

ger lies in the imports of foreign produce mainly from South America and Mexico.

So having agreed to this principle, that it is most desirable to raise the wages of all Americans to a decent level, California agriculture suggests that the U.S. Government look into its sordid record in the pay of its servicemen. It pays an ensign at sea less than a baby sitter. A Navy lieutenant makes less in 60 hours a week than a New York City policeman or fireman makes in 40 hours. A Navy petty officer on a Polaris submarine earns less per month than a man on the public unemployment rolls in New York State. A recruit in the Army earns \$78.00 per month which figures out to the princely sum of 44½ cents per hour for a 44-hour week.

Five thousand families of Air Force personnel are forced to accept relief checks, and 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but are too proud to accept it. One hundred sixty-nine thousand Air Force personnel receive basic pay below the poverty standard set by President Johnson. An underprivileged school dropout will receive \$105 a month in a Job Corps camp, but a skilled seaman with 2 years naval service receives only \$99.

Having accepted this principle of decent wages for all, how can our Government remain silent on the question of better pay for our servicemen? Or is it that taxes would have to be increased, and increased taxes is not politically popular? As mentioned above, agriculture can find no quarrel with the principle of decent wages for all.

The Secretary of Labor has also told agriculture that if it paid decent wages, they would not have the turnover problem and that workers would be more willing to stay. For the Secretary's information, the military has been complaining about this very same problem, and I would suggest that he contact the military and advise them of his solution to the problem.

California agriculture cannot pay \$1.40 per hour when Texas and Florida are at 90 cents or less. We would be most happy to pay industrial wages as long as our competing States pay the same. It is they with whom we must compete.

With respect to service pay, with whom does Uncle Sam compete that it can't pay our boys a decent wage?

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, Jr.

How Niles, Ill., Earned Its New Title of All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, every year the National Municipal League and Look magazine honor 11 communities whose citizens have put forth extraordinary effort to solve their problems, designating each as an All America City. It is a distinct pleasure to me and, I am sure, to all residents of the State of Illinois, to learn that the village of Niles, located in the 13th Congressional District which I have the honor of representing in the Congress of the United States, has been selected as one of the 11 outstanding communities in the Nation

in 1964. I extend my congratulations to the citizens of Niles and to their civic and business leaders on their public spirit and interest which has brought them this well-deserved recognition.

The towns selected for this coveted honor may win because their citizens survived a natural disaster, ousted a corrupt government, improved economic conditions, or undertook to solve other problems that beset American communities at some time during their history. The outstanding effort of the citizens of Niles, Ill., in meeting their problem of rapid growth during the period from 1950 to 1964 and in replacing their local government officials who did little or nothing to provide the necessary community services to keep pace with this growth brought the distinguished award of All America City.

How the village of Niles earned this distinction is described in the following article by Richard Hoffman, writing in the Chicago's American:

HOW NILES, ILL., EARNED ITS NEW TITLE OF ALL AMERICA CITY

(By Richard Hoffmann)

How does a community become an All America City?

First, you throw the rascals out, especially if they're part of a political machine in power for 20 years.

Then you inject helpings of spirit, pride, youth, dedication, integrity, and efficiency, all of which mobilize the community in the pursuit of higher accomplishments.

This, at least, is the formula for success described by officials in the northwest suburb of Niles, one of 11 communities just honored by Look magazine and the National Municipal League as an All America City.

Mayor Nicholas Blase, 36, whose New Era party swept to victory in the 1961 elections, feels the crackdown on gambling which had flourished on an unincorporated strip of Milwaukee avenue between Niles and Chicago gave the people confidence in his administration.

"Everything seemed to spring from that," he said, "and other new projects that followed enjoyed public support."

Blase and Police Chief Clarence "Whitey" Emrikson were both subjected to telephone threats for their campaign against the strip, whose gaudy establishments were finally shuttered when Chicago annexed the area.

Emrikson, also 36, said through 1961 and 1962 he was harassed by anonymous callers who would utter such threats as, "Leave the pinballs alone or your kids will never reach school tomorrow."

"This will be a constant problem," Emrikson says. "There are still people who want the pinballs and the jar games back." Emrikson is the type of police chief who turns down annual gifts of liquor with a polite but firm "no," associates say.

Although to the passerby there is nothing to distinguish Niles from any of the other towns which border commercial strips like Milwaukee Avenue, the community is really in full throttle now.

Citizens for Better Parks pushed through a \$705,000 bond issue in 1962 which resulted in two park sites and a new community center and swimming pool.

A \$575,000 library will open soon because of the efforts of the Women's Club of Niles, which started a part-time, volunteer book lending program.

A new \$198,000 village hall will be dedicated Sunday; a second \$375,000 fire station opened in 1962; an \$825,000 reservoir opened 2 years ago to increase water capacity by 3 million gallons.

A \$3,840,000 "leaning tower" YMCA is under construction next to a replica of the famed tower in Pisa, Italy.

The Tower was originally constructed in 1932 by Robert A. Iig, inventor and electrical manufacturer, to store water for his private park and swimming pools, which he later donated to the YMCA.

Niles also has changed because of the dedication of men like Trustee Robert Wente. He jumped into the swollen waters of the Chicago River to pull out old bikes and bed springs to speed the river's flow when basements began flooding.

Mrs. Margaret B. Lieske, village clerk, said when she took office she had to sort out 20 years of records filed in cartons.

While Niles has been able to build, it has also cut taxes from 0.370 cents per \$100 assessed valuation to 0.362.

Village Manager James F. Pryde says one of the reasons is top personnel.

Blase says the big problem now will be to live up to the All America image.

With village elections coming up April 20, Blase's party has also changed its image. It's now called the Forward Era Party.

The 75th Anniversary of the Inter-American System

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1965, marked the 75th anniversary of formal regional cooperation in the Americas, but the interest of the United States in creating an inter-American system dates far earlier than 1890. In fact, from the very beginnings of our Republic, leading political figures urged hemispheric cooperation to preserve the independence of the New World from European domination and to resolve peacefully tensions among the American nations.

The desire among North Americans and Latin Americans alike for hemispheric cooperation finally came to fruition at the end of the 19th century. In 1889 and 1890 the First International Conference of American States met in Washington. From this conference emerged the first hemispheric machinery for peaceful arbitration of disputes and the first permanent inter-American agency, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, later renamed the Pan American Union.

Cooperative efforts in the Americas slowly and gradually grew until the Second World War tested hemispheric solidarity: all the American nations joined forces against the Axis powers. The basis had been laid; solidarity had been tested and proven. In a sense the war was a watershed in inter-American relations, for it sparked intensified efforts at cooperation.

Thus, in the years since World War II inter-American cooperation has been consolidated and inter-American institutions have proliferated into our present-day inter-American system. The

April 15, 1965

Rio Treaty of 1947 formalized our hemispheric defense structure. The Bogotá Charter of 1948 creating the Organization of American States organized the hemisphere into an actively functioning regional political system.

In the years since World War II the inter-American system has developed into a dynamic instrument of hemisphere solidarity, successfully preserving the collective security of the hemisphere against the No. 1 danger today: Communist aggression. Recently the American nations have turned more and more to a set of problems virtually neglected in the early years of inter-American cooperation: the pressing economic and social problems of the hemisphere. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Punta del Este Charter are cornerstones of a vast cooperative effort to improve living conditions throughout the hemisphere.

The first 75 years of the inter-American system have witnessed a remarkable growth in solidarity, particularly during the last 20. The focus of cooperation has changed with the times: from collective defense against European domination to collective defense against Communist aggression. Political cooperation has expanded into economic and social cooperation. But the goals have not changed: a better life in freedom for everyone throughout the hemisphere. May the next 75 years bear witness to even greater progress through hemisphere cooperation.

Only Man Who Can Arrest a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent the State of Arizona are proud that one of our citizens has risen to the position of Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate. Of course, I am speaking of Joseph C. Duke, of Miami, Ariz., who has served the Senate in his present capacity for the past 16 years.

