

RESOLUTION OF HUNTEMANN-HUFF POST NO. 110, INC., DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, MOUNT BAINIER, Md.

At the regular meeting of this post held on July 14, 1965, the following resolution was introduced and unanimously voted on and passed:

"Whereas only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform; sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives at the crucial age of peak development;

"Whereas the 56 percent of their counterparts are using this time to further their careers and develop their education;

"Whereas these 44 percent are men who are least able to afford an education, who are least prepared for a civilian occupation, and who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition of the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Huntemann-Huff Post No. 110, Inc., the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., does endorse the Cold War Readjustment Assistance Act of 1965, Senate bill 9, known as the cold war GI bill; and that three copies of this resolution be forwarded to the department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., to be acted on at the 47th annual convention of the Department of Maryland; convening on the 21st of July through July 24, 1965, in the city of Baltimore, Md.; and be it further

Resolved, If passed by the Department of Maryland Convention, this resolution will be forwarded to the national convention of the American Legion at the next convention to be held August 20-26 in Portland, Oreg."

Respectfully submitted.

RICHARD S. CALALANO,
Commander.
PERRY A. MARTIN,
Adjutant.

dorse bill S. 1993, known as the National Milk Sanitation Act, which you and several other Senators have introduced and which now is in the hands of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Conflicting, duplicating, and discriminatory milk ordinances have been costly to both consumers and producers. They are encouraged by local bureaucratic health agencies to perpetuate themselves, and by local milk distributors and producers to eliminate competition.

When local supplies are short, it is frequently necessary for distributors to come to Wisconsin for supplementary supplies, but shipment of such high quality grade A milk is often permitted only at the discretion of the milk inspection agency of the receiving market. Midwest plants making such supplementary sales, report having been subject to numerous local health agency inspections.

In our own area, we are faced with unnecessary duplicative inspections. Our members who have long met the grade A requirements of Milwaukee, find that they must also accept Chicago inspection if the bottler of their milk wishes to sell milk in Chicago, and northeastern Wisconsin farmers supplying the Green Bay grade A market as subject to the Michigan State inspection before the Green Bay handler can extend his distribution routes across the State line into the Michigan Upper Peninsula.

We urge that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hold hearings and encourage passage of S. 1993 at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. ECKLES,
General Manager.

WH DR Gruening
A FOOTNOTE ON THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a thoughtful article on the situation in the Dominican Republic, written by Jaime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico, appears in the current issue of the Saturday Review entitled "The Leadership Crisis."

Jaime Benitez, in addition to his standing as an academician, as a long-time educational administrator was active in the Dominican Republic during its recent upheaval in trying to secure a useful settlement consistent with democratic practice and purpose. His well-balanced views are therefore of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that his article, "The Leadership Crisis," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LEADERSHIP CRISIS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of the following guest editorial is chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico. He has recently been closely involved in official efforts to find a solution to the Dominican problem.)

Our hemisphere is living through a crucial hour. The subtle web of concord and understanding is being dangerously torn asunder. Frequently, what is woven in the daytime is unwoven at night. And now a second Caribbean tragedy is developing, the tragedy of the Dominican Republic. This tragedy is much different from the previous one in Cuba, with which—because of thoughtlessness, or obsession, or faulty information—it was at first confused. One's sympathy must go out to the Dominican people in their present plight. Over the years the Dominican Republic has suffered a bloody fate. Civil struggles, interventions, dictatorships, coups d'etat, brief

and unstable flashes of democracy followed by more coups d'etat, and more civil struggles and interventions have left a confused legacy of poverty, uncertainty, suspicion, rejection, and, in some Dominicans, a stubborn will to correct the past.

How can one help in such a precarious situation? What can one do without aggravating even more the bitter internal strife that troubles the Dominican people? None of the Spanish-speaking countries has been able to answer these questions effectively. Latin American solidarity has failed the Dominican Republic at a moment of need. Nor has the United States, with its unilateral intervention—precipitate at first and later hesitant and faltering—been able to solve the immediate problem or reassure the rest of the hemisphere about implications for the future of its present course. Nor has the OAS, with its heterogeneous membership of diffident democracies, military and semimilitary regimes, and shaky civilian governments (all showing various degrees of fear and suspicion of their dominant partner), been able to act with anything approaching the needed firmness and cohesion.

