

when necessary and referrals to the specialty clinics at Mount Sinal, including the services of a dietitian, and physical or occupational therapists. Hospitalization is usually done at Mount Sinal, on the private service if the patient has hospital insurance (in which case a private doctor assumes responsibility) or on a service unit if the patient lacks hospitalization or money.

Dr. Bernard D. Epstein, director of the clinic, reports that 191, about 59 percent of the Springbrook residents, used the clinic last year. In the first 2 years, there have been 3,482 office visits, 438 house calls, 1,200 visits to Mount Sinal clinics and 124 hospitalizations. Twenty operations were performed, for such conditions as cataracts, bleeding ulcers or an acute gall bladder. Fourteen clinic members have died, mostly from cardiac failure.

The popular podiatry (foot treat) unit in the clinic itself registered 651 visits in its first year.

"Most of the Springbrook registrants use the clinic as they would a private doctor," says Dr. Epstein. "After all, they are paying something each time, and to most of these people even a dollar represents significant expenses. And we feel that patients benefit psychologically by paying what they can afford for medical care.

"Some of them come in more frequently than others for contact or reassurance."

In the giant Riverview project on West 25th Street, overlooking the Cuyahoga River, the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is experimenting with another type of program designed to keep old people healthy. A 1-year project, based on a grant of \$25,600, it is attempting (1) to determine how much illness actually exists in an older population and (2) to prevent deterioration by early diagnosis of common ills.

The Riverview Well-Elderly clinic is operated by Lutheran Hospital (a half block up Franklin Avenue) with the cooperation of HEW, the metropolitan housing authority, the city division of health, and the outpatient departments of several hospitals.

Located on the second floor of the 16-story main building, the clinic has a registered nurse, a practical nurse and a secretary. Dr. Myron August, Lutheran Hospital cardiologist, is medical director and the project is directed by Luther W. Goehring, Lutheran Hospital administrator. About 370 patients have been enrolled in the first 6 months.

Both diagnosis and treatment in the Well-Elderly clinic are flexible, and there is no charge. The basic physical examination is done by the staff, with the cooperation of agencies dealing with hearing, sight, diabetes, and cancer.

The home care and outpatient program of Highland View Hospital sends a representative once a week to the clinic to do necessary dental work. Lutheran Hospital is available for emergency care, and nursing service in a crisis is supplied in the client's apartment by the clinic staff, with the Visiting Nurse Association often furnishing long-term help.

"Aside from the examinations and referrals, our principal function is health education," says Miss Catherine Dwyer, registered nurse, a Cleveland division of health public nurse, who is in charge of day-to-day operation.

"We urge the residents to take the examination, help them to follow through with medical care, and are always available for counseling on such matters as gaining or losing weight, special diets or therapy which can help them keep fit.

"Normally these residents of Riverview have had good medical care in the past," says Goehring, "but they may not have had a checkup for some time. We hope to pro-

vide the security of early detection of a condition which could lead to serious trouble.

"We are trying to do this most effectively and economically by using available health services, and to our knowledge this is the first time that anyone has tried to coordinate them in this manner."

The Hon. J. Caleb Boggs
ADDRESS BY HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday an outstanding Member of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, was the principal speaker at an annual gathering of great importance in my congressional district, the Plymouth County Republican Club barbecue, at Bridgewater, Mass. It was my honor to introduce this outstanding public servant to my friends in Plymouth County, who, I might note, were immediately his friends as a result of his great personal warmth and charm and because of the straightforward, earnest message he carried with him from the Nation's Capital.

His message was one for all Americans, not just the members of the one political party represented at the Bridgewater meeting. He spoke in inspiring terms of the opportunity ahead for the Republican Party, true, but more importantly he discussed matters of major concern to the whole country—domestic and foreign problems alike.

I personally was very much interested in his comments on a worrisome and dangerous trend in government, which he aptly described as "a pellmell approach" on the part of the present administration with respect to domestic programs, and a fear that I share that greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Government is, as he put, resulting in "a danger of breeding an Ingrate Society," instead of the "Great Society" that is the slogan of the administration and, of course, the goal of all Americans.

