

years and which cannot be reconciled with each other."

The situation is worse today and many businessmen are guilty in the eyes of Washington's antitrust prosecutors of criminal conduct even before they are tried. Unfortunately, they are often guilty in the eyes of a substantial segment of the public which too often assumes, without knowing the facts, that a Government antitrust indictment is tantamount to proof of wrongdoing. A large part of the public also assumes, erroneously, that a "no contest" plea is an admission of guilt.

That is why business as a whole needs the protection of each of its individual members. That is why every successful defense of an antitrust suit imparts a little more of the glow of health and integrity to the countenance of business as a whole.

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Some students of the antitrust laws advocate their wholesale repeal. Most thoughtful businessmen would regard this as a long step backward into a primitive economy that no longer exists. Such a proposal is thoroughly impractical; moreover, it is undesirable. These laws were passed for the protection of the people, and the people includes us. The government's role is to make sure the laws protect all the people from economic harm.

Since the laws are a hodge-podge and repeal should not even be considered, what is left? The best solution, I think, is for business to arrive at some prior understanding with the Government, before trouble begins, on how business is supposed to interpret the laws. Many of these matters that reach court are completely legal technicalities.

How do we achieve this understanding? Well, the mechanics of setting up a meeting, or a seminar, if you will, are simple. On the initiative of business, representatives of industry may meet with representatives of the Federal Trade Commission, members of appropriate congressional committees, Justice Department attorneys, and with anyone else in Washington—including the Attorney General or the President if the subject is of sufficient importance—to dissipate the miasma of misunderstanding which enshrouds the entire body of antitrust legislation.

We need to know whether the sort of competitive practices we deem fair and practical, and which arise naturally in the market place, will be construed as illegal and actionable under the Sherman Act or the Robinson-Patman Act, or possibly both.

We need to know whether a price structure which we know to be honest and equitable not only to ourselves but to our customers will be held discriminatory under the Federal Trade Act.

We need to know that our Government is working on behalf of the whole nation including us, giving business as well as everyone else a fair treatment.

Business has a great deal to gain if we can sit down with Government people and try to find out what practices Government men interpret as contrary to the public interest. To prevent a suit, business must know just where it stands with Government. I am sure we can tell Government where we stand. If Government can do the same for us, we will know how to conduct our business in the future to keep off the legal rocks and shoals. If Government lawyers cannot do that—if they are unable to define the lines between legal and illegal conduct as that conduct relates to the antitrust statutes, then they are persecuting not prosecuting business.

I have a further suggestion. I think a graduate school of business practices should be set up with "exchange students" from Government and business. We could take turns being teacher and pupil. For we have mainly constructive policies of proved success and public benefit. We should not need now and then to remind ourselves of

could learn, on the other hand, at least what appear to be, in the eyes of Government people, the long-range consequences of some present economic practices.

The key thing is exposure to each other's ideas. We meet here smarting from the scars of our economic wars and ready to battle again if need be. The Government people meet in their groups and perhaps pat each other on the back for successful encounters with the business dragon. We need to communicate with each other and fix our eyes on our common goals.

Our economy is vast, its complexities are staggering. It is no wonder, perhaps, that how it works and why it works is so poorly comprehended by most of the public. Nevertheless, I was shocked the other day to read that a survey of college seniors showed that two-thirds of the women felt that the Government should control production and prices.

Just think, these young women have probably had all the instruction on economics that they will get in their lifetime. They will go on to careers and families without the slightest understanding of how quickly this Nation would stagnate and its prosperity crumble under such a system. They have no concept of how many of the benefits I'm sure they cherish have been created and are sustained by our free economy, by business.

Something is very wrong when the sources of a standard of living that is the envy of the world is misunderstood so badly. The Government is waging an antipoverty war. What is the great need? Jobs, a million more jobs, at least. But Government cannot create jobs any more than it can create wealth.

The source of jobs is an employer—a businessman. Businessmen using the profits from their enterprises risk that money to expand, to grow, to progress, and in so doing they add to the Nation's jobs and the Nation's wealth.

I don't see how there can be any question of this simple fact. Yet we must realize that among millions of persons, and as I said before, some of the career officials in Washington, there is a tendency to regard businessmen as potential conspirators engaged only in unsavory pursuits.

#### MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING A MUST

The American businessman has contributed hugely to his country's greatness, and his products and management talents have helped win his country's wars. For these reasons, and for reasons of ordinary decency and justice, I am disturbed at the reputation currently assigned to the businessman, particularly to those of the largest responsibilities, that he is, ipso facto, a public enemy if not a criminal. I am getting particularly annoyed at the assumption that the outstandingly successful businessman could have achieved his success only through unfair competition, monopolistic practices, price fixing and all the other alleged sins that are inevitably related by ignorant or jealous people to business success.