Intervention in the Dominican Republic has aroused animosity throughout Latin America. No Latin American government depending upon popular support can endorse it and expect to survive. (President Frei of Chile and President Leoni of Venezuela, both struggling against strong Communist opposition, have made their positions abundantly clear.) Only governments dependent for their stability upon the support of the United States rather than their electorate have been disposed, and that only after much prodding, to provide the minimum votes necessary to permit formal collective action.

In the United States the hard line seems to command the greater electoral support, and this fact promises, in the days ahead, to produce an even greater cleavage between the people of the United States and those of the rest of Latin America. We face a leadership crisis in this hemisphere. Basically, the crisis is traceable to the social revolutions in ferment throughout Latin America, which are steadily gaining greater momentum. The crisis also reflects the inability of the U.S. Government to define its proper role vis-à-vis the social upheavals and political convulsions at work in Latin America.

As the world's oldest and most powerful democracy, as well as the closest to Latin America, the United States is, in the minds and hearts of the great majority of ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed Latin Americans, the nation most able to support the legitimate aspirations of the common man anywhere. Unfortunately, many forces and circumstances have blocked the understanding that is needed. The difference in means, resources, power, thought patterns, and cultural traditions makes confidence and cooperation extremely difficult. American policy in the Dominican Republic seems specifically designed to render life in Latin America more hazardous and continental relations more bitter and hostile.

Going through Santo Domingo these days, one sees many clear-eyed, earnest American young men. Attired in battle dress, they man the security zones, patrol the corridors, control or support the military. In the eyes of all Dominicans they are invaders. Others, fewer in number and less visible, work as Peace Corps volunteers in hospitals, slums, training centers. All Dominicans regard them as friends. Yet soldiers and Peace Corps workers have much in common. Both groups represent the United States; they carry out their difficult tasks with integrity and loyalty; and they embody the ambivalence of U.S. policy. If we must have them both, could not the ratio of soldiers to Peace Corps be reversed?

The outlook for the future is not reassuring. The OAS, never a strong instrument of Latin American policy, is now weaker than

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON FREE FLOW OF MILK IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I recently cosponsored with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], Senate bill 1993, designed to eliminate unreasonable and unnecessary restrictions on the free flow of milk products in interstate commerce.

Since introduction of the bill, I have received several statements of support. One is from Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis., which represents 15,000 dairy farm families producing milk for markets in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois.

William C. Eckles, PMC's general manager, has had many years of experience dealing with the conflicting, duplicating, and discriminatory milk ordinances which are so costly to both consumers and producers. He is highly qualified to describe the problems these ordinances create and to comment on this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Eckles, written on behalf of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond du Lac, Wis., June 30, 1965.

HON. GAYLORD A. NELSON,
U.S. Senator,
Room 404, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: In behalf of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, we wish to en-

ever. It is possible, of course, that the protracted and unrewarding stand-still in the Dominican Republic may be ended through the formula of a provisional government followed by general elections under OAS supervision. But at best, this will be only a first step in a long and difficult road ahead.

—JAIIME BENITEZ.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS IN GUARANTEEING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the important role—indeed the vital role—that American business plays in the guarantee of equal employment opportunities has again been emphasized by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The Vice President made his remarks at the opening of the "Fair Employment Is Good Business" exhibit at the Department of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Vice President HUMPHREY'S remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY OPENING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE "FAIR EMPLOYMENT IS GOOD BUSINESS" EXHIBIT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21, 1965

I am delighted at this chance to visit the equal employment opportunity exhibit, and to pay tribute to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. My thanks to Secretary Connor and the Department of Commerce for making this occasion possible.

A lot has been written and said about the important task that Chairman Roosevelt and the other Commissioners will perform. It is a challenging job and they will need all the help we can give them.

By "we" I mean all of us in this country. There is no such thing as "the Negro problem" or "the minority group problem." We have an American problem, and all Americans are working today to help solve it.