Recently the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, of Buckeye, Ariz., published an article by Columnist Ralph Watkins reviewing Mr. Duke's career and praising him for his accomplishments. In the article Mr. Watkins pointed out that the position of Sergeant at Arms is the only office in the world given power to arrest the President of the United States—that is, on instructions of the U.S. Senate. I might say that I do not expect my fellow Arizonan to exercise this power, at least during the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert the article referred to at this point in the Appendix:

[From the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

POLITICAL SCENE

(By Ralph Watkins)

In politics, there are a few public servants who are known as can do people. There is

no task too large or too small for them to tackle and follow through to a successful conclusion.

The U.S. Senate is blessed with one of these rare individuals in the person of their Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY calls him the Houdini of Washington because he can produce the almost impossible on short notice.

He is affectionately called "Joe" by all of the U.S. Senators, his friends, and six Presidents dating from Herbert Hoover through President Lyndon B. Johnson. He proudly wears a wrist watch engraved L.B.J., which the President took off his own wrist and presented to Joe in appreciation of their long and pleasant friendship.

Joe's career started in Phoenix where he attended PUHS and was active in the Young Democrats of Arizona. He was extremely bright and was offered a job as teller with the Gila Valley Bank in Globe, this bank was the grandpa of the present Valley National Bank of Arizona. He accepted the job and was doing quite well when he had a better offer from Tom O'Brien of the mine. He accepted this offer and did well.

At this time, in 1930, the depression had hit and everyone was trying to cut expenses, even Joe. A good friend asked him if he would join the volunteer fire department in Miami where he could get his room free by sleeping upstairs over the firehouse. He made his application to join and was accepted. He moved in but spent most of his spare time at the police station next door just visiting and learning the ropes.

One night one of the officers was killed. This left an opening which was offered to Joe. The police job paid \$188 per month and he could still live in the fire house.

It was considerably more than he could make at the mine so he accepted the new challenge. He might still be an officer or possibly chief of the Miami Police Department if he hadn't tried to keep peace and order among a bunch of drunk Mexicans. In trying to do his duty, he was shot through the stomach. Dr. Nelson Brayton arrived just in time, and Joe gives the doctor full credit for saving his life.

While convalescing, he wrote his good friend, Senator Henry Ashurst in Washington, making an application for a more peaceful job on the Senator's staff. The Senator had just lost one of his most valued assistants by death and this left the perfect opening for Joe. He arrived in Washington in 1931 and worked as clerk and administrative assistant to Ashurst as long as he was in office.

He then moved over to Senator CARL HAYDEN's office, and later to become the Senate's bill clerk, a job so important that the Republican Senators requested that he stay on the job even through the 80th Congress which was Republican controlled.

Joe decided that he would like to be Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate when the Democrats gained control with Harry Truman in 1949. He started lining up his votes among the Senators, but it was necessary that he be nominated by his own Senators, CARL HAYDEN and Ernest McFarland. CARL didn't want to lose Joe, consented if McFarland would nominate him.

Mac made a slip of the tongue and nominated Joe Doaks. He was elected January 3, 1949, and served until the Republicans took over under Eisenhower. He was out 2 years, but was reelected January 5, 1955, and is still there.

His job gives him control of 14 departments and 900 people. He is the only man in the world who has the power to arrest a President, and this must be done on instructions from the U.S. Senate.

Watch your TV screen, the next time you see the President going in or coming out of a joint session of Congress, the dapper, youngish-looking man with horn-rimmed

glasses immediately in front of the President is our Joe who has done so much for Arizona and the country as a whole.

President Johnson Looks Beyond the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech on Vietnam last week clearly pointed out the divergent aims of the United States and Communist China in regard to southeast Asia.

President Johnson forcefully stated this country's commitment to peaceful change and economic progress. On the other hand, Communist China has given no indication that it is willing to abandon its policy of aggression in southeast Asia. The President's offer of extensive development aid for Asia stands in marked contrast to China's continuing role of encouraging and supporting insurgency wars in southeast Asia.

A column by Max Freedman, in the Chicago Daily News of April 10, eloquently emphasizes this long-range commitment of the United States. I have unanimous consent to place Mr. Freedman's article in the RECORD:

JOHNSON LOOKS BEYOND THE WAR

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson, in his address at Johns Hopkins University, has done much more than open up a new and constructive phase to American policy in Vietnam. He also has proclaimed an American commitment to resist Chinese expansion anywhere in southeast Asia.

Until now, for what has appeared to be weighty and sufficient reasons, the administration, from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Mr. Johnson, has steadily identified North Vietnam as the aggressor, as she certainly is and as this administration would never deny. China's appetite for aggression, however, has been given far less emphasis.

This technique died at Johns Hopkins. After weighing all the risks, the President decided to look beyond the war in Vietnam and to concentrate attention on China's threat to southeast Asia.

In this wider context he gave a pledge, an unlimited and unconditional pledge, to resist Chinese military aggression, alone if necessary, and as long as may be necessary.

Any country in southeast Asia attacked by China's power, either directly or through puppets and guerrillas, and willing to fight for its freedom and independence, can be assured that American help will be offered in response to an appeal for assistance.

That is the stark and far-reaching implication of the principles asserted in the President's address. Washington is ranged directly against Peiping in a more blunt and deliberate manner than many of us would have believed possible before Johns Hopkins.

This firm stand has been taken by the administration, after long and careful deliberation, because it has decided that China can be deterred from a continued career of aggression only if she realizes that she must overcome prompt and massive resistance by the United States.

Perhaps this warning will fail. In a situation overflowing with uncertainties, it is

quite possible that China will ignore the warning or will be provoked by it.

But China now stands on less solid ground. Her rulers know that the United States will forbid easy military conquests, and the threatened nations of Asia, no longer defenseless and alone, can have new confidence in resisting the encroachments of communism.

These must be considered two securities for peace, even though they will be brushed aside and will count for nothing if Peking is blind to reason and is covetous of conquest and aggression. Then a time of sorrow and upheaval will truly face mankind.

Meanwhile, beginning with Vietnam, the President has given fresh hope and opportunity to all of southeast Asia.

The rulers of North Vietnam have a clear choice. They can wreck their country in a suicidal contest with American power; and China and Russia will then find it much easier to degrade North Vietnam into a pathetic puppet than to respect its status as an independent country.

That is one choice—ruin, devastation, the loss of effective independence. It is the fate that awaits North Vietnam while she follows the present course.

But President Johnson gave North Vietnam another choice. It is a choice sanctioned by reason, by justice, and by generosity.

North Vietnam cannot only join with other nations in conditions of equality to obtain a fair and honorable and guaranteed settlement, she can also benefit from the economic and social aid that can quicken southeast Asia with progress in many fields now beyond its reach.

The President wants the United States to make an initial contribution of \$1 billion to that international program in which the United Nations will exercise an important influence.

While China threatens aggression, this country offers massive help. The contrast will be visibly clear to every government and people in Asia.

Let us note that the President invited Russia, and other industrialized nations, to unite in making the international program a great success.

He was silent about China. That too will be remembered and appreciated by Asia's rulers. For China will be welcomed in this international project when she renounces aggression and abides by the commitments of a good neighbor. Once again that is a choice for Peking to make.

The President at Johns Hopkins held out before the independent nations of southeast Asia the chance, with international aid, to root out the grievances and injustice that give Communist guerrillas their sinister opportunity.

He also should take the lead now in building a stronger system or regional security to replace the discredited SEATO alliance.

Choosing his time well and his words with wisdom, President Johnson has given North Vietnam a chance to end the war and southeast Asia a chance to enter a new age of hope. It will be a supreme tragedy if the promise of Johns Hopkins is not amply fulfilled.

Verrazano Day 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on or about April 17, 1524, 441 years ago, an

adventurous Florentine navigator sailed his ship into New York Harbor and sent a small boat through the Narrows to explore what we call today Upper New York Bay. The name of the navigator was Giovanni Verrazano.