This warped opinion of the business world and the responsible companies that are its core is surprising. Some of your forefathers came West to help build this magnificent city of San Francisco. They led wagons built by honest businessmen. They carried rifles and axes forged by factories of integrity. I like to think, in fact I am sure, that some of those pioneers carried good salt from our warehouse set up in Chicago nearly 125 years ago, for there was no salt to be had on the long trek across the plains.

Today, of course, San Francisco is one of the principal solar salt producing areas in the United States. Our company has a plant near here at Newark from which we conduct our campaign to capture all the salt business of the west coast.

I would like to say that we have not

the national welfare and the obligation on all of us to advance it. We are not a set of warring tribes, but one Nation. As Saint Paul told the bickering Christians of 2,000 years ago, the eye is no good without the hand, the head no good without the feet, all parts are needed for the body.

Government servants are as human as we, and capable of constructive thinking. It is constructive and in the spirit of free enterprise in a free society to seek to restore the cooperation between Government and business.

Business is ready to try, I'm sure. President Johnson has indicated he would like to see more understanding and cooperation. Now how about the people who run the bureaus and regulatory agencies in Washington? I hope they will join in a common effort which would benefit everyone.

### No Braceros, No Nothing

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1964

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter published by the firm of Mendelson-Zeller Co., Inc., growers and shippers in California, should be of interest to all persons either for or against Public Law 78, which will expire December 31 of this year. We will undoubtedly be reading many such articles in the future, so I commend this one to my colleagues as an indication of grower concern in the State of California:

#### NO BRACEROS, NO NOTHING'

As you know, the Mexican bracero program will expire December 31. Tired with being a political football, disgusted with do-gooders who at the very best are stupidly ignorant of the true situation, fed up with crackpot speeches by people from nonfarming States, California agriculture finally gave up the ghost and told the State and Federal labor officials that it would not ask for a renewal of the bracero program but would try to live with any sort of plan the Government people would work out. Agriculture has promised, offered, and is willing to help in any system which would furnish reliable labor for our crops.

Since then, the air has been filled with suggestions, recommendations, and some of the damndest ideas ever seen by the eyes of farmers and growers. Someone has suddenly learned that the so-called pool of unemployed labor available to agriculture after deducting women, teenagers, children, sick people, half drunks, full drunks, quarter drunks, social security collectors, and just-too-tired-to-work people might possibly add up to one-tenth of 1 percent. Of the tenth of 1 percent maybe half of one-twentieth of 1 percent get their fill of cantaloupe picking, lettuce cutting, and berry picking within 18 minutes after starting to work in the dust and hot sun.

Just to mention something with which we are closely connected, there are today in Orange County probably 5,000 strawberry pickers. Outside of the braceros and "green card" Mexican workers probably less than 5 percent is domestic labor. You realize that before a grower can hire braceros he must have exhausted all possible sources for domestic labor. At one time earlier in the season, when we got out a call to Government agencies, we got some 50 or 60 peo-

A2942

ple who stayed not less than a half-hour in the fields. At this very moment one of our largest growers, whose Mexican braceros are a little late in arriving, couldn't today hire a single domestic worker.

Next year, without braceros, how many acres of berries would you like to plant at a cost of around \$2,000 per acre? When they start yelling for laborers in the San Joaquin Valley for cantaloup picking in 105° to 110° weather next year, have you any names you can suggest who would be willing to do this delightful work?

It must be admitted some of the suggested plans are exciting. For instance, someone claims we could bring in unemployed West Virginia coal miners but they have neglected to ask the coal miners about it. Mining coal and picking strawberries on the surface seem slightly incompatible. And I wonder who would house them between after seasons. Maybe they could be used in precision work in the aircraft factories? Of course, the Government could pirate Texas labor, Idaho potato and fruit workers, Washington apple pickers, but wasn't one Civil War enough?

Civic groups are busy developing housing listings for migrant workers. Rents of wrath? Los Angeles County farm labor officials say 300 out-of-school youths could be used immediately in strawberry picking. Another great suggestion is the hauling of teenagers from county to county on a commute deal (complete with Beatles?). Last year in that area the department was able to recruit only 160 youths for farmwork in Los Angeles County and absolutely none for neighboring county fields. That really shouldn't bother anyone. Last year California employed a peak of 62,870 braceros.

Actually, I'm not too frightened, I am absolutely and completely scared stiff at this collision course on which California agriculture is pointed. The nicest thing you can say about the mess that will result starting January 1, 1965, is—chaotic.

**A Call for Action in Vietnam**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

**OF WASHINGTON  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 2, 1964**

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has forwarded to me an editorial clipped from a California community newspaper.

This editorial forthrightly expresses an opinion on U.S. policy in connection with Vietnam. This opinion may not agree with the views of the administration. Obviously it does not. Nor is this blunt outburst by a red-blooded American editor in harmony, necessarily, with the views of our State Department and the President. Obviously it is not.

Furthermore, it clashes completely with the so-called theory of realism and reappraisal as to world communism recently advanced by the chairman of an appropriate committee of the other body.

But, Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with what is going on in southeast Asia. Americans are disgusted with the halfhearted, halfway conduct of our affairs in South Vietnam.

I applaud and support as I know the citizens of this country support, the position of John Edwards the writer of this

editorial. It is about time, indeed, that America started fighting.

Listen to what Mr. Edwards says:

**IT'S ABOUT TIME WE START FIGHTING**

The U.S.S. Card has been sunk by Vietcong Reds.

Alright. How about it? What now Washington?

What in the name of God are you going to do now? We are not at war in Vietnam? This is just a military containing maneuver? The Vietcong are only misguided orientals? Time will show them the error of their ways? Good old status quo? Sit on our fat dumb duffs and let anyone anywhere shoot, loot, capture, torture, maim, and kill with impunity? Is that the answer?

Where does it end? When does it end? When in the name of all that's good and holy are we going to belt them back? I don't mean a nice soft, lilly fingered, limp wristed letter.

I mean a great big fat American belt in the mouth! A backhanded Irish slap in the chops.

I mean war, red war, all out, no holds barred, bloody bombing of Vietcong forces and any other that in any way, shape, form, or fashion threatens with words or deeds the integrity of these United States.

I know that somewhere in this American public there are some sort of guts. I've seen it before and I know that it still lives, and I want to know when we're going to show some of them.

Oh, I know that the meek inherit the earth. What I want to see is some of their meek inherit their earth. Six feet of it.

I'm sick and tired of understanding our enemy brothers. I think it's just about time that they started to understand me.

Now I don't know about you, Mr. President. I know about me. I know that I have had it. That I am filled right up to here with diplomacy, and gentle understanding, and love one another and all the bully ragging hokum I can stand.

I fought twice, Mr. President. My father fought once, my grandfather fought in the Philippines, and I have two greats that fought in the Civil War, and we go clear back to the American Revolution in my family.

Now then. By God it's about time that we remembered that you can get peace only when you stomp on a bully and let him have blood.

Let them want peace for a change—**JOHN EDWARDS.**

**Give Them Good Weapons**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI  
OF ILLINOIS**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 2, 1964**

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American public senses that all is not well in Vietnam despite the numerous trips of Secretary of Defense McNamara to that country and repeated conferences and declarations as to how the problems are being overcome.

The Chicago Daily News of Monday, June 1, effectively offered a practical suggestion to the administration as to what could be done to help in Vietnam. I insert the article into the Record at this point:

**GET THEM GOOD WEAPONS**  
South Vietnam, as a place to live and fight, is no bargain at best. It has a murky cli-

mate, and the jungles and disposition of the people provide exasperating hazards to the American military man.

Over and above all this, it now appears that the United States has been providing some gratuitous homemade hazards for its fighting men by sending ancient and rickety helicopters for service in the combat zone.

Secretary of the Army Stephen Alles said on Thursday that eight Americans have been killed in South Vietnam because of structural failures of the old "flying banana" type of helicopters, and that these old aircraft are now being taken out of service.

Why were they in service? Particularly, why were they in service in an area where casualty risks are already great?

Alles says that the structural failures that killed the American airmen "had no similarity and were not specifically due to age or length of service." This strains credulity; surely new craft incorporating latest concepts of design and dependability are likely to be safer than old craft. Otherwise, why are the old ones being replaced?

Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, and others are demanding a congressional investigation of all aerial equipment in South Vietnam to discover whether casualties are resulting from obsolete planes of any type. Defense Secretary McNamara says the suspicion is "absolutely without foundation."

Some foundation surely exists in the record of the eight dead American fighting men. We hope Congress will satisfy itself as to whether there are any more.

**A Memorial Day Letter by Senator Norris Cotton**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

**OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 2, 1964**

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Senator NORRIS COTTON, a Member of the other body and former Member and colleague of ours in the House, wrote what I think is one of the finest Memorial Day letters to his constituents I have had the pleasure to read and in order that it may have wider circulation, under unanimous consent I insert his letter of May 28, 1964, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

**NORRIS COTTON REPORTS TO YOU FROM THE U.S. SENATE**

This Memorial Day marks the centennial of the Civil War's bloodiest year. As the Senate pauses to observe it, I invite you to go with me from the clamor of Congress, across the historic Potomac, to that city of silence—Arlington National Cemetery. There, engraved in granite, is the history of our country.

For Arlington, too, this month is a centennial. On May 13, 1864, as Grant was launching the wilderness campaign, the first soldier was buried there—Pvt. William Christman, 67th Pennsylvania Infantry. From that day to the burial of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, 125,000 have there been laid to rest.

Despite the grandeur of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier or the presence of Pershing and Marshall and Wainwright, and the honored dead of all our wars, Arlington, like the Grand Army of the Republic, will always speak to us of the Civil War. And so it should. More Americans died in the 4 years of that conflict than