

Later I will introduce legislation which would increase the unit-cost limitations for family housing in amounts which it is felt would provide proper and adequate facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the men who wear the uniform of America's armed services are expected to assume whatever risk may be required of them. They can never enjoy a normal, happy homelife, such as that which is available to most of us. The career man simply cannot put down roots in the community of his choice. At the very least, we should attempt to help him to feel that he does have a home which is pleasant and attractive and comfortable. At too many military bases this is far from true. A good many servicemen live in World War II barracks which were inadequate even when they were built more than 20 years ago.

Let us correct this situation. It will have a profound effect upon morale and, I believe, a significant effect upon retention of desirable personnel in the armed services.

#### DEATH OF GEN. A. G. L. McNAUGHTON

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, this week death came to one of the outstanding men on this continent and in our age. He was Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, a retired general who had commanded Canadian Armies in both World War I and II.

General McNaughton was a remarkable human being who achieved reknown as an engineer, a statesman, an inventor, and general. He was a man with whom I was honored to serve as my counterpart on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, for 2 years, 1961 and 1962, until his retirement.

An obituary published in the Washington Post on July 12 follows:

GENERAL McNAUGHTON DEAD; SHAPED CANADIAN ARMY

MONTEBELLO, QUEBEC, July 11.—Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, architect of the modern Canadian army who fought in two World Wars, died today at his summer home here. He was 79.

The man who commanded the 1st Canadian Army before the invasion of France had been in apparent good health recently. The cause of death was not made public.

A brigadier at 31 in World War I he was credited with inventing the box barrage—an artillery firing system boxing in the enemy. He was wounded in the battles of Ypres and Soissons. A month before the end of the war he was placed in command of all Canadian heavy artillery.

After the armistice, he returned to Canada and began forming the nucleus of the Canadian army he was to command for a time in World War II. The military forces were reorganized during his tenure as chief of staff.

#### McGILL GRADUATE

An engineering graduate of McGill University, Gen. McNaughton became chairman of the National Research Council in 1935. He came with some credentials as a research physicist. He invented the cathode-ray compass, an aid to airplane pilots. The gen-

eral was still with the Research Council when World War II broke out. He immediately was called back to the command of Canadian forces.

By now a major general, he took the 1st Canadian Division to England, by 1940 he was promoted to lieutenant general and placed in command of the 7th Corps of Canadian and English units. He devised a flexible defense system of tank traps, road barriers and entrenchments against a possible German invasion after the fall of France.

When the 1st Canadian Army was created, Gen. McNaughton was placed in command and in constant maneuvers over the countryside, whipped it into a finely drawn fighting force. He called his army "a dagger aimed at Berlin." But he was not destined to lead it into battle.

In December, 1943, he became ill and the year 1944 found him back in Canada relieved of duty. The relinquishment in command was believed due in part to disagreement with the National Defense Ministry, which detached a corps from his army and sent it off to the war in Sicily and Italy over his protest. The ministry said the men were eager and impatient for battle.

#### TERRIBLE MISTAKE

"I still think I was right," he said later. "It was a terrible mistake to break up the army."

The army was reunited in time for the Normandy invasion in June, 1944, but the command had passed to Gen. H.D.G. Crerar, who led it through the battles of France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany.

Back in Canada, Gen. McNaughton was named Minister of National Defense and later became chairman of the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board. After the war he served as Canadian representative to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, president of the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada and Canadian chairman of the international joint commission that handles U.S. and Canadian affairs.

The general, whose full name was Andrew George Latta McNaughton, was born at Mossomin, Sask., Feb. 25, 1887. He married in 1914 to Mable Weir. They had three sons and two daughters. One son, squadron leader Ian McNaughton of the Royal Canadian Air Force, was killed in action in June, 1942. The widow and the other children survive.

#### REVOLUTION

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, we may well have passed the point of no return in the revolutionary violence in this Nation which masks itself under the name "civil rights." We may be beyond the hour of midnight; it may already be zero-zero-zero-one. If that is true, and I pray that it is not, every American will feel the hot breath of revolution on the nape of his neck, whether he be conservative, liberal, or radical, or any shade of philosophy in between.

There are few who have even a passing understanding of the accelerating demands of rights leaders who can deny that the Negro today is the deuteragonist of the Socialist and the Communist. This is not to say, of course, that all Negroes are Socialists or Communists, for they definitely are not. This is to say that in too many cases they are the

pawns of the left; the radical group which will discard them as useless when their purpose has been served.

The Shreveport Times published on June 28 a masterful editorial on this situation under the title "Revolution?" If there were a way I could require every American to read it, I would. I must, at least, make the effort to give it the nationwide attention it deserves by including it here in the RECORD. I urge every Member to study it line by line.