I think my colleagues in the House and Senator Boggs' many friends and admirers on both sides of the Hill will want to read and consider the main text of his memorable speech and I request permission to insert it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Of particular interest, I believe, is the Senator's call for an immediate blockade on all shipping to North Vietnam, similar to the Cuban missile quarantine imposed 3 years ago by President Kennedy. As Senator Boggs rightly points out, "trade with North Vietnam is being carried on briskly by many nations, some of which we regard as our allies in the cold war struggle," and that an effective shipping quarantine is a step which is all the more logical and necessary to consider in view of the recent additional commitment of U.S. forces to this critical struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored and pleased to have a part in bringing Senator Boggs to Plymouth County, and I am equally proud, in this way, to make his

comments and observations available to a wider audience. His address follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR J. CALEB BOGGS, AT THE ANNUAL PLYMOUTH COUNTY REPUBLICAN CLUB BARBECUE, BRIDGEWATER, MASS., AUGUST 1, 1965

Thank you, and good afternoon. This trip to Massachusetts is one I have been looking forward to for a long time. It is an honor to be asked to come to such an important political affair in this historic section of the great State of Massachusetts, and I am grateful to President Vitale and the Plymouth County Republican Club for inviting me.

First I would like to talk about a few of the possible issues before us. Then I would like to discuss briefly the opportunity ahead for the Republican Party. GOP, by the way, should stand for Great Opportunity Party.

I think you will agree with me that the general state of our economy is healthy today, largely due to our people whose varied talents and energies make our great economic system operate. Our economy would certainly not be where it is today if it depended for its progress on the nod of some bureaucrat's head in Washington.

But in Washington now we have a pellmell approach to everything on the part of the administration party which sees first one program and then another started without a reasonable waiting time to see even how existing programs are working out.

The Washington Daily News reported 2 weeks ago, for instance, that the poverty program office had paid \$87,000 to a private research group for compiling a catalog of more than 170 Federal programs which help the poor—in addition to those set up by the antipoverty program itself.

The catalog is thicker than New York's Manhattan phone book, the newspaper said.

Republicans want to see everyone share in this Nation's prosperity—make no mistake about that. But we object strenuously to the administration view that one program piled on another—one spending spree after another—will solve things. We want essential well-thought-out programs which can be well administered.

The administration may call this the Great Society, but to me it sounds more like rank unconcern for the taxpayer.

Instead of a Great Society there is a danger of breeding an ingrate society, one which is much too dependent on government.

This overreliance on the Federal Government is apparently the administration's attitude also in the field of agriculture.

To hear the Secretary of Agriculture talk, you would think farmers never had it so good. But farmers have a different story to tell. As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am often visited by representatives of farmers groups. When they tell me their problems, I refer them to the glowing statements of the Secretary. Invariably they are perplexed as they try to match their situation with what the administration's farm spokesman says it is. In a nutshell, they don't see nearly as bright a picture as he does.

In brief, we have to overlook all the talk from Washington about how wonderfully the administration is running things and examine situations for what they really are. We have to propose better ideas while keeping in mind the well-known Republican maxim that the Government should only do for the people what they cannot do as well or better for themselves.

Let me mention just two issues which I think Republicans should develop.

One is the idea that the Federal Government should share unconditionally with State governments some of the substantial Federal tax revenue.

our U.S. Ambassador, Marshall Green, in view of Sukarno's latest outbursts and deliberate stirring up of anti-American demonstrations.

Both these articles outline a totally unrealistic foreign policy position by our Federal Government in its relations with southeast Asian nations, one which all of us hope will be corrected before it is too late.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Aug. 4, 1965]

TRANSMITTER DEAL ANNOYS THE BRITISH
(By Karl E. Meyer)

LONDON, August 3.—The pending sale of three American-made radio transmitters for use by the Indonesian army is causing serious static in Anglo-American relations, it was learned today.

British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart said his Government would "deplore" the sale to Indonesia of the three transmitters manufactured by Philco and costing in all about \$3 million.

The British contend that the use of the transmitters for internal military communications would strengthen Indonesia at a time when British forces are defending Malaysia against a shooting attack.

