

CIVIL RIGHTS

The President and Civil Rights -
April 27

International Day for Elimination
of Racial Discrimination -
March 21

General Mills and Equal
Opportunity - Sept. 25, 1967

worldwide scale. It is properly a matter for the attention of the United Nations. Last year the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution establishing today, March 21, as International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

We must take the occasion on this day to take stock of our efforts to blot out racial prejudice and discrimination from the world. Moreover, while racial persecutions and bigotry have existed throughout the history of mankind, we must never concede that the problem is beyond human solution. It will be most difficult to achieve the goal of racial harmony and equality, because many nations, unlike the United States, do not have guarantees against such discrimination in their basic social fabric of constitution and statutes. In fact, some of the most glaring examples of racial discrimination are based on a State policy committed to that end.

But, in the words of President Johnson, if we as a nation, and I might add the world, take what appears to be the easy way out and abandon the long hard struggle for social and economic justice, there would be little hope of ending the chain of personal tragedies that began with ancient bigotry and continues to this hour.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER PRICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the past several months I have received many communications from the State of Oregon relating to the subject of the appraised prices of timber on the national forests in Oregon.

On February 28, the Forest Service wrote to me on this subject, supplying a current report. Because of the widespread interest in my State on the issue of national forest appraised timber prices, I ask unanimous consent that the February 28 report be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to inform you about some things taking place in the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service that relate to appraising National Forest timber for sale. We constantly reviews, reinforces, and adjusts its timber sale appraisal data. The objective is to have appraisals of National Forest timber reflect the most current logging and marketing conditions.

Early in 1964, there were indications that our stumpage appraisals were getting out of line with bidding experience in western Oregon and Washington. We found that prices bid for National Forest stumpage were exceeding appraised prices by margins that exceeded justifiable expectations. A careful analysis of our appraisal premises and data led us to believe that the divergence was due to changes in market techniques that had affected product recoveries and costs. An extensive series of lumber and plywood mill recovery studies had been under way for some time. These were hastened to provide a possible solution to the pricing problem.

We completed the greater part of this series of studies during 1965. They were

carefully designed to fully reflect the expected combination of recoveries of both veneer and lumber from logs of typical grades. They clearly disclosed that there had been significant increases in both lumber and plywood recoveries and costs since the time when our existing data had been developed. The results of these up-to-date studies are now being placed in effect.

Although this action is a routine one—a part of the constant effort to update appraisal data—we realize that it will generate comment and inquiry. We thought you would like to know about it and the reasons for it. One significant fact should be kept in mind: The change will tend to raise the estimated recovery value of timber stands that include a typical proportion of Douglas-fir. However, appraised prices during the current quarter are expected to be lower than during the fourth quarter of 1966 due to offsetting changes in market levels and cost estimates used in the standard appraisal method.

Should you have questions on the subject or a need for greater detail, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. GREELEY,
Associate Chief.

RECOGNITION AND PRESERVATION OF BIRTHPLACES OF PRESIDENTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is taking up S. 1161, a bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

We, as a nation, have not evolved a distinct policy for the commemoration of former Presidents by the recognition and preservation of their birthplaces. Actually, only five Presidents' birthplaces are owned and administered by the Federal Government. The birthplaces of the others are owned by non-Federal entities, some preserved and open to the public, some not open to the public, some merely recognized by plaques, and some not even definitely identified. Only one-half of the Presidents' birthplaces are in governmental, foundation, or institutional ownerships.

Many of the past Presidents are recognized by the preservation of homes identified with their later years. Mount Vernon, Monticello, and the Hermitage are fine examples of this type.

The pattern in the few instances of Federal recognition of Presidents' birthplaces has been fairly distinct, though. The five birthplaces now a part of the national park system were acquired either in total or in part through donations of the sites by the administering foundations, the surviving families, or combinations thereof.

The Kennedy Birthplace National Historic Site would follow this pattern. The house at 83 Beals Street, in Brookline, Mass., would be donated and completely restored to its 1917 condition. The National Park Service would then assume the administration of the home.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, due to his tragic and untimely death, was not associated with a particular home in later life, as were many of our Presidents. I believe it is fitting, then, that we accept this offer of his birthplace home to become a part of our historical heritage.

I was most pleased to join my friend and colleague, the distinguished senior

Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in sponsoring this bill. I believe that Congress should avail itself of this unique opportunity, and I urge the prompt passage of S. 1161 by the Senate.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Future Homemakers of America have a week dedicated to recognition of their achievements, April 2-9, and I wish to invite particular attention to one of these achievements.

Women in 20th-century America play an important part in civic and community affairs, and the Future Homemakers of America, among their many achievements provide practical training in participation in these affairs.

As an example of what is meant by practical training is the work which the 12 national officers of this organization have done in guiding the planning for the National Future Homemakers of America Week. One of these national officers is Brenda Holes, Hunter, N. Dak., a vice president. Her particular responsibility is the area of public relations.

This national association is made up of hundreds of local chapters along with State organizations which meet regularly and practice self-government by electing officers and planning and executing community and individual improvement programs. This is important training for the roles these young women will carry in their adult life. Tribute should also be paid to the State and local leaders, such as Janice Lindstrom, of Sheyenne, N. Dak., who is State president. She is the leader of 4,864 members in North Dakota.

These organizations which are training grounds for tomorrow's citizens and leaders are great bulwarks of democracy. They are carrying on important work which will be paying its dividends for years to come.

UTAH INTERMOUNTAIN BUSINESS LEADERS SUPPORT RESTORATION OF 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on March 10, the Salt Lake Tribune published an article which indicates widespread support among business leaders in the Intermountain area for the restoration of the 7-percent investment tax credit. I know from my own mail and personal conversation with these business leaders that support for the restoration is strong and vocal. I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Mar. 10, 1967]

Possible restoration of the seven per cent investment credit tax was hailed in the Intermountain Area as being therapeutic for the economy.

President Johnson announced Thursday that he would ask Congress to restore the credit.

Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Assn., said it would be an incentive

The free never backbite, because their heart is in the things above.

There is no envying and strife among the free, for who can envy being and who can quarrel with truth?

The free never forsake one another, for to whom will they then go?

The free never chop up history to bits and pieces: they hate arbitrary beginnings.

Where they cannot speak, where they should not speak, they are silent, and silence speaks mightily.

In the presence of something great and higher than themselves, they do not fret and wish it away: on the contrary, they rejoice and bow their heads in gratitude.

The free understand and forgive, and nothing people need more than to know the forgiveness of the free and the freedom of forgiveness.

The free radiate freedom through their mere presence, through the strength and freedom of their spirit, through the obvious light that shines from their brows.

Being is personal; therefore, according to those you associate with and admire and follow, you are. Seek, then, the company of the free.

Freedom passes from man to man by contagion. The problem of the first free man or men is therefore crucial. Seek the free wherever they are and inquire into where they got their freedom from. Then you will be happy indeed; then you will have life and have it more abundantly.

Freedom is free men. Whatever else this University does or plans to do, it must always have a few free men in its midst—men of truth, men of understanding, men of spirit, men of fun, men of joy, men of heart, men of peace—positive men, deep men, humble men, gentle men, true men, loving men, forgiving men, thankful men. These men alone constitute the meaning of the University; by them alone it justifies its existence here; through them alone it hands on its message. To secure them is always its primary task, its first preoccupation.

XII. THE FOUR FINAL WORDS

There remain four final words.

First a word to the students of the coming generations:

"Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." And in finding, never let the good become the enemy of the best, for I assure you there are depths beyond depths of truth and being which are yours for the asking.

Then a word to the present and future faculty:

Nothing that is good elsewhere in every field of knowledge and being is not also good and possible here. Therefore, do not grudge the students the best you know nor the best that you possibly do not know. Especially as nothing deeper or higher has ever been seen and realized anywhere than what was seen and realized in terms of being and nearness to God in the eastern Mediterranean.

Then a word to the present and future Board of Trustees:

You are the stewards of a pearl of great price. We want the best men here—faithful men, dedicated men, free men. We do not want the best available men; no, that is not good enough: we want the best men made available. Above all, I beg you never to say, because "the area" does not support us materially, therefore let us fold up and go—and there are ways and ways of folding up and going. This is intellectual and spiritual abdication. One can perhaps understand political abdication and withdrawal, but abdication in the order of the spirit I cannot understand. It is enough to be given the opportunity not only to exist here but to be as deep and as free as you can. This is the only "support" you really need. Make

full use of it and see that it continue, and be thankful. And since you cannot possibly abdicate intellectually and spiritually, the material support will come to you from a thousand sources—"good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over."

Finally a word to the men and women who will be celebrating right here the 200th anniversary of the University in the year 2066:

In contemplating the development of the University, may you find us of the year 1966 half as worthy as its founders of the year 1866, and may those of the year 2166 find you twice as worthy as we are. And let us all, we and you after us and they after you, join together in repeating with David what I am sure Daniel Bliss and his colleagues would love also repeating with us (Psalm 100):

"Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands.

"Serve the Lord with gladness: come before his presence with singing.

"Know ye that the Lord he is God: it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.

"Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful into him, and bless his name.

"For the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations."

SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, although the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is only beginning his second term as a Member of the Senate, he has already gained wide recognition as a pacesetter in a number of areas vital to the growth and development of our country.

His perception and imagination have resulted in new approaches and a program for interurban transportation, oceanography, education, and cultural affairs. The plans which he is advocating today will be crucial factors in the future improvement of our society.

An article about Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, written by Ernest Cuneo, effectively describes the scope and range of his activities thus far in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

RHODE ISLAND'S CLAIBORNE PELL, A RISING STAR IN U.S. SENATE

(By Ernest Cuneo)

NEW YORK.—Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island has attained national importance in the quiet tradition of senators Hull of Tennessee, Glass of Virginia and Wagner of New York. Though labeled differently, these giants of the Senate took deliberate aim at the problems of their times in the light of the future expansion of the country.

Senator Pell has followed this pattern. Relected by an overwhelming majority in the last election, it is a fair assumption that the gentleman from Rhode Island, backed by unprecedented majorities in his electorate, will expand his blueprints of the future. They, like those of his predecessors, envision an America 20 years from the present.