Long before the voyages of Raleigh, Hudson, and the Pilgrims, Verrazano and his intrepid companions came to the shores of North America, explored these shores, and reported their findings to Europe. For centuries, Americans remained ignorant of this exploit. The name they gave to their continent evoked the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. They set aside a day to commemorate the discoveries of Christopher Columbus. But neither of these great explorers—who contributed so largely to the renown of Italian navigation—came to the shores of what today is the northeastern coast of the United States. It is to Verrazano that credit belongs for first exploring this coast.

Belatedly, Americans have come to recognize the achievements of Verrazano. In 1909, a statue of Verrazano was unveiled in Battery Park in New York City. In 1964, a suspension bridge across the Narrows of New York Harbor was completed, bearing appropriately the name of Verrazano. It is my hope that one day all our citizens will be acquainted with the exploits of Verrazano, and that his name will be set alongside those of Columbus and Vespucci when the glorious history of Italian navigation is evoked.

With Courage and Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday morning, April 9, 1965.

The editorial follows:

WITH COURAGE AND REASON

President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University—directed to America and the world, to our friends and our enemies—was a masterful presentation of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

It is a policy that calls for continuing courage in the defense of a far-off land against the aggression of a brutal invader. It is a policy that summons the forces of reason in quest of peace even though the foe is notoriously unreasonable and seemingly committed to the path of war.

The President balanced a strong pledge to defend freedom in South Vietnam with an equally strong promise to seek a fair peace through "unconditional discussions." He capped it all with a billion-dollar offer of economic development aid to southeast Asia that ought to serve as a persuasive inducement to end the war and reap the harvest of peaceful progress.

While there were overtones of idealism in his speech the President also faced the hard truths and the harsh realities—something that many of his critics have been too timid to do.

"We must deal with the world as it is, Mr. Johnson said. "The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest * * * To abandon this small and brave nation to its enemy—and to the terror that must follow—would be an unforgivable wrong."

It was on this note that Lyndon Johnson rose to the pinnacle. His policy is based on what is right rather than on what is expedient. His firm voice of compassion for the victims of Communist terror in South Vietnam comes as a refreshing breath of hope in a world where many people and many countries are all too willing to pass by on the other side and leave the oppressed and the tormented to their horrible fate.

President Johnson emphasized that "we will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

This was a well-deserved rebuke of those who clamor for negotiations on any terms. What they really are seeking is a way to surrender.

If Hanoi is ready to talk peace, it has an open invitation. America's terms, as stipulated by Mr. Johnson are eminently fair and clear: "An independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others."

Whether the Communists will consider these terms acceptable is another matter. It takes two to negotiate.

Senator Dodd's Leadership

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the pending drug bill, H.R. 2, and am very anxious to compliment and congratulate the distinguished committee for its fine work in bringing this very desirable, constructive legislation to the floor of the House for appropriate action.

I am also very anxious to compliment and congratulate the very distinguished Senator from Connecticut, our former great and esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, for his tremendous contributions in so ably developing and pressing for this necessary, vital legislation.

Many of us here know of the long-sustained interest and effective work of Senator Dodd in this field, and those of us who know him well and served with him here in this great body well understand his very high purpose and the dynamic impact of his great ability, patriotism, and spirit of dedication upon many of the great issues confronting the Congress.

The country and his great State, and its wonderful people, are fortunate indeed to have such a wise, inspired, sagacious leader representing them in the other body, and I believe that this drug bill, which is to a great extent the product

of Tom Dodd's deep concern, will do much to alleviate some of the shocking conditions currently extant in the Nation, raising speculation and doubt regarding the future health, strength, stability, and soundness of some of our youth and our people.

I am very proud that I serve in this great Congress with a brilliant, farsighted, courageous leader like Senator Tom Dodd, and that I can call him my dear, admired friend.

School Bill Big Great Society Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the education bill has become the working law of the land, it is gratifying to know how greatly our Nation will be altered in the years to come because of its enactment.

Those of us who worked for final passage of the bill can take particular pride in having preserved its main strength—direct aid to students.

The future of America is limited only by the economic and mental future of her citizens. Tomorrow's problems will not be solved by reliance on old formulas, old theories, old conceptions of poverty, deprivation and limited abilities. Americans today must do more than take their place among the people of the world who have learned the rudiments of reading and writing.

President Johnson sees 190 million Americans as individuals, with individual capacities for growth. He has stressed the need for far-reaching programs to help those individuals who, through lack of education and training, cannot help themselves. The President's devotion to this concept of the worth of every individual reinforces our ability to see that each of us participates directly in the wealth and progress of our country.

The enormous wealth of achievement which will be realized as a direct result of this historic education bill can be felt in classrooms and communities all over America.

The President has called on us to lend our skills to insuring the freedom of opportunity to every man, woman and child in the 50 States. Now, in fact and in our lifetime, we can provide direct assistance to those millions less fortunate to develop their abilities for the enrichment of all. The wonder is why we waited so long to turn our attention to this great cause.

Following is an article written by Mr. James McCartney, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently about the education bill and the hope it has stirred in communities across the length and breadth of the land. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues today so that they may share its reaction of

approval and applause for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Apr. 10, 1965]

SCHOOL BILL BIG GREAT SOCIETY VICTORY

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—We're off on the road to that Great Society.

Suddenly, in two smashing and unprecedented victories, President Johnson has taken giant strides toward achievement of his major legislative goals.

Friday night his education bill—after nearly 20 years of frustrating and often angry debate on similar measures—went rocketing through the Senate. The vote was 72 to 18.

It was only Thursday that the President's health-care-for-the-aged bill passed over its steepest hurdle, in the House, by the eye-popping vote of 313 to 115.

That, too, was an impressive achievement. The education bill now requires only a Presidential signature to become a reality. The health care bill, which is just about as revolutionary, is not expected to encounter serious trouble in the Senate.

The President was so confident concerning the prospects for the education bill that he left town before the final vote.

He did not think it was necessary to stay handy to the telephone to apply his velvety technique at persuasion in case it should be close.

The President has done more than simply show that he can accomplish legislative feats that previously have seemed impossible.

He goes one better than that.

He makes it look easy.

Republicans aren't quite sure how to react. They seem, at times, simply stunned.

It can't be said that the President is totally responsible for the success of the education bill.

Surely, it is his bill, but there is no evidence that it was Lyndon Johnson who came up with the brilliant concept—at least from the legislative point of view—that made it possible to pass the bill in Congress.

This is the concept, essentially, that the major part of the money in the bill—\$1 billion—should go to help children of the poor, regardless of whether they attend public or private schools.

In terms of historic perspective, the passage of the bill is simply a marvel.

The first serious effort to pass a general education bill after World War II was made in 1948. By 1950 the discussion degenerated into a bitter and acrimonious fight over church-state relationships.

Over the years bills foundered in every imaginable way. They were tied up in committees, boxed in by powerful congressional committee chairmen, sometimes passed in one House of Congress and stopped in the other.

But once the magic concept came from the White House this year, on January 12, the atmosphere was different.

A successful solution had been found to the church-state controversy. Groups which had bitterly opposed one another in previous hearings were suddenly nodding and smiling.

Even Republicans who are famous for their conservatism found themselves unable to stand in the way of the bill's passage. Some finally helped boost it along its way. Others voted for its passage.

The story behind the passage of the health care bill is nearly as dramatic, although it tends to be more the story of a single man.

That man is Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee.

For years he stood as an opponent of health care for the aged under social security.

Whether it was President Johnson's seemingly limitless powers of persuasion, or a slow process of educational conversation that changed his views this year, the public at present does not know.

He modified his views to the extent that he became willing to accept a social security-style system of prepayment. Then he hurried hearings through his committee.

A final touch in the legislation was to add a package of voluntary provisions which the aged may sign up for if they wish.

The final package includes, essentially, a hospital care plan under a social security style system of prepayment, plus a voluntary health insurance system to cover doctor bills.

Report to Kansas on H.R. 6675

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to the people of Kansas on H.R. 6675:

REPORT TO KANSAS

The House of Representatives, on April 8, passed the administration's hospital and medical services bill. Although President Johnson has recommended that Congress enact a limited hospital care program—the Ways and Means Committee, apparently with the President's blessing came forth with one of the most far-reaching medicare programs ever to reach the floor of the House.