Stewart's views have attracted little notice because his words appeared in a written answer to a question posed on Monday in the House of Commons about the sale.

American sources contended that Indonesia could buy the same equipment in six other countries and that the transmitters have been fixed so that they cannot be beamed in the direction of Malaysia.

Indonesia had received American aid in building 12 transmission stations for military use. Cement had been poured and roads built when aid to Indonesia was suspended.

The Indonesians then sought to buy the transmitters on a purely commercial basis. Export licenses must be granted for sales involving strategic instruments.

In the past, Americans have criticized the British for selling buses to Cuba. The British assert that these buses had no military use and that American soldiers were not being fired upon by Cubans.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 4,
1965]

UNWELCOME ENVOY

When the President nominated Marshall Green to be U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia a few months back this paper questioned whether this was the best use of such an outstanding Foreign Service officer, and because of Indonesia's increasing hostility to the United States, we thought it might be better to leave the Embassy under a charge d'affaires.

The temptation is to say we told you so. Last week, when Ambassador Green presented his credentials, President Sukarno promptly harangued him for representing a country whose policies in Vietnam and Malaysia had brought United States-Indonesian relations to an all-time low. When Ambassador Green returned to his residence he was promptly greeted by a threatening mob waving placards telling him to go home.

Later in the week, "Green go home" placards again were brought out in northern Sumatra as the U.S. Consulate there was stoned and its windows broken.

Sukarno now is openly envying Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk for his action, earlier this year, in first permitting the U.S. Embassy in Phnom Penh to be stoned and then breaking off diplomatic relations. And both Sukarno and some of Indonesia's leaders are boasting that they are about to come out with their own A-bomb, and urging other newly de-

veloped nations to do the same as the proper defense against such "imperialists" as the United States.

In view of all this, the only dignified action for the United States to take is to recall Ambassador Green and let Sukarno know that when he matures enough to conduct diplomatic relations the United States will send back a full-fledged ambassador.

For quite a few years now, the United States has been turning the other cheek toward President Sukarno and this country has simply run out of cheeks to turn.

THE YEAR OF THE BIBLE

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American Bible Society has urged the Congress to designate 1966 as "The Year of the Bible." As vice presidents of this organization Senator PELL and I are cosponsoring today such a resolution.

The American Bible Society avows one simple purpose; as stated in its 147-year-old constitution its "sole object" is to "encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment." This task, though simply stated, is an enormous one in the modern world. The Bible was originally written in three languages and through the efforts of scholars over the centuries has been translated into 1,202 languages. This accomplishment is certainly impressive, but the fact remains that the Bible is now available in less than half the known languages of the world. To many millions of people, the language of the Bible is still unavailable, and the work of the American Bible Society is to fill this need by translating, publishing, and distributing Bibles. In doing this, the American Bible Society performs a function that can be accomplished in no other way. It is economically impossible for private industry to make the Bible available at prices that all those who wish to buy it can afford.

The work of the American Bible Society is, therefore, indispensable in the task of increasing world knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

The resolution which I am introducing today would authorize and request the President to designate 1966 as "The Year of the Bible" and encourage the people of the United States to acquire a better knowledge and appreciation of the Scriptures.

I hope you will join me in support of this resolution.

**PIONEER CLINICS FOR THE
ELDERLY**

(Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we Ohioans are very proud of the achievements of Ernest J. Bohn, director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority. Once again Mr. Bohn has come forward with a unique development;

namely, built-in health clinics for some 600 elderly people residing in two Cleveland housing projects. The Springbrook health maintenance unit and the Well-Elderly clinic of Riverview apartments represent two new and different approaches to the challenge of keeping the over-60 population out of the hospital or wheelchair as long as possible.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in knowing what is being done in this pioneer field in Cleveland, I include as part of my remarks an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer Sunday magazine of May 2, 1965, entitled "Pioneer Clinics for the Elderly":

PIONEER CLINICS FOR THE ELDERLY
(By Margaret E. Marshall)

Much of the luster of the golden years depends on the degree of health and independence which the aging person is able to maintain. To some 600 elderly people living in two Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority projects, this is less of a problem than it is for many of their fellow citizens, thanks to two unusual built-in health clinics which are attracting national attention as possible models of geriatric preventive medicine.