With almost breathtaking and unnoticed daring, Senator Pell is pioneering into three fields, any one of which is of transcendent national importance. Apparently embracing the theory of the 20th Century Fund studies that one gigantic city is emerging on the Atlantic Seaboard, extending from Boston to Richmond, the Senator has become virtually

the spokesman for that emerging American phenomenon, the 11-state Megalopolis Northeast. In effect, this projects the present-day problems of the great cities into their single common problems. The key to this is transportation.

Rapid inter-city transportation is his sole idea, and has already resulted in tremendous revitalization of the role of the railroads. Indeed, almost single-handedly, Senator Pell's persistence has resulted in the new Cabinet post of Secretary of Transportation. His new book, "Megalopolis Unbound," is a reassuringly thorough study, as unassuming and as solid as concrete. If it does nothing else, it should elevate the sights of those aiming at solution of the current big city problems in terms of easing local paroxysm.

Additionally, with the temerity of a Magellan, Senator Pell has literally embarked upon the oceans. The senator envisions the seas as vast reservoirs of energies untapped and indeed unimagined, and clearly believes man will tame the oceans and their sea water as man has tamed fire.

Almost compulsively addicted to doing his homework, he has produced another book, "The Challenge of the Seas." Actually, it adds up to a most readable thriller on the new science of oceanography. To augment this, Senator Pell has urged the idea of sea-grant colleges, parallel to President Lincoln's land-grant colleges which are today the present state universities. Obviously, if any nation can convert the sea into farm, mine and chemical colossus, the know-how of American industry is preeminently qualified.

This is quite independent of his position on higher education generally. He conceives of higher education as a government investment, and has introduced a bill providing a government grant of \$1,000 a year for two years to every qualified student upon going to college. Again, this alone would revolutionize the budget of millions of American families.

Further, Senator Pell's philosophy of the expanding mind of man is such that when the Institute of Arts and Sciences was brought into being, the President handed him two pens, for it was largely Pell's brainchild.

Tall, young and handsome, he is all but maddeningly deliberate and undramatic—but so was Cordell Hull, his prototype. It is significant that Senator Mike Mansfield, majority leader, unqualifiedly declares that Pell of Rhode Island has one of the most massive first term records in senate history.

Senator Pell is anything but a comet; but assuredly, in the national heavens, there is a slowly rising star of great magnitude.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. President, more than 7 years ago President John F. Kennedy pledged the best efforts of this Nation to those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery.

One of the most cruel bonds faced by those millions of peoples is that of racial discrimination—whether it be in the reprehensible apartheid policy of South Africa, in the imposition of boycotts by some nations on the basis of race, or in the continuation of racial disabilities here in the United States. It is a scourge visited upon some peoples for reasons entirely outside their own control, and results in hopelessness, frustration, and violence.

It is one of the most grave threats to world peace, and exists as a threat on a

straight and express my sadness that so great and eloquent a leader would, for whatever reason, cloud the shining record of accomplishment and commitment President Johnson has achieved in the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity.

FEDERAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES PRACTICE IN FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I recently received a most encouraging report from the director of the Dallas region of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Louis S. Lyon, concerning a review of equal employment opportunities practices in the various employing agencies of the Federal Government in Fort Worth. The survey was made last February.

Mr. Lyon reported that minority group employment in Fort Worth has increased over the past 3 years by 1.9 percent, from 7.1 to 9 percent. Today there are a total of 646 minority group employees out of a total of 7,104 Federal workers in Fort Worth.

During the same period, in which minority group employment increased nearly 2 percent, the overall Federal employment in the Fort Worth area declined by about 10 percent, due principally to the closing of the Fort Worth Army Depot.

What is especially enlightening is that minority group employees have shown gains in holding professional, administrative and supervisory positions. According to Mr. Lyon, increasing emphasis will be given to encouraging and motivating youths and adults to pursue higher education and advanced training.

In a letter to me, the director advised me that overall community conditions in Fort Worth were found to be favorable. It was an analysis I was quite proud to hear.

Mr. President, our system based upon individual merit has done more than any other to eradicate color-consciousness.

RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WOULD BE OF GREAT VALUE TO U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—LXI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, which I have been urging during every session of the 90th Congress, would be of great value to the United States in the conduct of this Nation's foreign policy.

U.S. ratification would be of immediate advantage in putting our Nation squarely on record on four vital issues of human dignity.

U.S. ratification would rob unfriendly nations of a major propaganda device which our failure to ratify has provided them.

U.S. ratification will also resolve the dilemma of many of our allies who have valiantly attempted to serve as apologists for this Nation's failure to ratify.

U.S. ratification will relieve the embarrassment of our own representatives at the United Nations which our failure to ratify has inevitably produced.

U.S. ratification will enable this Nation to "blow the whistle" on any signatory countries to these treaties which are violating any of the four treaties' provisions.

In short, the benefits to the United States through ratification greatly, greatly outweigh the remote threat of any unfriendly nation bringing a transparently fraudulent charge against the United States.

But what, if anything, do we as a nation have to fear from ratification? Our own domestic law has established standards of human rights immeasurably higher than the minimal guarantees contained in these four conventions.

Mr. President, the case for ratification is compelling. I urge the Senate to ratify the Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery without further delay.