Let's not kid ourselves. When this bill becomes law, the soundness of the social security pension program will be in real jeopardy.

It has always been my feeling that we have a responsibility to provide hospital and medical care for all our people, young, and old, who are in need of such assistance. We have a responsibility to assist our senior citizens who are able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but who live in constant fear of a major illness, which might wipe out their savings, and force them to become public charges—and such assistance should be given without embarrassment or humiliation to those who need help.

Hence, the real issue before the Congress during the debate on H.R. 6675, insofar as I was concerned, was not whether we should provide assistance but how we should provide assistance.

The administration bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which permitted 10 hours of discussion but denied to House Members the right to offer amendments, to remove objectionable provisions, clarify ambiguities or improve it. Hence, a Member was required to vote "yes" or "no" on the whole package. With a single exception, the minority was permitted to offer one amendment in the form of a motion to recommit. Under these circumstances, the minority offered the Byrnes bill as an alternative proposal.

The administration program and the Byrnes alternative both included the provisions of H.R. 11865 which passed the House last year (and I supported it) providing for (a) an increase in social security benefits, (b) lowered the retirement age to 80 years for widows, (c) provided social security benefits for those over 72 years of age, and (d) continued benefits to dependent children up to 22 years of age if in school. Both bills provided for a voluntary insurance program for medical (physicians) care. Both bills provided for hospital care. In fact, the Byrnes

April 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1889

proposal was far more liberal since it provided for catastrophic illnesses and medicals—these were not included in the administration's bill H.R. 6675.

The major difference in the two programs, was not so much in the benefits provided, but in the method of financing. The administration bill provided that hospital care for those over 65 should be paid through an additional payroll tax attached to social security by those who now pay social security but who would not be entitled to any benefits until they reach 65. The Byrnes proposal which I supported provided that those over 65 should pay one-third of the hospital and medical care insurance premium (average \$6.50 per month) and the Government would pay two-thirds of the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury. It was the same program provided by the Government today for Members of Congress and Federal employees.

It was agreed by some that if we could give aid to the nations all over the world, if we could pay benefits to labor, industry, and agriculture, if we could assist Federal employees, then we could subsidize the medical needs of the aged to meet their medical costs. The question has also been raised why should a worker with two dependents and earning \$3,600 per year be required to pay an income tax of \$214 and also hospitalization costs for a person on retirement who has an income of \$3,600, pays no income tax and contributes nothing toward the hospital care program.

I supported the Byrnes proposal. I could not in good conscience support the administration proposal which in my opinion undermines the whole social security structure and places unnecessary additional burden on those who now pay social security.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOSPITAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY?

Most of us have always considered social security as a program under which we would receive a pension at age 65—which combined with our life savings—would make it possible for us to maintain a decent standard of living during our years of retirement. When the program was first enacted in 1937, it held out much promise. But since then what has happened to social security?

Through the years we have so expanded and enlarged upon the original intent that, like Government bonds, it is rapidly losing its attractiveness. We now have on the books commitments to pay out approximately \$625 billion to those on retirement or covered by social security. We have in assets around \$305 billion. If all payments into the fund were to stop—we would be \$300 billion short to meet present commitments.

Instead of building up reserves, as private pension programs do, we have actually been paying out approximately as much as we have been taking in. We have continued not only to increase the social security rate, but also the earnings base upon which the tax is paid. In 1954, when disability payments were added, we were told OASI trust funds would climb to \$28.5 billion by 1965—actually the fund is now estimated at around \$19 billion, \$7.5 billion short. And now we are enlarging the program by adding hospital care, increasing cash benefits and reducing the age requirements for widows.

Have pension payments kept pace with the increased social security payments made by the worker? The answer is "No." In 1939, an employee who earned \$550 per month paid \$30 per year into the Social Security fund. He could look forward to receiving \$58 per month on retirement. Today an employee earning the same amount pays \$174 into the social security fund and his maximum social security benefit is \$127 per month. By 1973, an employee earning \$550 per month will pay \$353 annually into the social security fund, and he will receive a maximum pension check of \$168. In other words while the cost has gone up 480 per-

cent—the workers retirement check has increased only 119 percent.

What is there about social security that is attractive to the young man who is about to enter the labor force for the first time? One must remember that these are the workers upon whom we must depend to pay into the fund so that those over 65 may secure these benefits. A young man, 21 years of age, entering the labor force next year and paying the full amount of social security until 65, could have deposited the same amount in a building and loan at 4½ percent, and he would accumulate by retirement time an estimate of \$42,000. If we add the employer's share, it would be \$84,000. His retirement checks under social security would total \$2,004 per annum. If he invested \$42,000 at 5 percent, he would earn \$2,100 annually and still leave an estate of \$42,000 at his death.

Can we keep expanding the social security program by adding hospital care, medical care, increasing benefits to those over 65, and charge it to social security? Yes, if those who pay into the fund are willing to stand for an increase in the payroll tax and the earning base upon which the tax is paid. It should be remembered, however, that the social security tax by 1971 will be as burdensome as the income tax. For example, take a man earning \$5,000 per year with a wife and two dependents—in 1971 his income tax will be approximately \$290 and his social security tax will be \$260. These, of course, will be increased when demands are made that Congress grant further increases in social security benefits to meet living costs, and as hospital and medical services increase in cost.

A hospital care program for those over 65 financed by a payroll tax attached to social security not only does serious damage to the social security pension program, but it also inflicts the most unfair tax in our whole taxing system. The president of the corporation pays on the same basis as the plant janitor.

In closing may I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe in providing hospital care and medical care for those who are in need. I want to help those who can care for themselves, but live in constant dread that one serious illness will place them on relief. But I want to do it without wrecking the social security pension system for those who are between the age of 21 and 65 and are required to foot the bill. I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. That is why I favored the financing provided by the Byrnes alternative and opposed the administration bill.

Pan American Day

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other Members in expressing appreciation for the fine leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee. His fine work has been a credit to our State and to our country. Americans of every political persuasion owe him a debt of gratitude for his outstanding contribution in this area of foreign affairs.

James A. Farley: Truly a Pro's Pro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Conniff which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 5, 1965:

JAMES A. FARLEY: TRULY A PRO'S PRO (By Frank Conniff)

One of the nicer tints brightening the political spectrum during recent years is the universal admiration and affection exhibited toward James A. Farley, a pro's pro who has been to the wars without losing his integrity or his self-respect.

Although he scrupulously shuns donning the toga of an elder statesman, audiences, especially those of a Democratic Party tinge, seem intent on communicating their vast esteem for him at every opportunity. He is still much too vigorous to hold still for the wise man role, but people seem dedicated to placing him in a niche removed from the less seemly facets of public life.

Largely by coincidence, this writer has many times this winter been at affairs where the introduction of Jim Farley brought a heartfelt and spontaneous response. The standing ovation bit is the most overdone feature of the banquet circuit these nights—a claque of about three stands up and the rest of the room is ashamed not to follow suit—but in the case of Big Jim the roaring tribute strikes one as emanating from a deep desire to convey the audience's high regard for the man.

There is something heartening about all this: a feeling of events coming full circle to honor the man for his many contributions devoid of the sniping that marred the unhappy years. Deep down, we suspect Jim Farley believes he has never been given proper credit for the role he played in helping enact President Roosevelt's New Deal into law.

Not too many years ago, critics dismissed him as a "conservative." This was in the days when one's attitude toward Soviet communism determined your classification as a "liberal" or a "conservative."

Those who viewed communism tolerantly and believed the United States could accommodate itself to all things Russian automatically were designated as "liberals." Others who, like Jim Farley, looked at Soviet Russia with suspicion, were branded "conservatives," although their support of liberal welfare measures had been a long standing commitment.

But that's raking over a long-gone ideological dispute which Josef Stalin settled by his unabashed aggressions following World War II. We would do well to bear the old feud in mind, however, in the current Vietnam controversy. Those who believe the United States has committed its honor to the defense of South Vietnam are not necessarily trigger-happy reactionaries; nor are those who call for instant negotiations automatically appeasers of aggressive communism.