The Springbrook health maintenance unit project and the Well-Elderly clinic of Riverview apartments represent two different approaches to the challenge of keeping the over-60 population out of the hospital or wheelchair as long as possible.

The Springbrook project, affiliated with Mount Sinai Hospital, offers complete medical care for a nominal fee, while Riverview's clinic, operated by Lutheran Hospital, provides multiple-screening physical examinations and emergency care. Brain children of Ernest J. Bohn, metropolitan housing director, both are underwritten by Federal funds.

The Springbrook clinic, located on the first floor of the 16-story municipal housing project on Ansel Road for low income, over 62 residents, is in its third year. One of the first on-the-spot health facilities in the country, it was designed as a research project to answer several questions: (1) Can prompt medical action against the routine ills of old age prevent more serious sickness? (2) Does easily available medical care boost morale of old people? (3) Is such a project economically justifiable?

Because the answers have widespread implications for our increasingly aging population, the U.S. Public Health Service granted \$160,000 to set up and operate the clinic for 3 years. At the end of that time, the physical and mental well-being of the Springbrook residents who have used its services will be compared with that of the residents of nearby Wade project, which lacks a medical maintenance unit.

A close working relationship with Mount Sinai Hospital across the street enables the Springbrook clinic to furnish everything in the way of medical care from treatment for an ingrown toenail to gall bladder operation. The clinic itself is staffed with a medical director, an assistant director, a full-time registered nurse, social worker, secretary and research assistant.

Participation in the clinic is purely voluntary; residents are not encouraged to leave their own private doctors. Services are not free, but payments are scaled to the modest incomes of Springbrook residents, such as \$2 for the initial registration, and anything from \$2 to 25 cents for subsequent visits. X-rays or simple laboratory tests cost as little as 25 cents, and medication is free or available to 25 percent of cost.

Privileges of enrollment include a complete physical examination, regular check-ups and followup visits, apartment calls

The purpose of this is to strengthen government at the State and local levels because it is here that the brunt of the problems caused by our exploding population has to be met.

It is a progressive plan, in my opinion, because it seeks to help State and local governments deal with massive problems of urbanization.

And it is conservative in that one of its end results would be to arrest the flow of political power to Washington.

The sad state of our merchant marine fleet is another problem which I think deserves special attention.

The latest issue of Lloyds Register of Shipping, for instance, tells us that the United States has slipped from 10th place to 11th place in shipbuilding. Also, it is estimated that this year only 9.1 percent of American cargoes will be carried on ships flying the American flag.

Given the intensive nature of the cold war struggle, it makes good sense to me for this country to have its own ships on hand to use when and where our best interests dictate. A program of building atomic-powered merchant ships which are highly automated is one possible answer. Republicans can help the Nation by seeing that this present condition of drift and decline of our merchant marine does not continue.

On all our minds today is the administration's conduct of this Nation's foreign affairs, particularly in southeast Asia. Vietnam is a problem which will not simply evaporate, no matter how fervently we all wish it would.

As citizens, and as Republicans, our role in relation to South Vietnam is clear, in my opinion. While we do not give up our right and duty to offer constructive criticism, we support the President and his policies, and our boys who are fighting this hard and cruel war in defense of freedom.

We all wish our Vietnamese policy had been clearer. We wish hard decisions had been faced up to earlier. But we also recognize that the President has the responsibility for conducting foreign policy in Vietnam, and we will do our best to back him up. We hope and pray he is successful.

There is one step which I think is due immediate and serious consideration in the Vietnam conflict. It is a step which is made all the more necessary to consider in light of our additional commitment of men as announced by the President this past week.

I would like to see the United States study carefully the imposition of an immediate blockade on all shipping to North Vietnam, just as President Kennedy did in the case of Cuba 3 years ago.

Trade with North Vietnam is being carried on briskly by many nations, some of which we regard as our allies in the cold war struggle. This trade is vital to North Vietnam and harmful to us. Many of the cargoes shipped to North Vietnam undoubtedly make life more dangerous for our own fighting men.