NEED TO MAINTAIN ECONOMIC COMPETITION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a cry of "wolf" seems too often to be the only way to catch the attention of Congress. This is not by the way of criticism because as a Member of this body I am aware—and I suspect observers are too—that we generally can stretch ourselves only to handle the crises. Impending danger frequently, then, is neglected until it too reaches the crisis stage.

Sometimes this chaotic situation wreaks only minor ills—ills which in one manner or another can be alleviated by tardy action.

But the Joint Economic Committee in its 1967 report has pointed a finger at an impending crisis which could not be cured with a belated bandaid.

In a strong section on "maintaining competition," buttressed by comments expressing even more alarm by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the committee warned that if antitrust is not brought to bear on the increasing economic concentration in this country we soon will have no alternative but "some sort of statutory price-wage surveillance and, perhaps, actual controls."

The idea is appalling to me—and I know it is to Members of this body. However, I must concur in the warning. The investigations of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee—which are quoted in the joint committee report—offer ample proof to substantiate that fear.

Certainly we are not yet too late in coping with the conglomerate mergers which account for approximately 70 percent of the merger activity in the United States. And, armed with the recent Procter & Gamble-Clorox decision from the Supreme Court, it is to be hoped that present law can do much to make sure competition is once again the base stone of our economic system.

What is needed is the cooperation of each citizen—industrial and private. Especially what is needed is an awareness of the deterioration striking competition and a recommitment from Congress and the Nation to the competitive system.

It would be ironic if—as the other major nations of the world are steering more and more onto the road of compe-

tion—the Nation which carved that road from the wilderness should desert it.

As the report states:

Antitrust must be assigned a central role in national economic policy of no less significance than monetary and fiscal policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section of the Joint Economic Committee report for 1967 to which I made reference be printed in the RECORD:

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

MAINTAINING COMPETITION¹

However, much private enterprises are exhorted to conduct their affairs in accordance with wage-price precepts, achievement of price stability in an economy operating at or near capacity is impossible without effective competition. And without vigorous antitrust enforcement industrial markets will not long remain competitive. To underscore this duality—the vital role of competition and the necessity of government antitrust enforcement—is only to repeat what this committee has often said before and, indeed, what, as in its report this year, the Council itself spoke of in clear unequivocal terms. In fact, it has become a kind of annual ritual to stress the importance of preserving competition through antitrust activity.

Antitrust must be assigned a central role in national economic policy of no less significance than monetary and fiscal policy.

It is an economic fact of life that many vital industries in the American economy are now characterized by a high degree of concentration, with a few large firms accounting for most of the output. Sellers in these oligopolistic industries possess substantial power over price which they can exercise in a manner inconsistent with the larger public interest in achieving rapid economic growth with relative overall price stability. By reducing or inhibiting concentration in such industries and increasing the role of market forces, antitrust can materially complement other public economic policies. But if antitrust enforcement is to play such a role, greater vigor and more imagination are required, for, in recent years, far too little significant action has been taken. While price-fixing, bid rigging, and other forms of overt collusion have often been prosecuted by Federal agencies, too few cases have been brought to stem the merger tide and virtually nothing of consequence has been done to reduce the high levels of concentration in oligopolistic industries.

With nearly 2,000 mergers taking place annually—and with fewer than one percent being challenged by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—it is hardly surprising that the economy is steadily becoming more concentrated. Data published late last year by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee showed that in 1963 a mere 200 companies accounted for 41 percent of value-added by manufacture—up substantially from 30 percent in 1947. Even in industries already highly concentrated—autos, to cite just one example—mergers and other factors continue to reduce the number of active competitors. Given also the powerful influence of conglomerate (diversification) mergers, the likelihood—absent strong antitrust intervention—is that concentration will increase and that the number of firms with substantial discretionary pricing power will rise sharply. If the public is to be protected under these circumstances, the only answer—and it is an unappealing one to those of us

¹ See supplementary views of Representative Patman, p. 40.

cies and for carrying them out to explain them, to defend them, or to counter those with opposing views. What move has been made to brand dissenters as "traitors" except by the dissenters themselves through a brand of reverse psychology aimed at mobilizing sympathy? I for one have not noticed that those who oppose our policies in southeast Asia have been coerced into silence by the administration or by anyone else. If anything, the tempo of their vocal exercises has been increased in recent days.

If the public debate does give false hope to Hanoi that somehow North Vietnam ultimately will be able to achieve politically what it cannot win militarily—and I must say I am convinced this is the fact—then so be it. This is the burden a free and open society must bear. Thomas Jefferson put it well, Mr. President, when he wrote in his first inaugural address that:

Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Mr. President, let us have reason. Must those who oppose the Government's policies desecrate the principles of free debate by accusing our leaders of tyranny? Must they reserve to themselves all wisdom? Why would they apply a double standard by refusing those who accept and agree with our Government's policies, and therefore happen to disagree with the dissenters, equal access to the public forum?

No, debate is not and will not be curbed, Mr. President. But it will be encouraged as a two-way discourse. Those who oppose our Government's policies in Vietnam are free to express themselves. Indeed, they have a duty to do so. But, by the same token, those who support the Government—and the Government itself—have an equal duty to explain its policies, to expand public knowledge about the war, and to enlarge the area of agreement.

Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post, in its lead editorial, dealt admirably with this controversy. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEETING DISSENT

The government of a free society has no right to suppress, restrain or punish dissent; but it is under no obligation to refrain from reply or rebuttal.

Reaction in some quarters to the tour of General Westmoreland suggests that the opponents of the war may be seized of the notion that they have every right to mobilize their sympathizers but that those in favor of the war do not enjoy the same right to summon support to the forum.

Some bitterness has been caused, in particular, by General Westmoreland's disclosure that criticism of the American policy in Vietnam gives comfort to North Vietnam and, by prolonging the war may be costing American lives. This is simply a fact of life attested to by most authorities who have interviewed officials at Hanoi. The dissenters do wrong to try to suppress this fact and they are mistaken in resenting its disclosure. It is an awkward fact of life.

General Westmoreland did not say, and no other responsible critic has said, that this disagreeable fact makes it disloyal for anyone

to criticize the conduct of the war or to dissent from the policy of the Government. It is doubtful if any democratic society could ever achieve, without the sacrifice of all principle, the degree of unanimity needed to divest the North Vietnamese of plausible pretenses on which to maintain the illusion that they can gain a victory by political dissent in the United States. One dissenting voice alone probably would be sufficient to that purpose. How much does an undeniably greater dissent increase the illusion? To whatever degree dissent contributes to it, this is a burden that a free country must cheerfully bear in wartime.

So debate cannot and will not be curbed in the United States, no matter how much it contributes to the hope of the North Vietnamese that they can achieve politically what they cannot accomplish militarily.

While it would be wrong for an American Government to try to diminish dissent by unconstitutional and antidemocratic methods, the Government has every right to try to diminish dissent by making its own contribution to the debate. It is perfectly free and able, within the framework of a free society, to mobilize the sentiment of the country. It should not be reproached for trying to enlarge the area of agreement by increasing the information and knowledge of the public about the war.

And it might be very well advised to seek frequently the advice and consent of Congress to the objectives of policy and to the altering means of achieving those objectives. The time is at hand when Congress, by a new and explicit direction to the Government, stating the ends of American policy and the methods of achieving them, might provide a healthy corrective to the North Vietnamese illusion that they are dealing with Paris and not with Washington.

THE PRESIDENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was both surprised and saddened today to read the Reverend Martin Luther King's comments in Cleveland yesterday regarding who would be the best presidential candidates in 1968 "from a civil rights standpoint."

I was surprised and saddened not because of the names Dr. King mentioned but because of the name he did not mention. I think that to talk about candidates "from a civil rights standpoint" without mentioning the name of Lyndon Johnson calls for an explanation to the American people. For no President in our history has done more for the cause of civil rights than Lyndon Johnson.

When the history of the 1960's is written at some future date, the civil rights struggle will assume a central place in that work. The names of Martin Luther King and Lyndon Johnson will also assume central places in that history.

For if Martin Luther King was the apostle of the civil rights movement, Lyndon Johnson was the leader whose total commitment secured these rights in the laws of this land.

I am sure that the Senate shares my view that President Johnson has led the way toward more civil rights legislation than any other President since the reconstruction period.

President Johnson's civil rights and equal opportunity record speaks for itself. And friend or foe must admire the moral weight and the far-reaching effects of that record.

I know Dr. King cannot have forgotten that it was Lyndon Johnson who united the people and the Congress behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964 first proposed by the martyred President Kennedy; that it was Lyndon Johnson who worked hand-in-hand with HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to prevent a filibuster from talking it to death; and that it was Lyndon Johnson whose tireless efforts and skill produced the overwhelming margin by which Congress approved this historic act—the most comprehensive civil rights law since the adoption of the constitutional amendments which freed the slaves and gave them the right to vote and full protection of due process of law.

I am sure Dr. King has not forgotten that Lyndon Johnson was the first President to obtain a voting rights law with teeth in it, and which has already resulted in the registration of hundreds of thousands of minority voters throughout the country. Is there any doubt that this effort took deep moral courage and commitment, and great strength to be successful?

And I am sure Dr. King has not forgotten that President Johnson pledged to go all the way in civil rights when he proposed the comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1966 to prohibit discrimination across the board in housing, on juries and in the exercise of the very basic right to protest.

Is this not the program of a great civil rights President?

And while it was President John F. Kennedy who proposed the beginnings of the most extensive equal opportunity programs in American history for the poor and the victims of discrimination and deprivation—it was Lyndon Johnson who saw them through into law and concrete action.

It was Lyndon Johnson who literally emancipated the minds of disadvantaged schoolchildren with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; it was Lyndon Johnson who made the Economic Opportunity Act a total crusade against the cycle of poverty and dependency for millions of citizens too long kept out of American life because of their color; it was Lyndon Johnson who said that the cities of our Nation are the vital centers of life and commerce and growth and that they must be helped and strengthened with Federal assistance from every department of the Government; and it was Lyndon Johnson who made the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Project Headstart and Project Upward Bound realities.

In short, Lyndon Johnson has, in the past three and a half years, built perhaps the greatest equal rights record of any President in American history—a record which cannot be denied.

To omit his name when talking about presidential candidates "from a civil rights standpoint" is an injustice.