We are not trying to adjust a halo on Big Jim's shiny pate, because he operated according to the rules of political warfare, which can be pretty rugged at times. What he has proven is that you can survive in this rough game and still abide by the canons of decency, respect for opponents and trust. He managed to do it, and it's a shame not

A1890

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 15, 1965

enough of the new breed have pondered his example.

Now he has come into the years of full recognition and his story reads very pleasantly over the long haul. Prestige-wise, we would say he is ranked only by President Johnson and Harry S. Truman in the Democratic Party. Vice President HUMPHREY, Senator BOB KENNEDY, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to mention of a few of the later generation, have years to go before the accumulate the record of public service, adherence to ideals and party loyalty built up by Jim for more than 40 years.

As we say, it's one of the nicer things we've seen recently, the spontaneous salute of admiration and affection showered on James A. Farley whenever people get the chance to demonstrate how they feel about him.

Conference at Soviet Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. I. E. "Pappy" Schechter, publisher and editor of the Park Forest Reporter, Park Forest, Ill., attended the National Editors Association Conference held in Washington. As part of the program, he and his fellow newsmen had an opportunity for a press conference at the Soviet Embassy.

It isn't very often that Communist diplomats expose themselves to proper scrutiny by the U.S. press. Mr. Schechter's report of the interview is so fascinating that I felt it deserved widespread review.

I place it in the RECORD at this point:

"Nyet" may be the most popular Russian word in the American lexicon, yet in all candor we must admit that during our 1-hour news conference at the Soviet Embassy in Washington recently, Red diplomats were affirmative, skillful at responses, suave in their mannerisms. One couldn't help coming away with a feeling that the confidence they exuded regarding political and economic matters was based on their true feelings, not on a false sense of security.

The event was a first in Russo-American relations. The 130 newsmen who attended the 4th annual National Editorial Association Government Relations Workshop were the first news group of this size to be invited to the Soviet Embassy to query their diplomats.

In the absence of Ambassador Dobrynin, his chief aide, Consul Alexander Zimchuk, undertook to answer all queries. His comments were firm and even though we sensed the uselessness of pursuing inquiry, he could hardly be classed as equivocal. Obviously, he must have answered similar queries before.

Here are some random questions and answers:

Question. Why is your government insisting that the United States get out of South Vietnam?

Answer. You are violating the treaty of 1955, when Indochina was partitioned. At that time a free election was promised in the nation. Only a dictatorship has existed since then. The United States has no right to arm South Vietnam and send its troops.

Question. Didn't you do the same thing in Cuba?

Answer. No. There was no civil war in Cuba. We sent missiles to Cuba at the request of Chairman Castro. We also removed them and our men when it looked like they could cause an all-out war. We are basically a peaceful nation.

Question. There are signs that Russia is going capitalist. Can you explain your latest efforts to increase production by employing standards long used in this (capitalist) nation?

Answer. The Soviet Union will never go capitalist. We have embarked on an incentive program. This is not a profit motive, just a means to increase our production. It may interest you to know that our gross national product has increased 8 to 10 percent while the United States can boast of only 4 or 5 percent.

Question. Can you explain the split between your country and Red China?

Answer. Our differences with the Republic of China are purely ideological. (He never used the word "Red" in describing a Communist nation; acting bullish, perhaps?) We are not nearly as estranged as you are led to believe. Furthermore, it's obvious that your government and some of its western partners don't see eye to eye on many matters either.

Question from this correspondent. What about the controlled press in your country? Is there anything like the type of newspapers we represent—suburban weeklies, semi-weeklies and small town dailies, who reflect the attitudes of America's grass roots? We can and frequently do criticize our governments and officials and show our editorial independence to a remarkable degree.

Answer (Comrade Zimchuk bristled a little. A slight tic on the left side of his face began a more rapid action). Our press is not controlled. Yes, we have papers like yours in our communities. But they carry mostly social news—something like a company house organ. Our major papers are national ones. Remember, we do not have private ownership of the press.

Question. Can your community papers criticize?

Answer. Yes, if there's a grievance toward a factory superintendent, for example, a letter to the editor will be accepted to be printed.

Question. What was behind the ouster of Khrushchev.

Answer. Chairman Khrushchev sent his resignation to the Presidium, the same body which elected him to his high office. (Before this response could draw a followup query, the Consul recognized another outstretched hand.)

Question. Do you expect that Russo-U.S. tensions will ever cease?

Answer. Yes, but it's hard to predict when. At the present time we are negotiating the opening of legations in major cities of your country. This may help you to understand us better.

Question (this one on the lighter side). Do you have anyone in Russia who compares with James Bond?

Consul Zimchuk didn't appear to understand the question. He exchanged a few words in Russian with an aide and then asked to have the query repeated.

His answer, We're somewhat old fashioned in Russia, we still believe in Sherlock Holmes, brought down the house.

The camaraderie was spreading. It was easy to see that the Russians could parry with the best of them.

Question. If I went to Russia, my travel would be restricted, why?

Answer. I don't know why, my own travel here is plenty restricted.

Question. How did you react to the U.S. orbit conquest of Grissom and Young?

Answer. It was a great achievement.

Question. Did you celebrate it in the embassy?

Answer. No, we didn't even celebrate our own triumph in space a week earlier.

The hour went by rapidly. Most of us concluded that these diplomats could not be embarrassed. Their answers slick, yet positive, didn't create fury—only sound. It was the kind of afternoon we would enjoy repeating. Even though the answers weren't satisfying, the intellectual vying is good mental therapy.

Settlement in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, One of the major concerns of our country today is our position and attitude regarding the conflict in Vietnam. I am therefore pleased to insert an editorial from the Denver Post of April 8 on the President's position:

PRESIDENT EXPANDS CHANCES FOR PEACE

President Johnson took the firm, positive course in his address to the Nation on American policy in southeast Asia. It was clearer than any previous statement on that difficult and frustrating subject, and it held more hope for decent, peaceful settlement in South Vietnam.

The speech was obviously the product of thorough analysis and painstaking preparation. It was not merely the response of a sensitive political leader angry at his critics, as some had suggested it might be, but rather a responsible, detailed policy statement, framed for world consumption.

There was in it something for all interested parties. There was, of course, repetition of the administration's determination to continue in strong support of South Vietnam. Military attacks against the North Vietnamese will continue for now, he said, "because they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace."

The enemy and his allies, as well as those at home who feared this determination might falter at a critical juncture, will mark this statement well.

But while saying that the United States would not grow tired and withdraw "under the cloak of a meaningless agreement," the President announced his willingness to enter "unconditional discussions" on a Vietnam settlement.

If this was not a radical departure from previous statements in which he has said that the government in Hanoi would have to indicate readiness to cease aggression against its neighbors before we would talk about negotiations, at least it was a far more direct expression of our willingness to seek peace.

The President for the first time appeared to be going at least half way in the quest for peaceful settlement in Vietnam. His statement was a major effort to gain the diplomatic initiative in southeast Asia. At the same time, it was clear that the other half of the distance would have to be covered by Hanoi, or Peiping or Moscow, or by all of them together.

But the willing hand he extended to friend and foe on the subject of peace also held the promise of dramatic and massive American aid.

He called for a large-scale cooperative effort "to improve the life of man" in conflict torn southeast Asia while pledging a

\$1 billion assistance program. And, significantly, he invited North Vietnam to "take its place in the common effort just as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible."

He is soon going ahead to name a special team to inaugurate U.S. participation in economic aid programs in southeast Asia—with-out waiting for response from Hanoi.

This is in the Johnson pattern: expand the Great Society, as it were, into the most trouble-stricken area of the world, and ask the enemy to help you.

It could, in the long run, work.

Meanwhile, the speech from the campus in Baltimore answered the President's doubts and his critics about where the nation stands on the issue of South Vietnam. At the same time it pledged American aid on an unprecedented scale while expanding on American willingness "to bring about the bright and necessary day of peace."