#### REVOLUTION?

The civil rights movement in this country has taken a distinctly revolutionary turn. Doubtters can look at the most recent demands of rights leaders: \$50 billion for Negro welfare over the next 10 years; all local police power in federal hands; federal trials for civil rights cases; forced integration to compel "racial balance." The list is longer than we have space.

Much of the evidence of a new revolutionary outlook in the rights drive is visual—all too visual. At a critical juncture in its effort to maintain racial accord, Mississippi finds itself stormed by marchers shouting "black power" and flaunting slogans that could incite blacks or whites—or both—to bloodshed. What we have, in essence, is a remarkably cynical bid on the part of rights leaders for martyrs—martyrs that will transfuse their cause with somebody's real blood.

But the revolutionary bell tolls not only in Dixie. Far to the west of Mississippi, California has seen the flames, real flames, of open rebellion in Watts. Across the continent, New York City sits on a summer powderkeg of mob violence and so-called racial "moderates" like Martin Luther King are lighting the fuse with barely-concealed threats of "disorder" unless demands are met.

In between, revolutionary sparks have fallen on midland cities like Chicago and Cleveland where Negroes and other racial minorities have taken their troubles into the street, firing cars, smashing glass, and shooting at police. Other places are braced for trouble that Negro leaders and advocates have predicted—as a result of this or that "grievance."

Federal officials, now concerned over the violent character of the revolution, haven't helped to curb violence with their vague implications that the only way for "oppressed" people to get "something" is for them to go out into the streets on a hot night and heave a brickbat through somebody's store window.

Revolutionary attitudes, of course, have spread beyond the area of civil rights and into the minds and morals of some elements of our most important commodity—youth. There is a spirit of anarchy abroad, of "anything goes," that masks itself in democratic slogans but seems to glory in dope and dirty words. Defiance of law, of all authority, is the hallmark of revolution and we can see it not only in youthful campus rebels but in the rising tide of crime in this nation.

This has been a country of law and order—the founding fathers thought nothing more important—but the Supreme Court of this era has put itself in the vanguard of revolution and its rulings most often only mirror the demands of the militants. The Warren Court seems to be—at times—a revolutionary tribunal rather than a constitutional arbiter.

All federal office-holders take an oath to uphold the Constitution, but the "liberal" fashion of permissiveness and the raw, exposed power of minority voting blocs have packed more power than Bible-sworn prom-



ises. Congress has often yielded to the revolutionary tides in these circumstances.

But there are other reasons why radicalism has replaced common sense and realism in dealing with our problems, the most important of which is the fact that this racial revolution is given—as much as possible—camouflage trappings of legitimacy; of democracy; of doing what is right; of going with the flow of history. This illusion has been made almost perfect by three decades of liberal indoctrination.

It is not unusual for revolutionary ideas to sweep up so-called "liberals" or progressives. Short-cuts to some vague all-equal socialist paradise appeal to many people who honestly do not believe in authoritarian government. The shortest short-cut to this "paradise" is a social revolution in this country. So Martin Luther King says "we can't wait." Freedom now! As he professes "Non-violence," he shouts that "we will make the white power structure say 'yes' when it wants to say no."

Why wait, indeed. The Russian revolutionaries said freedom was their goal, too. And maybe it was. The oppressed worker was the Russian Revolutionary cause just as the Negro is advanced as today's vehicle of total change. But Russia no longer is revolutionary; radically reactionary is the phrase for the Kremlin. What happened to those dreams of freedom? What happened to the worker?

The trouble is that revolutionists are all too human. Once in power they want to stay in power. The way to stay in power is to establish a dictatorship. Nothing is there to stop them because the wave of revolution has destroyed the checks and balances, the institutions and traditions that could have barred the way to totalitarianism. The Russian worker was just a pawn of power.

This nation has avoided such social revolutions and as a result freedom has endured on these shores. Some inequities prevail, but the best system of justice yet devised—together with freedoms no other nation enjoys—provide eventual outlets for most of our troubles. The American way of dealing with problems as they arise has been one of calm, lawful evolution—not the revolution we now are seeing.

What good will it do the Negro if, in compelling a revolutionary equality for him, the wider freedoms of all Americans—black or white—are lost? The Russian worker had a revolution made in his name, too, but in the end only a deeper slavery was his reward. It can happen here. It is happening here.

#### LEGISLATIVE SOLUTION TO THE "UNCONSCIONABLE" AIRLINE STRIKE

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include several editorials.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the words "unconscionable strike" are headlined in the editorials of the New York Times, the Washington Daily News, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, Chairman of the Presidential Emergency Board, express public concern in the pending controversy between the International Association of Machinists and United, Trans World, National, Eastern, and Northwest Airlines. Similar editorials have also appeared in other newspapers across the Nation including the Washington Evening Star, Washington Post, and the Wall Street Journal.

This crippling and unnecessary strike has again emphasized the sterility of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act as

well as the efforts of emergency boards appointed under this act to resolve labor disputes in the transportation field.

To repeat what I said on July 11, the reports of the emergency boards have never in my recollection been totally accepted by the parties to the dispute; indeed these reports, as in the present airline-IAM dispute, have served only as a new basis to try to get substantially more concessions from management.

The President of the United States should promptly exercise his great powers in an effort to persuade the IAM to settle this strike within the reasonable perimeter of the Emergency Board report which L.B.J. described as "the framework for a just and prompt settlement." The President should also ask Congress for immediate legislation designed to forbid any future strike in the transportation industry under similar circumstances as exist in the present controversy which cause such a great inconvenience to the public, including Vietnam veterans trying to get a few frantic minutes' leave at home.

I am today introducing a bill, H.R. 16189, identical to S. 3587, introduced by Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, providing that whenever a labor dispute has occurred in the vital transportation industry and after the Conciliation Service and Mediation Board have exercised unsuccessfully its power to bring about a settlement, the President shall create a Presidential Board that has the power to make final decisions.

For the information of my colleagues I am attaching copies of the editorials from the New York Times, Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, Washington Daily News, and the Wall Street Journal to be included as a part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Daily News, July 9, 1966]

#### AIRLINE STRIKE

By any standard, the strike of the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines is unfortunate. As usual, it is the public that suffers most. On that ground alone the strike ought to be ended—and speedily.

The union wants a bigger share of the industry's recent substantial prosperity. It blames "short-sighted" management for the strike and declares its dissatisfied members "have a right to strike."

The employers, bargaining together for the first time, point out that they accepted—while the union rejected—as the basis for settlement the recent recommendations of a Presidential Emergency Board. President Johnson called the recommendations "the framework for a just and proper settlement, which is in the national interest." The companies say they have sweetened the pot "by an additional substantial offer above the Board's proposals" that would exceed the estimated \$76 million cost of the recommendations.

These are the facts. What complicates this—and very nearly every labor-management relationship—are the intangible, the human, the political considerations. One of these is the union's announced determination to smash the Administration's 3.2 per cent wage guidelines even tho the Presidential Board's recommendations were in excess of that figure. They want to claim credit for it themselves rather than having the board do it for them.

Another factor is the union's internal po-

litical problem. The highly skilled mechanics, in a strong bargaining position because they are in short supply, object to being grouped in the same unit with porters, kitchen workers, ramp and store personnel. They say the unskilled depress their wage and working standards.

As a result, IAM leaders, faced with a revolt by militant mechanics and fearful of losing them, apparently feel the necessity for being more militant still.

But surely these political and intangible considerations are not sufficient reason for shutting down 60 per cent of the domestic trunk line industry, for depriving 150,000 daily passengers of air service at the start of the vacation season and for disregarding public opinion and the public interest.

Under Presidential prompting both sides have agreed to resume negotiations. They could do no less. We urge them to settle their differences realistically and speedily.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 11, 1966]

#### A STRIKE AGAINST THE PUBLIC

The International Association of Machinists seems determined to press its strike against five of the nation's major airlines to the point where restrictive labor legislation will become a matter of urgent national policy.

The latest manifestation of the union's "Public-be-damned" attitude was the announcement last night that IAM personnel would be forbidden to service any aircraft leased by the struck airlines to those still operating. The leasing plan could, under no stretch of the imagination, be considered a strike-breaking move. The legitimate economic pressure on the struck lines would have remained in full effect. The only result would have been to alleviate, in some small degree, the crisis in the nation's transportation system, war effort and economic life. Now, even that slender reed has been snatched away.

Even before this latest ill-considered action, the union put itself on shaky ground by spurning every attempt by disinterested parties to head off the strike. Every statutory means of avoiding the crisis was passed up. In addition, the union brushed aside the offer of the National Mediation Board for binding arbitration. A presidentially appointed emergency board headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, probed the issues in dispute and came up with a recommendation for wage increases averaging 3.3 per cent. The carriers accepted the package; the union rejected it. Despite the fact that the proposal exceeded the administration's economic guideposts, President Johnson hailed it as the basis for "a just and prompt settlement." The airlines' final offer was even more liberal than the proposals of the emergency board. But the union walked out.

The union's main contention is that the airlines are prosperous and that the workers should share in that prosperity. It is true that the airlines are prosperous. It is also true that the union membership already shares in that prosperity in the form of high wages and an ever-increasing number of jobs available. But the suggestion that wage dispute settlements should be based directly on profits could be taken seriously only if accompanied by a proposal for a lower wage package for the less prosperous of the carriers and a decreased scale in the event profits should slack off. The union has made no such suggestion.

The threat of a strike and the strike itself are legitimate weapons in collective bargaining. But the thoughtless, capricious use of that weapon to create havoc in the nation's economy can only increase the demand for congressional action to curb abuses of union power.