If it makes sense to intercept supplies from North Vietnam which are being funneled by one land route or another into South Vietnam, it makes even more sense to cut off these supplies before they ever reach North Vietnam. Since ships play a major role in providing these supplies, then it follows that an effective way to squeeze North Vietnam and ease the pressure on South Vietnam is to intercept these supplies on the water.

A blockade is something within our immediate and effective capability. We have the 7th Fleet on the scene. On the other hand, North Vietnam has only limited naval strength.

One significant asset to this course of action is that it would not be as spectacular as bombing; therefore, it should not invite quick escalation. It would bring telling

pressure, nevertheless, and our immediate aim in the war, as I understand it, is to impress North Vietnam and the Vietcong that the negotiation table is their next best move.

Our Nation is committed in South Vietnam. We must use every means possible to contain the conflict and yet increase pressure leading toward negotiations for an honorable peace. In my opinion, we cannot afford to delay longer the immediate prospect of creating a blockade, both as a further protection for the lives of our servicemen and as a means of materially advancing the successful conclusion of the war.

If there is one burning political question before us today, it is: How will the Republican Party make a successful national comeback?

The answers aren't magical. They revolve around good candidates, good issues and hard work.

Opportunity for a Republican comeback is at every hand, as I see it.

For instance, although 70 million persons voted in the last election, there were 43 million who didn't. How many of these will be prompted to vote Republican the next time? It all depends on us. Do we want their votes enough to work for them? We have no one but ourselves to blame if we let this opportunity go by.

And besides this huge group of voters, we have the rapidly growing ranks of the new young voters. This is a young country, as I am sure you know, and growing younger all the time. In the 21 to 35 age group today there are more than 32 million Americans. By 1970 nearly 100 million Americans will be under 25 years of age. These young people are learning. They are asking questions. We have a responsibility and duty to reach them.

Let me emphasize those words "responsibility" and "duty" again as I refer to our two-party system.

Perhaps we take this system, and the stability it represents, for granted. Because it has existed does not mean that automatically it will always exist. I mistrust the frequent reference to the pendulum swing of the parties after a lopsided election. We are not going to do well at the polls next year simply because last year we didn't. We are going to do well only to the extent that we work to win. And we must work harder than the other side.

Those who wall about the health of the Republican Party seem to forget that during the past century—a century of tremendous progress for the United States—it has been the Republican Party which has been at the country's helm for roughly two-thirds of the time. Our party will come back, have no fear about that. Reports from various sections of the country already indicate an upswing. And it is just such meetings as this which are the building blocks of a vigorous and victorious party.

While we are temporarily in the role of a minority party, it seems to me that we can best serve our country, and prepare for majority party status at the same time, by making full use of our opportunities to:

1. Support administration proposals when we agree that they will benefit our country, and
2. Recommend constructive alternatives to these proposals when we are convinced that the other party's programs are not in keeping with the long-range best interests of our Nation.

As a minority party—the loyal opposition, if you will—we have the essential task of keeping the majority party on its toes. In keeping with our time-tested check-and-balance system of two-party government, we must constantly make the other side prove its case, and yet at the same time we must be careful not to oppose simply for opposition's sake.

It is by conducting ourselves responsibly now that we give the public confidence about

our ability to move into the position of leadership again.

By vigorously taking our message to the voters we can win a sweeping Republican victory next year, and in 1968 as well.

It's our task and responsibility. Being here today gives me renewed confidence that it will be done. Thank you for the privilege of sharing this wonderful Republican get-together with you.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. ANTONIO B. SANTILLANO

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in behalf of Dr. Antonio B. Santillano, a competently trained pathologist, who because of the dilemma in the medical practice laws of Missouri and their interrelationship with the laws relating to naturalization of foreign-born persons, finds himself ineligible for licensure as a practicing physician in Missouri.