Johnson's "Idea War" Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 9 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

JOHNSON'S "IDEA WAR" WEAPON

President Johnson has cut through the confusion of the Vietnamese war and made a point that must be made clear to every Communist in southeast Asia, whether he be a guerrilla in the rain forest or a high official in Hanoi. Continued warfare is futile and senseless. Peace will bring a better life for all. The choice is up to the Communists. If they choose continued warfare, the United States has a total commitment—"we will not be defeated" Mr. Johnson says.

The United States will stay in South Vietnam and continue to slug it out with the Communists, if that's the way they want it. But the United States also is willing to engage in "unconditional discussions" to stop the bloodshed and to help all of southeast Asia to a better life.

The billion dollars the President says the United States is willing to put into the backward area for economic development was quickly termed a carrot—part of the classic carrot and stick approach. It also has been labeled a bribe or an attempt to buy friends with dollars, to get out of a sticky mess in South Vietnam.

This is a superficial viewpoint. It ignores fundamentals. Marshall plan aid could have been described as a bribe, too. So can all forms of foreign aid. But they also are acknowledgments that it takes more than firepower to fight the Communists.

The battle against communism is also a fight against an idea. Ideas cannot be fought with guns. They must be fought with other ideas. Americans win this part of the battle when they convince the people in underdeveloped countries that capitalism and the democratic way can do more for them than communism.

President Johnson once again has put in perspective both types of warfare against the Communists.

Communism promises the people a better material life. But they would lose the right to govern themselves.

The United States and other free nations stand ready to help poorer nations build a

better life and enjoy the fruits of modern science and invention. They would retain their political independence.

Mr. Johnson has reminded the people of North Vietnam as well as South Vietnam that they have an alternative to war that would mean more than the end of bloodshed—it would mean a better life, better than ever before.

In offering unconditional discussions, the President lets it be known that discussions can begin even while the fighting goes on. The United States will not accept the Communist condition that the United States withdraw troops from Vietnam before any talks begin. On Wednesday, before Mr. Johnson talked, Soviet President Anastas I. Mikoyan repeated that the first step toward peace was withdrawal of U.S. troops. It may be significant that yesterday he did not mention this in discussing Vietnam.

Perhaps Mr. Johnson might have made the "unconditional discussion" speech a few weeks ago and if the Reds had agreed to talk, have saved many lives. But a few weeks ago, the United States would have made the offer from a position of military weakness. Today, with the North Vietnamese taking punishment from the air and the battles in South Vietnam going against them, the United States makes its offer from a posture of strength and has given convincing proof that it "will not be defeated."

The Soviet Union still prates about the "aggression" of "American imperialism" against North Vietnam. But no reasonable person anywhere could read Mr. Johnson's speech and conclude that America wants to dominate the people of southeast Asia. It wants to help them govern themselves.

Secretary General U Thant, of the United Nations saw President Johnson's position as a favorable response to the recent appeal of 17 nonaligned countries to bring about a political settlement of the Vietnam war. It was "positive, forward looking, and generous." This seems to be the attitude of most non-Communist countries.

Mr. Johnson has challenged not only the Communists but the Communist system to show whether they are sincere in their protestations that they stand for peace and for a better life for the common man. The world awaits their answer.

The Pittsburgh Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story of "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania. This chapter is entitled "The Pittsburgh Story," and I include it as part of my remarks:

THE PITTSBURGH STORY

The Pittsburgh area has much to offer—in scientific and technical talents, laboratory facilities, and research and development effectiveness.

The contents of this brochure are convincing evidence of the high level of scientific and technological activities in the nine-county area. They also point out the numerous opportunities for interaction among industrial, governmental, and institutional organizations in the region.

The Pittsburgh area has achieved an R. & D. balance in scientific disciplines, industrial fields, laboratory sizes, source of support, and nature of research. It has the professional manpower, specialized equipment, and supporting services necessary for creative investigation and enterprise.

Always strong in the materials field, it also has become the center for nuclear power research—and is making significant contributions in a variety of other fields—chemicals, machinery, electronics, medicine, and instruments.

Most of the research is of an applied or developmental nature, but a surprisingly large amount of basic research is underway. Unlike many other parts of the Nation, an unusually high percentage is funded by industry, rather than Government, thereby providing greater economical stability.

The R. & D. activities range from small one- and two-man operations to some of the largest research laboratories in the Nation. The Pittsburgh story, however, is more than generalities.

Getting to Work and Back

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House the third article in Consumer Reports' informative and thorough series on the cost and convenience of metropolitan transportation, "Getting to Work and Back." Since many of our major urban centers are facing key decisions on mass transportation, I know my colleagues will be interested. The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

Before a new expressway or transit route can be built, it must be planned. Most of the planning has been done by highway engineers employed in State highway departments. The plans have been designed to get people from place to place in their own automobiles—with relatively little concern for the areas through which the roads run or for other means of transportation. Since most of the money for new urban expressways has come from Washington, and most of the planning from the State capitols, local communities have had relatively little voice in their own transportation futures.

But a change is underway. The 1962 amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act declares that, beginning in July 1965, plans for new urban expressways shall be drawn up with "due consideration" of their probable effect on the cities through which they run, and shall be "properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation."

There are teeth in this amendment, moreover. For the bulk of the money for new urban expressways—90 percent in the case of Interstate System routes—is allocated by the Secretary of Commerce; and, beginning in July, the Secretary is forbidden to give approval to new urban freeway routes "unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by the States and local communities."

In other words, no more freeway funds will be coming from Washington after July unless an areawide planning study is underway. Federal funds to assist in comprehen-

April 15, 1965

sive regional planning are available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The new planning studies are being sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and the BPR has established a laudable framework for them. The Bureau is insisting, for example, that planners give full consideration to all transportation facilities, "including those for mass transportation," instead of just to new highways; the factors analyzed are to include "zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, etc."; and area planners are instructed to consider "social and community-value factors, such as preservation of open space, parks and recreational facilities; preservation of historical sites and buildings; environmental amenities; and aesthetics."

The boundaries of the new planning areas are based on Census Bureau maps; in general, each city or cluster of cities with its suburbs is considered a single area. Each local government within the area is expected to participate in the planning process. "The State highway department," the BPR states, "will be expected to show by suitable evidence that scrupulous efforts have been made to carry out the intent of the act with respect to cooperative action by all political subdivisions. If there is an unwillingness on the part of a local political unit within the entire urban area to participate in the transportation planning process in such area, a determination shall be made as to whether the percentage of the urban area affected is such as to negate an effective planning process for the whole area"—and thus warrant curtailment or withholding of Federal highway funds.

An exciting feature of both the BPR and HHFA approaches is that Washington is not dictating solutions to local problems, but rather insisting that local machinery be established to solve them.

WHERE THE CITIZENS GROUPS COME IN

The mere establishment of these new transportation planning studies, of course, is no guarantee that urban transportation problems will be more effectively solved in the future than in the past. As CU noted in February, the new planning projects could prove to be mere facades, behind which the same old highway engineers will continue to make the same old highway-oriented decisions from a regional planning office. Here is where a vigilant citizens group comes in. It can start by asking questions.

Is your community, for example, properly represented on the body that is preparing a comprehensive plan for your urban area? Is your spokesman an impartial representative concerned primarily with the community—or is he a highway contractor, a gasoline company executive, or someone else with a personal ax to grind? If your local government office can't answer these questions, you can get the name and address of the body making the transportation study for your urban area from the State highway department; and you can then check with the planning agency itself to learn whether your community has an authorized spokesman. If it doesn't, urge your local officials to establish effective liaison with the agency at once.

Next a citizens group should ask the local representative to explain how the planning agency is going about its task. Planning a sound transportation network for a metropolitan area is so complex a job that planners necessarily make use of electronic computers to aid them in their work. What counts is how they are used—what questions are asked and what data is given the machine to use in arriving at its answers.

The first primitive attempts to use computers in transportation planning were woefully inadequate. The planners divided an urban area arbitrarily into 10-block or 20-block zones and determined by a survey what

trips were being made by the residents of each zone. These trip data were fed into the computer along with population predictions, automobile ownership trends, land-use trends, travel time figures, and other such statistics. The computer then produced a set of desire lines showing how many people would want to drive from A through B to C a decade or two hence, and multilane expressways were bulldozed through to carry the anticipated traffic. Local protests were ignored, on the theory that the computer knows best. This approach may still survive in a few local projects.