And as one who has admired and been deeply moved by Martin Luther King, as one who has supported the efforts of his Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and as the chief Senate sponsor of President Johnson's Fair Housing Act of 1967, I feel compelled to set the record

Senator and Congressman just before they left on Fourth of July vacations asking them to check on their districts or states to make sure racial problems were handled before they reached a boil. The response was excellent.

Most important of all, perhaps, were his telephone calls to big-city mayors. If he found the mayor was lying down on the job, Humphrey telephoned the leading newspaper publisher in town to tell him the mayor didn't have a youth program and the city might be in trouble.

The Vice President has listed the mayors in the big cities who did the best job in heading off riots. At the top of the list are: Richard Daley of Chicago, Democrat; John Lindsay of New York, Republican; Theodore McKeldin of Baltimore, Republican; James Tate of Philadelphia, Democrat; and A. W. Sorensen of Omaha, nonpartisan.

It was Humphrey's idea to open up the National Guard armories all over the Nation to serve underprivileged youngsters. They were used as gyms, shower rooms, locker rooms and recreation centers in the bigger cities.

Chicago used National Guard trucks to take youngsters to beaches and turned a Navy pier into a giant gymnasium, thanks to the work of the Chicago fire department. In New Brunswick, N.J., the National Guard turned over an old armory to the city to use as a recreation center.

The Defense Department, at Humphrey's suggestion, opened various camps around the Nation, including Camp Roberts near the Watts area of Los Angeles. Last summer the same National Guard which was called out to quell the Watts riots organized a program for 2000 Negro children. The Vice President pays tribute to Mayor Sam Yorty of Los Angeles for obtaining food and other aid for the Watts youth program.

The Defense Department also opened Camp Robinson near Little Rock, Ark., where 1700 boys camped out on an integrated basis. They were not far from where Federal troops were called out to enforce integration at Central High School ten years ago.

The Vice President figures that the best job training was done by the Department of Labor. He also gives great credit to private industry. As a result of their combined efforts, plus those of various local groups, a total of 1,400,000 summer jobs were found for youths.

GENERAL MILLS AND EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the past few years have witnessed the most intense and determined effort in our history to resolve the manifold problems created by decades of prejudicial treatment for the minorities in our midst. Those efforts have been good, and their long-range impact on minority group members and society as a whole will be positive.

Our determined effort to achieve equality in voting rights, in education, in housing, and in employment has taught us that the problems created by years of prejudice and deprivation for minority groups in each of these areas are far greater and far more resistant to change than we had thought.

Previously, we addressed ourselves to the task of righting racial and religious wrongdoing in America. What remains now is to rededicate ourselves to the more difficult task of bringing legislative enactments into real life experiences for minority group members.

Equal employment opportunity is an excellent example of the gap between our

best efforts to date and the reality of full social equality and opportunity for American Negroes and other minority group members. Numerous firms endorse and enthusiastically pursue the principle of equal employment opportunity. One such firm is Minnesota-based General Mills, Inc. Recently, Gen. E. W. Rawlings, president of General Mills and a distinguished Minnesotan, committed the corporation he heads to going far beyond a simple willingness to hire qualified job applicants without discrimination. He has, in his own words, committed General Mills to "give help in the development of employability and motivation among those culturally or educationally deprived."

Mr. President, I commend General Mills and General Rawlings for this enlightened approach. Only comparable commitments by firms in every city and State can make a reality of the full social opportunity envisioned by the landmark civil rights legislation enacted in the past few years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper report of General Rawlings' statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

CORPORATION HEAD LOOKS AT MINORITY HIRING

(From a report by Gen. E. W. Rawlings, president of General Mills, Inc., at its annual stockholders meeting)

Your company (General Mills) is fully aware of some of the problems now affecting our country nationwide—particularly with regard to employment opportunity for minority groups.

In this respect, our official position is clearly presented in our corporate policy statement, which says: "In the best interests of progress and efficiency, General Mills, Inc., must employ and promote the most capable and promising individuals available, without regard to race, religion, sex or political party." Beyond this, it should be noted that we are an equal opportunity employer and have signed an agreement as such with the federal government.

This is all well and good, but at the practical level the best of intentions do not bring us to grips with a problem which is growing with intensity throughout the nation.

Willing as we are to hire minority group members in every instance in which their qualifications match our job requirements, there are factors which limit the number of minority group applicants who can qualify for the jobs we have.

This problem, of course, is not peculiar to General Mills. It is nationwide and economy-wide, and grows daily more difficult as technical standards at every level of employment grow more demanding.

As a result, it is becoming increasingly obvious that industry needs to go further than mere willingness to hire qualified job applicants without discrimination. We must, additionally, give help in the development of employability and motivation among those culturally or educationally deprived.

To this end, General Mills has provided financial aid to organizations dedicated to the well-being of minority groups. In the Twin Cities and elsewhere, we actively support such organizations as the Urban League, Industrial Opportunity centers, Plans for Progress programs and others.

We have participated in training programs designed to raise the level of skills of potential job applicants who cannot now qualify

for some of our job openings, but who, hopefully, will be able to do so when their training is complete.

We have also, through our Corporate Contributions Committee and the General Mills Foundation, increased our grants to Negro educational programs at graduate schools, colleges and secondary schools.

Meanwhile, through advertising, we seek minority group employees and actively recruit at a number of Negro and predominantly Negro colleges, and we have embarked upon a program designed to let all of our management people in every location know of our concern and of our commitment to help in the solution of this complex problem.

All this, however, is only a beginning, in the light of today's needs. The programs already instituted must be expanded and intensified and new programs added. American business, along with the American people as a whole, faces a challenge in which all of us are involved and which none of us can side-step.

THE LEADEN AGE OF U.S. LIBERALISM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it was with something of a leaden heart that I read Howard K. Smith's Sunday column in the Washington Star, for he wrote of the leaden age of American liberal intellectualism, and it was obviously rather painful. Mr. Smith had always counted himself in that group, as he said, and so had I. He has articulated the same distress I think so many of us feel at seeing one liberal of the intellectual bent after another display blindness to the issues and irresponsibility in stating them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 24, 1967]

ASHMORE AND THE LEADEN AGE OF U.S. LIBERALISM

(By Howard K. Smith)

If times of unusual brilliance are known as Golden Ages, this is surely the Leaden Age of American Liberal Intellectualism. It is with distress that this reporter, who has always counted himself in that group, watches one old friend after another compete to see who can be blindest to issues and most irresponsible in stating them.

Harry Ashmore has just added his leaden thump. One of a small number allowed into North Vietnam, he found Ho Chi Minh conciliatory and says President Johnson is brutal. It reminds me of an interview I had with Dr. Goebbels once. He was conciliatory to me but he told me President Roosevelt was brutal. I suspected that dictators rarely kick you in the teeth after they have cuffed you as one of few to be allowed access to them. In my case I chose to be skeptical and did not parrot Goebbels' line.

On the basis of Ho's friendly attitude, Mr. Ashmore came back and with State Department aid composed a letter to Ho—vague, but hopeful of opening a channel for peace talks. While Ashmore's vague letter was on the way, President Johnson had found it necessary to send a more specific one to Ho. Now, Mr. Ashmore gives vent to his peeve about this "cancellation" of his effort by writing an article fulsome in its accusations that Mr. Johnson does not want peace and deliberately thwarts it.

There are a few basics Mr. Ashmore needs to be reminded of. One is that the Constitution makes the President—alone—responsi-

ing. Since the cost of borrowing is higher to businesses than to the federal government the possibility exists that firms will be undertaking projects with a higher return than government projects. As mentioned earlier, this would imply that a redistribution of productive resources from the public sector to the private sector would increase the overall return of our productive resources. This fear is, of course, legitimate. The fact that the government can borrow at a lower cost than corporations does not give it license to undertake projects from which the benefits are negligible or nonexistent. Indeed, the government must be especially careful to avoid such temptations. However, it does not follow from these considerations that the only way, or the best way, for the government to avoid this possibility is to penalize itself by using a higher rate of interest for discounting than the rate at which it can borrow. As has been mentioned earlier, the difference between the government's cost of borrowing and private cost reflect more the lender's risk of not being repaid than the actual uncertainty regarding the outcome of the project. Moreover, this difference in interest rates is not an inherent feature of a private enterprise economy. Instead, this difference mirrors our present institutions and laws. Methods could be devised whereby a private firm could borrow at the same rate of interest as the government.

The third school of thought on this issue contends that neither the interest rate the government must pay or a private enterprise must pay to borrow are appropriate for discounting in cost-benefit analysis. The former rate is too low, this group argues, because it does not take into account the uncertainties attached to the project. The latter rate is too high because it reflects not only the lender's risk, or lack of total insurability, but also the discriminatory practices in the capital markets. The latter contention is of course a question of fact which can only be resolved by presentation of empirical evidence. Currently, there does not exist compelling evidence to deny or confirm this allegation. This group, therefore, advocates that the source of the funds used to finance a particular project, most often taxes, be traced back to its origin and the return on the alternative uses of these funds be calculated. The resulting rate of return would be used for discounting in cost-benefit analyses. The referred to origin of the funds would be taxpayers in different income brackets and the resultant rate of return would be an average of several rates. The reasoning behind this proposal is very much the same as the basis for the second school of thought along with the belief that discriminatory practices exist in the capital markets on a large scale. As stated earlier, whether or not discrimination exists, and how important a distortion this creates are currently unknown. The question of fact is critical to this argument as the advocated procedure is very difficult to carry out. It seems that further research into the workings of the capital markets is required before this proposal can be seriously contemplated.

The discussion till now has been mainly directed toward answering the first question posed at the beginning of this paper. The underlying issues were outlined and several different proposals regarding the proper rate of interest to be used in cost-benefit analyses were presented and appraised. On that basis it was concluded that the appropriate rate of interest was the rate on long-term government bonds and that the uncertainty associated with the project be accounted for in the estimation of future benefits and costs. In particular, what this means in practice is that all possible eventualities relating to future benefits be considered. The likelihood of each eventuality then be estimated. The expected, or most likely, benefits would be calculated by taking a weighted

sum of the possible outcomes, where each outcome is weighted by its possibility of occurrence. Further adjustments could be made to take account of the variability of the most likely outcome, say by dividing the expected outcome by its variability.