Dr. Santillano's case is one that has its counterpart in many States of our country. Those States, such as Missouri, require that a person must be a citizen of the United States before he can be issued a certificate to practice medicine in the State or can take the examination which is a prerequisite to the issuance of a medical certificate. Dr. Santillano, not yet being a citizen, though having filed his declaration of intention to do so, finds that he will have to wait 3 years until he can become a U.S. citizen and join a group of pathologists who are anxious to have Dr. Santillano join them. The members of the group are all familiar with his work as a trainee in this field when he was in the United States previously as a student exchange visitor.

After receiving his M.D. degree from Santo Tomas University in the Philippines, Dr. Santillano obtained a clinical internship at Evangelical Deaconess Hospital in St. Louis in 1958 and then had a 2-year residency in pathology at St. John's Hospital in the same city. He completed his training in pathology at Albert Einstein Medical School and its associated hospitals in New York where he made a sterling record.

Meanwhile, Dr. Santillano married an American girl in 1959 and they had several children. When they returned to the Philippines in 1963, they discovered that his oldest child, a girl of 4, had a diaphragmatic hernia. Moreover, the doctor was unable to find employment for his highly developed skills in the Philippines. After a year of this futility, and wanting to have his child's surgical operation in a U.S. medical center, the Santillanos applied for reentry. The 2-year waiting requirement was waived on the basis of hardship to the child, and they arrived back in the United States on May 8, 1965, with an immigrant visa.

Dr. Santillano has been well trained in pathology and there is a critical shortage of pathologists in the United States; yet he cannot register with the Missouri State Medical Board because of his citizenship status.

August 4, 1965

This would be a matter which might properly be characterized as a State matter except that the time Dr. Santillano spent here as a student exchange visitor has not counted toward the 3 years of time required for naturalization purposes. Dr. Santillano has in fact spent over 5 years in this country, yet has several more years to go before he can complete the requirements of the law and practice medicine.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill which would have the effect of holding that the time he spent in this country as an exchange student will be considered in compliance with section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it relates to residence and physical presence.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RECENT ATTACK ON HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER JERRY FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my dismay and deep concern over President Johnson's recent attack on House Republican Leader JERRY FORD. This has serious implications far beyond the fact that the President was exhibiting impetuous pique. It is apparent from the reports of all newspaper people directly involved in Mr. Ford's background briefing last Thursday that the President's version of what happened was completely in error. JERRY FORD distorted nothing and he revealed no confidences of the President or anybody else.

The really serious issue revolves around the purpose to be served by White House briefings of congressional leaders. Obviously, no responsible leader breaks secret or confidential material involving the national security. That has not been charged here nor is it involved in any way. Apparently the so-called confidential information that irritated the President so much was that many members of the President's own party question a firm policy against aggression in southeast Asia. Is the President really so sensitive to criticism, so thin skinned, if you will, that he thinks there should be an embargo on this kind of background news just because some aspects of it were revealed at a White House briefing? If this is the President's interpretation, he will make it impossible for Republican congressional leaders to attend such briefings at the White House. We cannot and will not abdicate our responsibility of applying independent judgment to critical national issues and giving the press and the American people all the facts on matters outside security limitations.

Is the President really contending that the revolt within his own party, particularly within the other body, is confidential? Is it really malicious for Re-

publican leaders to point out that the President is under considerable pressure from members of his own party to cut and run in southeast Asia? We Republicans in the House are proud of our leader, JERRY FORD. Unlike many members of the President's own party, we will continue to support a policy of firmness against Communist aggression. We will also continue to make critical, constructive suggestions, whether the President likes it or not. That is our obligation to the people who elected us and to the American people as a whole.

Perhaps the President underestimates the reaction of anger, indignation, and resentment among House Republicans as a result of his rather intemperate and less than coherent criticism of Mr. Ford last Sunday. I hope not, because repetition of this kind of ridiculous episode could bode ill for the bipartisan support and bipartisan contributions the President and the country so urgently require in times of national crisis.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the very thorough and complete report by one of our most eminent Washington correspondents, Mr. Tom Wicker. Mr. Wicker participated in the background briefing by Mr. Ford that subsequently came under attack by the President. His report appeared in the August 3 issue of the New York Times, and follows:

MISUNDERSTANDING, FORD SAYS IN REPLY TO
JOHNSON ATTACK

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, August 2—Representative GERALD R. FORD, House minority leader, said today that President Johnson's criticism of one of the prominent members of the Republican Party was the possible result of a misunderstanding.