A much better approach, however, is now in common use. The computer no longer dictates an expressway plan; instead it is fed alternative plans, and their cost and adequacy are compared. Thus, planners, elected officials, and local voters can make the final choice on the basis of the helpful findings emerging from the computer.

Despite this improvement, there remain many pitfalls. One results from the fact that computer estimates of future traffic are generally based on recent trends toward an automobile-dominated society. Thus the worst features of our past decade of urban chaos are projected into the future on an inflated scale.

Moreover, many of the planners in control of the urban planning projects were trained in automobile-oriented university engineering schools; and many are former employees of highway planning departments. Thus the alternatives with which they are most familiar are expressway alternatives. They are less likely to program for the computer a thoroughly detailed evaluation of a modern, high-speed rapid-transit system like the San Francisco BART system, described in the February Reports (with its 80-mile-an-hour top speeds, scheduled speeds of 50 miles an hour including stops, abundant and convenient peripheral parking, average platform waits of only a minute or two at rush hour, comfortable seats, low noise levels, air conditioning, and other amenities).

Finally, the computer is generally asked about getting travelers from neighborhood A through neighborhood B to neighborhood C. The rights, wants, and needs of the residents of neighborhood B are seldom consulted in advance, much less reduced to a form that the computer can assimilate. But this lack can be remedied. And citizens groups can provide the drive if it is not initiated by the regional planning office. How they can participate is very well illustrated by what is now going on in the Boston area.

HOW BOSTON IS DOING IT

Under the Boston Regional Planning Project (BRPP), a thorough transportation planning study is currently underway in the Boston area, comprising the city itself and scores of its suburbs. This study is supported by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and Department of Commerce & Development. Its director is a community-minded regional planner, Donald M. Grama. And its incomparable virtue is that Graham. And its incomparable virtue is that community representatives before rather than after the computers are put to work. Researchers for this series of reports attended a meeting called by BRPP, one of a series of 10 for representatives of 6 suburbs 30 miles northwest of Boston. The meetings were held in the evening so that ordinary citizens could participate. Graham himself presided.

The communities represented learn from one another at these meetings. "My town isn't interested in better rail service to Boston," one representative may remark. "Our commuters own at least two cars and drive one in."

A representative from a neighboring town disagrees. "How do you know your commuters wouldn't be delighted to sell their second

car and take the train if more comfortable, convenient, and speedy service were available?"

"My town's a mess every morning and evening when the trains come in," someone remarks. "The cars around the station tie our downtown district up in a knot until it looks like Boston."

"My town, too. Why not tear down both miserable old stations and build a new one in the country halfway between?"

"Good idea. Then we would have enough room to park near the station instead of five blocks away."

Out of such local exchanges, new ideas—and new projects—are born. BRPP is holding a similar series of meetings in each of its 18 districts. Later these expressions of local concern and need can be included among the data fed into the BRPP computers.

The meetings work in the other direction, too. The BRPP men bring news of projects that may affect local interests. A new freeway is being planned around Boston, for example—even further out than the famous Route 128, once touted as the solution to the area's traffic snafus but now itself congested. Where should the interchanges along the new beltway be located? One suburb may welcome an interchange because of the boom in land values it will generate; another may be horrified by the destruction to a settled community the interchange will bring. If neither knows of the plans, neither can speak up while there is still time.

Some traditional planners are appalled by Graham's cards-on-the-table approach. They warn that if plans become known in advance, land speculators will reap windfall profits; and they predict that if so much time is allowed for opposition to mobilize, nothing will ever get built. Graham disagrees. Windfall profits are only possible, he points out, when knowledge of plans is limited to a few insiders who can then prey upon the ignorance of their neighbors. And he predicts that if the BRPP plan is devised from the start with adequate consideration for community needs and wants, support rather than opposition will be engendered through most of the area.

"The way to recognize a sound urban-area planning program," Graham told CU, "is by its approach to your own community. Do the planners come in with a completed plan and try to sell you on its merits? Or do they come in with an open ear to learn in advance your community's needs and wants—and then try, with the help of their computers, to reconcile your needs and wants with those of the rest of the area?"

Where official planning projects fail to do their work well, a citizens group with sufficient determination—and the necessary talent—can do a great deal of investigating and publicizing on its own. A CU subscriber Ernest Ratterman, has reported one unusually comprehensive effort of a few years ago in Cincinnati.

Concerned with the traffic jams and commuter delays that were plaguing the city of Cincinnati back in 1957, Ratterman and a handful of his friends—most of them professional engineers like himself—asked why a high-speed rapid transit system could not be built with a modest investment to operate along an existing, little-used railroad right-of-way into the city. As a contribution to the city's progress, this citizens group, headed by Alvin L. Spivak, submitted a study of the possibility, including "data on costs for rights-of-way, electrification, new trackage, purchase price of rolling stock, operating costs, and income." Then, they organized themselves as the "Rapid Transit Study Committee" and published their full report. "We dug deeply into Cincinnati's transportation picture both past and present," Ratterman recalls. "As engineers we were able to present well-thought-out plans and ideas to generate interest in our goals. * * * At no

time during our many presentations did we encounter any dispute about our facts or questioning of our conclusions about Cincinnati's transit needs. Ordinary citizens * * * showed their eagerness for something new and better in urban transportation. What they lacked, however, was a strong, coherent leadership which could achieve action on their wants."

Inevitably, the Cincinnati committee came into conflict with the local highway lobby. One issue that evoked the clash was a controversial plan to build a four-level underground parking garage in the downtown district.

"Building such an enormously expensive facility struck us as foolish," Ratterman writes, "unless it could be planned to accommodate mass transit facilities at some future date. We made proposals to the city council on this subject and even developed plans for using the first deck of this garage as a central point of a modern downtown subway system integrated with surface lines to the suburbs. We studied the downtown parking facilities and their location, cost, utilization, rate structure, and financing. These studies cast grave doubt on the feasibility of the proposed new structure.

"But we soon learned that politics rather than facts would decide the parking-garage issue. Our proposals and recommendations were graciously received by the city government—and blissfully ignored.

"We were handicapped rather seriously * * * by being unable to garner the support of some business and professional groups. Individuals in these groups privately lauded our work and expressed envy of our freedom of expression; but the groups themselves were dominated by many conscious and some unknowing supporters and members of the highway lobby. * * * The expressway and parking plans which the city had developed, and the ease with which Federal funds could be secured to finance the expressways, blocked serious consideration of more effective approaches to the city's transport problems. One city councilman told us candidly that, until the Government passes out transit money as it passes out expressway money, there would be no rapid transit in Cincinnati."

The Cincinnati committee broke up in 1961 when Splvak, Ratterman, and several other key members moved to other cities. Cincinnati still lacks a rapid transit system. But Ratterman does not regret the effort expended on the project. "I am sure other members would agree," he writes, "that it was a great personal experience."

Such a committee if launched today, it should be added, would have working in its favor many factors that the Cincinnati committee lacked from 1957 to 1961. Among these factors are:

San Francisco's successful adoption of the BART plan for high speed, comfortable, convenient rapid transit of a quality that should exceed any now available in the United States. When it is in operation, the precedent may engender a demand for better transportation in other areas.

The likelihood of Federal funds for transit systems (see last month's article in this series) so that cities will no longer be faced with a Hobson's choice between Federally-supported freeways and transit systems that must be financed at home.

The existence of area-wide planning programs, which at least provide a forum for presenting ideas.

Finally, even some urban interests that would normally form a part of the highway lobby now realize that mass transportation must be improved and expanded to unclog the expressways. The Jenney gas station chain with 600 filling stations in the greater Boston area, to cite one example, has taken full-page advertisements urging public support of transit expansion there. The Stand-

ard Oil Co. of California and the California State Automobile Association both endorsed San Francisco's BART transit plan.

With such new factors affecting the situation, committees like the one in Cincinnati should have a considerably better chance of success in the future.