Let us now turn briefly to the second question posed earlier. Some economists argue that even if the economy were of the idealized type described earlier, the single interest rate determined by market forces would still not be the correct one to use for discounting purposes. Recall that in an idealized economy the government and private enterprises would have to pay exactly the same amount to borrow funds. The reason it is inappropriate is that the market determined rate of interest reflects the evaluation of present sacrifice for future gain of individuals acting independently of one another. If they were to act collectively, the argument continues, they would place a higher value on future benefits and a correspondingly lower value on present sacrifice than when they act separately. The conclusion reached is that account should be made of this by using a lower rate of interest than the rate on long-term government bonds for discounting in cost-benefit analyses. Again, the validity of this argument rests on a question of fact, namely is there a discrepancy between our collective evaluation of present and future benefits and our individual evaluations. The evidence at this time is not conclusive. However, even if this turns out to be true it does not follow that a special lower rate of interest should be used for government projects. If we collectively value future benefits more than we do individually than this is so regardless of the source of the benefits. That is, whether the benefits derive from the private sector or the public sector. The appropriate policy for the government to follow in this eventuality, is to lower the rate of interest in both sectors via monetary and fiscal policy.

Before concluding, two further issues deserve mention. The first pertains to the fact that corporations usually do not finance projects entirely with borrowed funds. A portion of a private project is financed out of equity capital. Because tax laws treat equity and debt financing differently a corporation may have to realize a higher before tax return on a project than is actually needed to pay the interest on the borrowed funds. The public sector is not affected by this circumstance. This again gives rise to the possibility that the return on investments may be higher in the private sector than in the public sector. Unless allowance is made for the difference between before tax and after tax returns in evaluating government projects the overall yield on productive resources will not be maximized. The called for adjustment can be made either by raising the interest rate used for discounting or by calculating benefits after taxes. The latter alternative seems preferable because it focuses attention on who the recipients of the benefits will be. The after tax adjustment of benefits and costs can then be made in accordance with the tax-brackets into which the beneficiaries fall.

The final point to be touched upon deals with the question of how to take account of inflation in cost-benefit analyses. Since in a cost-benefit analysis costs and benefits are calculated in terms of current dollars a corresponding adjustment should be made in the discount rate. Put another way, the interest rate that must be paid on long-term government bonds partially reflects lenders' anticipations of the future value of a dollar. Consequently, a downward revision of the discount rate is necessary. The precise manner in which this should be done is a technical matter. Various techniques of forecasting the rate of inflation are available though not all economists agree on a single best procedure. Nevertheless, there is no disagreement that in principle that this should be done.

YEOMAN WORK BY VICE PRESIDENT TO PROCURE SUMMER WORK FOR YOUNGSTERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Drew Pearson's column in the Washington Post of Sunday, September 24, 1967, was a tribute to the yeoman work done during the past summer by our Vice President and presiding officer, Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY. Mr. Pearson has recounted the efforts of the Vice President to find jobs and outlets for youngsters, particularly those in our big urban ghettos. His efforts here in the Nation's Capital have drawn attention, but Pearson has recounted how he functioned elsewhere, and how he worked at urging mayors, chambers of commerce, and private employers to produce jobs and recreational opportunities for these young people.

Without these efforts by our Vice President, the summer just past doubtless would have been much more chaotic than it was. Certainly, thousands upon thousands of young people would have had little joy to look back upon as the summer ended, and many with some coins in their jeans would not have felt that satisfaction either.

Mr. President, the commendations for Vice President HUMPHREY are well deserved. I wish to second them and ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pearson's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

H. H. H.'s ACCOMPLISHMENTS
(By Drew Pearson)

The job of being Vice President is probably the toughest in Washington. President Johnson found it that way when he was No. 1; so have many other Vice Presidents, including Hubert Humphrey.

The trouble is that the Constitution gives the Vice President no work except the boring job of presiding over the Senate, plus looking over the President's shoulder to check on his health.

In searching around for something to keep the Vice President busy, President Johnson made him chairman of the "Youth Opportunity Council," composed of Cabinet members charged with getting jobs for unskilled semi-literate dropouts in Negro ghettos.

Early in the summer Stokely Carmichael, the No. 1 Negro rabble-rouser, boasted that he would reduce the big cities of the United States to rubble.

The Vice President immediately met with District of Columbia leaders. "We ought to recognize that challenge and meet it," he told them. "We've got to make the Nation's Capital a model for youth."

The Vice President got busy. His activities ranged from getting the Army, Navy and Marine Corps service bands to play more than 150 concerts in the Negro areas of the city rather than just in the park areas around the Lincoln Memorial; opening up National Guard armories as gymnasiums; getting 118 playgrounds illuminated at night, as against 18 last summer; arranging for 3000 youngsters to see the Senators play baseball on one night alone.

He also opened Camp Roosevelt on Chesapeake Bay, closed for some months, and raised \$90,000 to refurbish it. A total of 1300 boys from slum areas, who had never been to camp before, enjoyed Camp Roosevelt.

More important, Humphrey rode herd on the mayors of big cities to prevent race riots. He telephoned or wrote to every Chamber of Commerce in the country to urge that they give jobs to youngsters. He wrote to every



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org