Mr. Ford was suggested as the President's target in a number of newspaper articles today, though Mr. Johnson mentioned no one by name.

The President said yesterday that the unnamed Republican had broken and distorted his confidence after attending a White House meeting of congressional leaders last Tuesday night. At that session, Mr. Johnson discussed with the leaders the situation in South Vietnam.

Today, Mr. Ford replied that he refused to be baited into a verbal Donnybrook with the Commander in Chief that would play into the hands of Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow.

If Mr. Johnson was referring to him, he said, there was a "misunderstanding which I trust the White House will correct."

At Austin, Tex., in a news conference held before Mr. Ford spoke out, Joseph Laitin, the assistant White House press secretary, said there would be no further comment. The President, he said, "never gets into personalities of any kind (laughter is recorded at this point on the news conference transcript) and that is that."

He said the President had answered a fair question that had referred to stories he read in the newspapers which didn't give a source, and the President felt that it was a distortion and was inaccurate.

After Mr. Ford's statement, Mr. Laitin said at a second news conference: "I've said all I'm going to say this morning. The White House isn't interested in controversy."

There was no suggestion that there had been any direct conversation between Mr. Ford and Mr. Johnson.

Here is an account, based on the pub-

lished record and on the notes and memories of persons involved, of how the controversy arose:

Last Tuesday, Mr. Johnson invited a number of congressional leaders, including Mr. Ford, to the White House for a discussion of conferences among administration officials on the war in Vietnam.

SOME SURPRISED BY DECISION

On Wednesday, in a Presidential news conference, Mr. Johnson announced that he would gradually double draft calls to 35,000 a month and send 50,000 additional troops to Vietnam. This surprised those who had predicted that he would call up the Reserves and declare a national emergency.

On Thursday, Mr. Ford and Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, the chairman of the House Republican conference, met for lunch with a small group of reporters. It was one of a regular series of meetings they hold, and invitations had been issued at least a week before.

Mr. Ford and Mr. Laird devoted most of their remarks to their own views on Vietnam, including the statement that they would urge the President and other Members of Congress to cut back on domestic expenditures in order to meet the growing expenses of the Vietnamese war.

Both explicitly stated that they would not criticize the President for his course in Vietnam until there had been time to see whether the troop buildup had been effective. The two Republican leaders had previously been urging intensified air and sea attacks on North Vietnam rather than emphasis on the ground warfare.

DESCRIBES MANSFIELD STATEMENT

During the session with reporters, Mr. Ford said that at the White House meeting Tuesday night Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate Democratic leader, had read a two-page statement in which he expressed fears about the stability of the South Vietnamese Government, the dangers of escalating the war, and the possibility of a damaging debate in the Senate on the Vietnamese question.

That is the extent of the description of the statement that Mr. Ford gave. This part of the discussion was on a background basis—not to be attributed to Mr. Ford—although most of the session was on the record.

On Friday morning, at least three reports of the Mansfield statement were published. The New York Times referred to it as it had been described by Mr. Ford, in an article that said the attitude of the Senate had been one factor in Mr. Johnson's decision not to call up Reserves or declare a national emergency.

The Chicago Tribune mentioned the Mansfield statement, again as described by Mr. Ford, in a dispatch that began:

"President Johnson, in an 11th-hour decision Tuesday, canceled plans to declare a state of emergency, call up the Reserves, and ask Congress for \$5 billion to expand the war in Vietnam, congressional sources said today."

The article, written by Willard Edwards, said Mr. Johnson had done so when warned by Senate Democratic leaders that the more dramatic plans would cause a "tremendous congressional and public reaction."

The syndicated columnists Robert Novak and Rowland Evans also referred to the Mansfield statement in an article in the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers. They described it as having expressed the Senator's opposition to "almost everything the United States has done in Vietnam since the murder of President Diem in 1963" and said that he also implied that this sentiment was felt widely in the Senate.

The columnists, neither of whom had attended the Ford-Laird luncheon, said the