for example, used to be able to count on up to \$500 million in foreign exchange each year from its sales of coffee. This year, it will be a little more than half of that—and as a result, Colombia must cut its economic development plan by one-third. Eduardo Frei, the President of Chile, is one of the most progressive leaders in all Latin America. For a long time, his administration was a symbol of how the Alliance for Progress can work. But President Frei's government is in deep trouble today, primarily because the price of copper on the world market fell in one year from 56 to 42 cents a pound.

The goal should be to increase the export earnings of the poor countries by 6 per cent each year. To do this, the nations of the world should formulate price stabilization agreements on commodities like rubber, tin, cocoa, tea and petroleum, similar to the coffee agreement of 1963, which has been partially successful. Until these can be worked out, international organizations should be allowed to make quick grants of funds to single countries dependent on one or two commodities, to cushion them against sudden drops in the world price of what they sell. We should try to agree with the Common Market to eliminate duties on tropical agricultural products.

For our own part, it will involve reappraising the entire network of restrictions we have erected, for the benefit of our own industries, over the years. I refer not only to tariffs and quotas on imports, but to the laws which require aid-receiving nations to buy American products and ship them in American bottoms. These laws lower the value of our aid by almost 20 per cent. I refer, as well, to our depreciation allowances and our many other subsidies to domestic business that make it harder for the poor nations to compete in our market. President Johnson's statement at the Latin summit conference—that he would be willing to look into the possibility of creating tariff preferences for the manufactured goods of the poor countries—shows his willingness to consider these possibilities. We should spread this willingness to the nation as a whole. Changing these policies might involve temporary dislocations in some parts of our economy. But the last few years have shown how expansionist, and wonderfully flexible, the American economy has become. Millions of jobs have been destroyed, through automation, geographic shifts and changing defense needs—but even more jobs have been created. Domestic industries that might be adversely affected by the trade policy I have mentioned should be eligible for the same adjustment assistance as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides—but I think the industries where this would happen are very, very few.

Fifth, we must encourage private enterprise to join in the development process. Even if world aid is doubled, there will still be a gap between what the rich countries provide and what the poor countries are going to need. This can best be supplied by private investment. It is no coincidence that the handful of developing countries which have enjoyed good growth in recent years—Korea, Mexico, Venezuela, Taiwan—are countries

which have encouraged local and international private investment.

The most important potential field for private investment is in industries producing products, like fertilizer, that agriculture needs, and industries using agricultural products. In many ways, this is the most critical of all the areas of development, and the most difficult. Unless the poor nations can modernize their agriculture—unless they experience the same technological revolution of the farm that we have had, their people, very simply, are going to starve. As we see in India today, the other efforts in development will come to a halt, as nations are forced to spend all their capital on food.

The giant new "agribusiness" industries of the developed countries have the know-how to change this. They have learned how to increase production, develop better strains of crops, conserve the soil and make the available water go around better. They can help develop the buying and selling co-operatives, and the pricing systems that would allow the farmers of these countries to invest even their meagre funds in the new techniques. But private firms cannot be expected to invest in the agricultural improvement of poor nations unless they have the reasonable confidence of making a profit. Our government can help in this through better guarantees against risk, similar to what was given to the New York City Bank that has agreed to supervise the modernization of the agriculture of Thailand. We can help, as well, through interest subsidies, through disseminating of more information about investment opportunities, and by helping our companies cut the red tape that surrounds doing business with the governments of many poor nations. All of this is vital to development, for it will determine, in large part, whether poor countries can have a balanced growth, or whether they will have to spend all they have to buy food to ward off starvation.

CHALLENGE OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

Democratic development is not just a process of economic change. In many ways it will require a social revolution. And it will require much more effort on the poor nations' part than on ours. Japan was able to modernize her economy in thirty years without any foreign aid at all, because she was a nation. Her people were one with her leaders and they worked with tremendous energy.

The process of modernization is a fundamental process of social and economic change. The American people are not going to support a development program that merely makes the rich richer and the class structure more rigid. Nations must be willing to change their ways so that their people can have a share in the fruits of the development process. Farmers will not be inspired by shiny machines and modern methods if they do not own the land they till. Commodity agreements will not help if the higher prices go only to wealthy growers who salt the money away in European banks. The most modern schools and school books will be useless if the class system is so rigid that people cannot rise according to their ability, for then they have no incentive for education. Nor will they be inspired by a growing industrial system, if it is dominated by foreign managers and gives them no opportunity to rise through the ranks.

In short, social justice and individual opportunity are going to be indispensable to economic progress and to the efforts the nations must make for themselves.

To create world peace through world development is an immense task, but it is no different, in philosophy, from what we have done in our own country. Since the beginning of the century, we have known that the greatest source of domestic discord and danger lay among those who lived in poverty.

And we know that increasing their demand for goods is the surest foundation of a healthy economy. Most of our grant-in-aid laws, for schools, hospitals, airports and such, contain "equalization" formulas that insure more for our poor states than our rich states. Our farm price supports are directed not just to the wealthy farmer, but to the family farmer. Fifty years of government effort, from the New Freedom to the New Frontier and the Great Society, have resulted in a redistribution of wealth to the underprivileged, which has increased everybody's wealth, and created the strongest economy the world has ever known. So there is nothing revolutionary or untried in this.

THIS GENERATION'S TASK

I have not come here tonight merely to ask you to support the foreign aid program. This generation of college students should have higher sights. I would propose that you take up, as the task of your generation, nothing less than the modernization of the poor nations of this planet. I propose you do it hand in hand with the young people who today comprise a majority of those countries, and who, in your lifetime, will be no more than two or three hours away from you by supersonic transport.

By modernization I do not mean merely the kind of material growth we associate with the Industrial Revolution of the West. This is important, but if there is anything that your generation has taught its elders, it is that material goods are not enough to make a satisfying life. And this is also in the deepest tradition of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are interested as well in the development of the mind and the spirit, the improvement of the quality of life and the quality of social justice here in our own country and in the poor nations.

There is more to this challenge than the preservation of world peace, vital as it is. There is the creative explosion of whole cultures. We speak of poor peoples, but many of them belong to some of the oldest, most creative cultural traditions on this earth. If the people of these countries, now bound down by poverty, could live in a way in which they could use their talents and historic cultural abilities to the fullest, they could make this world infinitely richer and more exciting for all of you.

Your generation is especially qualified to undertake this, for you will have at your command all the marvels of the new technology—to automate industry, teach through machine, irrigate the deserts, tap the ocean depths and create new sources of food and fabric.

Eight years ago, President Kennedy called the gap between the rich nations and the poor the most critical challenge in the world. Today the gap is greater and more dangerous than ever. The United States owns fully half the wealth of the entire free world. Is this great blessing not also a danger? Can we remain aloof from the poverty and misery of the world? As Pope Paul said, in his Encyclical on Peace and Development, "If today's flourishing civilizations remain selfishly wrapped up in themselves, they could easily place their highest values in jeopardy, sacrificing their will to be great to the desire to possess more."

But I do not think that you want that kind of America. I think you want a deeper involvement. The spirit of democratic development in all its fullness of material, social and spiritual change is the spirit that excites our young people and excites the enthusiasm and commitment of people around the world.

I hope you are ready to take up this challenge as the great task of your generation—to take this as your responsibility to the wider world community of which you are a part, and which in your time, you are going to lead.