That is why, Secretary Connor, I was particularly pleased to hear you say that "the business of American business is America."

It has been my experience that the business community is more than willing to volunteer its resources to help solve problems of national concern. We have seen this recently, for instance, in the President's summer youth employment program and in the voluntary steps toward the solution of the balance-of-payments situation.

We have also seen it in Equal Employment Opportunity. In a recent meeting of some of the plans-for-progress companies in San Francisco, I reported the fact that companies with the highest productivity and profits have also provided great leadership in the field of merit employment.

I was also glad, Mr. Secretary, to hear you refer to the need to use education and training programs as a part of equal employment. Not only must we offer equal job opportunities, but we must be sure that all Americans have the chance to build a better life through equal opportunity for education and training. This is another great area where labor, business, and Government work together for the benefit of all.

The headlines that bring us news of unrest ignore the silent accomplishments of countless communities, companies, unions, and schools. The accomplishments of the past give us optimism that we will do still more in the future. Fair employment is good business because it is good sense.

USE OF OPTOMETRISTS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was delighted that the medicare bill recently passed by the Senate made provision for the use of optometric services. Optometrists have long since established themselves as trained and skilled professionals in eye care. More than 70 percent of Americans who wear glasses rely on the services of the optometric profession. Let me emphasize that optometrists are not merely mechanical lens grinders, but educated, dedicated professional men. I think the so-called freedom of choice amendment allowing a recipient of medicare benefits to choose either an ophthalmologist or an optometrist was a wise proviso, and gave long-overdue recognition to the optometric profession.

I was particularly concerned that optometric services would be available to children given medical care under special project grants for the low-income children of school and preschool age. Therefore, I wrote to Secretary Celebrezze requesting that this point be clarified. In his reply to me Secretary Celebrezze said:

It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 532 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care.

And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

I am certain in making this statement Secretary Celebrezze is recognizing the clear intent of Congress, and I am delighted that children will benefit from the healing skills of the modern optometrists. It has too often been tragically demonstrated that the reason that Johnny cannot read is because Johnny cannot see. As a result many optometrists are already participating on a voluntary basis in medical care programs associated with Operation Head Start activities. The medicare bill will make optometric services more easily available to young children. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Celebrezze's letter be included in the RECORD.

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

**THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.**

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of July 7, 1965, regarding the provisions in H.R. 6675 relating to the use of optometrists.

The recognition of optometrists was very substantially advanced by a provision in the House-passed bill which requires that under the new medical assistance programs if a State provides eyeglasses the individual shall have free choice between having an examination made by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist.

The Senate, before passage of the bill, adopted general language applicable to all

titles of the Social Security Act which would accomplish the same result in relation to any services that optometrists are licensed to render. What action the conference committee will take on this amendment I, of course, cannot forecast, but there is no difference in the Senate and House-passed bills in the provision of the medical assistance programs relating to the use of optometrists.

The section 532 relating to special project grants for low-income children of school and preschool age, as you indicate, does not refer explicitly to either eye care or to optometrists. It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 532 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care. And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY AND THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the statement of 67 American college and university professors, political scientists and others, who have come forth in the past few days to, as they put it, "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam."

As one who has spent his share of time in the academic halls, I spoke here in April, asking for professors and students who agreed with our President and with our Government's policies to come forth and be counted. I asked that they make a true dialog out of the so-called campus debate over the course of affairs in southeast Asia. This group of 67 Americans has. Many others have done likewise.

These distinguished academics have made it clear in their statement of support that they do strongly desire peace and "a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties." And they make it ultimately clear that they firmly believe the President of the United States fully shares this desire.

Realistically, this group has taken into account, however, the limited number of alternatives facing the United States since it was confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam. They have stated their belief that President Johnson and his advisers have chosen wisely from among the choices presented them. And they have rejected what they call the "bizarre political doctrine" that the President of the United States has special obligations to the academic community. I ask unanimous consent that their document of support, with names, and addresses be printed in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday.

There being no objection, the document, names, addresses, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: