search for an honorable and enduring peace in Southeast Asia should never be doubted again by any American, by any foreigner however cynical, or by any person however skeptical.

May I also draw attention to our President's clear understanding of the sentiments of the American people, and his creating the framework for an honorable and enduring peace, and also as evidence of our complete unwillingness to fight on or continue to perpetuate the war. We, the American people who are the source of all our power, are demanding peace now for those American boys who are in the service. We must have an answer, and a decision.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are not alone in knowing the facts. The Australians and New Zealanders, the Filipinos, the South Koreans know it; the Filipinos know it. The first author served four years on active duty and sixteen years in the reserves, and he is willing to serve again if necessary.

The verdict of history will be favorable to an Administration that has attacked the social anarchy in the Philippines with skill and vigor. The most recent Civil Rights Bill, with an open-house section, is another step in the right direction. Let history reflect that the Johnson Administration is one of domestic triumphs. More significant education legislation; more new laws to reduce the costs of living; more efforts to reduce the gap between the haves and have-nots that have emerged during the five years since Mr. Johnson became President in any significant form, in our history.

The Post-Dispatch's James Deakin Writes Excellent, Objective Summary of House-Senate Differences on Truth-in-Lending

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 23, 1968

MRS. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives on February 1 passed H.R. 11601, the Consumer Credit Protection Act, containing strong provisions assuring the disclosure of the full truth to consumers in the use of consumer credit, most people thought the battle was over, and won. But this was only the beginning. The Senate version differed substantially from the House measure. The Senate passed the bill by a thumping vote of 382 to 4, it seemed therefore, between H.R. 11601 as passed by the House and S. 5 as passed by the Senate. The conferences have held several sessions to try to reconcile the two basic agreements on the major differences in the two bills, and further sessions are scheduled this week beginning tomorrow afternoon.

The Senate passed a truth-in-lending bill on July 11, 1967. It contained many good features—all of which were incorporated into H.R. 11601 as it passed the House in a contest over the retrenchment bill left out of the Senate measure. As passed by the Senate, the bill left out some of the basic requirements of truth in lending which the House, in contrasted but overwhelming votes, insisted on restoring to the measure. The House bills on consumer credit. I know that many of the Members have been receiving letters from constituents on this issue, inquiring about the status of the legislation and urging support for the strong provisions of the House bill. There have also been letters, of course, particularly from the collection industry, in opposition to some features of the bill, particularly the title on garnishment.

I therefore commend Mr. Deakin's article to the Members for the information it provides on the Senate bills on consumer credit. I know that many of the Members have been receiving letters from constituents on this issue, inquiring about the status of the legislation and urging support for the strong provisions of the House bill. There have also been letters, of course, particularly from the collection industry, in opposition to some features of the bill, particularly the title on garnishment.

The article referred to is as follows:

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL STICKLE IS CONCERNING-HEARING IN HOUSE SAY SENATE VERSION HAS LOophOLES

(By James Deakin)

WASHINGTON, April 20—Like the easy credit abuses that it seeks to curb, the truth-in-lending bill seems to have an inexhaustible supply of instalments.

Although truth-in-lending bills have been approved by both houses of Congress, the right to enact a law informing consumers about credit charges and protecting them against sharp practices is far from over. Another chapter is about to be written by a Senate-House conference committee, and the lobbying pressures are as intense as ever.

On Feb. 1, when the House approved the bill by a thumping vote of 382 to 4, it seemed to many persons that the eight-year fight over truth in lending, one of the hardest in recent legislative history, had come to an end. Six months before, the Senate had passed its version of the bill by a vote of 92 to 2.

Almost overlooked after the House vote was the fact that the Senate version differed substantially from the House measure. Concerning the Senate's efforts to reconcile the two versions will be resumed when Congress returns from recess. With House backers of the bill insisting that the Senate version has serious loopholes and omissions, talk of a deadlock is being heard on Capitol Hill.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One of the very few speakers was Maj. Hugo E. Marek, of the Tactical Air Command, who is qualified to report the “View From the Cockpit.” Surely, our colleagues and, indeed, the entire nation, benefited from it as enlightening and moving as it did.

“A View From the Cockpit” follows:

Much has been said and much has been written about the air operations being conducted over North Vietnam. In fact, there have been quite a number of conflicting and contradictory “big picture” type accounts of radio and television, in the newspapers and magazines, so I would like to view from the basically personal observations and interpretations of the feelings and outlooks of those who fly the bombing missions into Ho Chi Minh’s backyard—what is the job—what do the pilots feel about it?

What is the pilot flying over North Vietnam? What do we think of our Vietnam ‘mission accomplished’ job? One doesn’t have to fly too many missions before three basic objectives become clear:

First—we are limiting the military sanctions available to the North Vietnamese. We are the only nation capable of putting a number on the military sanctions we impose, but, as recent events in Laos, Cambodia and Thailand show, the United States is not alone in this assumption—it is a certainty. And, the pilot, knows he is not alone in this.

The second basic job for the pilot recognizes is that we are not creating a bygone age for the Vietnamese. We are not seeking to re-establish a bygone age, but, we are seeking a peaceful and productive future for the Vietnamese. No one expects them to be the leaders of tomorrow, but, they are to be self-sufficient leaders—leaders that can keep free from attack—a future made possible by the vast wealth that investment in Vietnam has allowed our combat pilots.

A View From the Cockpit

HON. MASTON O’NEAL

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1968

Mr. O’Neal of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a recent national convention of the Air Force Association in Atlanta, Ga., was marked by a number of interesting and inspiring addresses by our combat pilots. They know where they speak.