Some are already at work. Examples are the District of Columbia Rapid Rail Citizens Committee, the Bergen County (N.J.) Transit Association, the Intermunicipal Group for Better Rail Service (New Jersey), the Westchester Commuter Association (New York), and the Committee for Better Transit of Greater New York. Also important are the long-established planning groups such as the Regional Plan Association of Greater New York. If there is a sound organization of this kind in your community or region, by all means join and support it.

If a city's residents do not value it they are of course free to move out. But much of the shift to the suburbs today is not the result of an innate dislike of the cities. Rather, it is being forced on families and business concerns alike by the failure of the cities to solve their most pressing problems, including the transportation. Thus, willy-nilly, we are drifting toward a future of urban sprawl.

At least four major North American urban areas—San Francisco, Montreal, Toronto, and Philadelphia—are bucking this trend toward sprawl by investing in high quality rail transportation that will link city to suburbs for balanced growth. The residents of other areas may prefer different patterns. If so, they are free to plan differently, but let them get what they really want, not merely what the requirements of automobile transportation dictate.

The new comprehensive planning projects now underway or soon to be launched in every urban area make it possible to plan for the future of people, rather than just for automobiles. Let us make the most of this opportunity.

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Much more is at stake in such local efforts than merely an opportunity to get to work and back a few minutes faster or for a few cents less each day. The entire future of American cities hangs in the balance.

An increasing number of people today, looking at our blighted central cities and traffic jams, have concluded that large cities are obsolete. They therefore envision a future in which all of us will both live and work in suburbs, surrounded by vast parking lots, and linked together by multilane freeways along which we can all whizz in uncongested private-car luxury.

One objection to such plans is that they leave out of account the many services that people want and need but that each suburb cannot possibly supply for itself—a symphony orchestra, to cite a striking example.

Right To Be a Bum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. Paul Harvey, made on his news broadcast on February 27, 1965. I think the emphasis he has correctly placed on freedom is one which each of us should consider carefully in preparing his legislative pro-

gram. There is plenty of security in a jail cell but I have never heard of anybody beating down the doors to get in.

[Excerpt from Paul Harvey News, Feb. 27, 1965]

RIGHT TO BE A BUM

I had meant to confine this next just to generalities. And embellish it with some fervent plea for the preservation of the Republic. Then I got to thinking about a parttime dishwasher I know, who's a bum the rest of the time, and I tried to figure what's his stake in all this free enterprise. How about the ragpicker, or even that good-natured old janitor in the North Western train station, what's his percentage?

If he votes right and puts up a fight for freedom, what's his cut? "The Government can't give you anything which it has not first taken away from you." He's heard that. But he has nothing anybody can take away from him. So who's he to worry about whether the Constitution gets chopped up or the flag hauled down?

He's got nothing they can tax and nothing anybody'd want, so why shouldn't he take a bottle of cheap wine from the precinct committeeman and just vote the way the man says.

I had meant to talk about the American heritage, and I got to thinking about Joe the bootblack. What has he inherited? Well, I've been asking around. And the rest of you tune out, now. And dial in 3 pages later. Because right now I aim to talk just to Joe the bootblack. And to Lennie, the part-time bum.

You know, I think that's what's wrong with the fervent flag wavers in this country. We spend too much time talking to one another. But Joe and Lennie and Paul Harvey understand one another, too. Because they've all been flush and they've each been hungry and any one of them knows what it's like to work a hard 17-hour day for \$1 packing or sacking or stacking somebody else's groceries. So we can speak the same language, and it's that language we're going to use here. The kind that'll be understood by Lennie and Joe and the vast mass of unorganized, unterrified human beings whose two-by-four house or third-floor walkup is as close to the silk as they're ever going to get. The rest of you just excuse us for a bit—if you will.

A while back a chap named Dean Russell made a speech out in Billings, Mont. Probably talking to a gathering of folks who already agreed with him. I'm going to try to remember how he compared the American Negro slaves and the American Indians.

For a lot of years now we've been voting for the men who promise us Government aid—of all kinds. We figured we wanted the Government to guarantee to look after us. Well, sir, in the early American slave States the law specified that the slaves must be taken care of. The constitutions of the slave States generally specified that the slaveowners must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. And the Mississippi constitution contained this additional sentence: "The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves (except) where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

Now get this—The slave was guaranteed food, lodging, medical and old-age care, but the highest honor the State of Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service was to set him free from this security. The State's highest reward was to give a man the personal responsibility of looking after his own welfare. Freedom to find his own job or to be a bum if he liked.

Do you see why that's so important, just the right to be a bum? And so the slaves eventually found freedom to earn money they could keep, to save for their own old age and then they weren't slaves any more.

Let us, on the other hand, take the American Indians. These we made wards of Government. These we gave security. We took away their freedom and gave them security. So they have become steadily less self-supporting. I speak of the average, of course, not the spectacular exception. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Look at the remarkable progress in just one lifetime later. Today the average American Negro is self-supporting, self-respecting, and responsible. Today the average American Indian, it is said, will actually die of starvation unless he is fed by the Government.

So we have to hire 13,000 Federal employees to take care of 380,000 reservation Indians. That's one Federal employee for every 30 Indians. This has nothing to do with the color of a man's skin or the shape of his cheekbones. The Negro was free to work or loaf; to starve or to win a potfull. The Indian was secure. There was no reason for him to educate himself or learn to manage his own affairs or to be productive. It's no fault of his; it's ours. Just as it's going to be our fault, Joe and Lennie, our fault if we let them repeat this tragic error on us.

Simply because some arrogant would-be masters are convinced that today's Americans are too ignorant or too worthless to be trusted with their own destiny. They actually think that we would literally starve in the streets unless the Government looked after our welfare. Welfare! Man, this is where we came in. They're on the way to buying and selling us again!

Now maybe you see what I started out to say. You—you're a gandy dancer, you're a hod carrier, a trolley pilot, or you take tickets at the ball park. What have I got to lose, you say? Why shouldn't I take their offer of free medicine, money for work I don't do or crops I don't grow? Why not?

Here's why not, and don't ever forget this. "If your Government is big enough to give you everything you want, it is big enough to take away from you everything you have."

And don't tell me you've nothing to lose. That's what they thought in Britain, too. But already in Britain, elected leaders can force the citizen to work wherever the government decrees they are most needed. Force!

In Russia, where this kind of security got a slight head start, they'll make him work—if necessary in leg irons.

You've nothing to lose, you say, because you're a bum? That, sir, is a priceless privilege. In Russia you would be whipped or shot for it. It is your American right to be a bum. That is part of being free.

So for Heaven's sake don't let them peddle this absurd security idea as something new. It was written into the Code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. The Romans called it "bread and circuses" to keep the crowd pacified while their sons died.

Karl Marx called it "socialism." It's where the state makes laws for your own good whether you like them or not. And Russia will imprison those who object.

It can't happen here?

Wait a minute, mister—it has happened here. Don't tell me you're still 100-percent free or I'll tell you about the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania.

They told him he had to kick in money for his own social security. He didn't like the idea of being forced to buy insurance, and resisted. The State confiscated his property.

Still he refused to obey.

So the State preferred criminal charges against him. And the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison. An enemy of the State because he had refused to pay social security. He paid. His 6-month prison sentence was suspended.

From now on, Lennie and Joe, get this straight. You do have plenty to lose. Whenever some of us try to warn you that big

Government wears brass knuckles we're not trying to get you to fight for any other man's mansion. We're trying to protect your equally important right to be a bum.

Listen and remember. The guaranteed gifts are just bait, nothing more. They'll offer the rewards of 1864—a free meal, a free roof, a guaranteed job, and then—

We're trapped into being somebody's slaves again.

New Vietnam Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial on the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia was published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on April 11.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this informative editorial:

NEW VIETNAM BLUEPRINT

(By Melvin K. Whiteleather)

What is your primary interest, to better the lot of the people or to make revolution for revolution's sake?

This is the question President Johnson put to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, with last Wednesday's proposal to end the war in Vietnam and embark on an imaginative effort to lift up the whole of southeast Asia.

U.S. effort to bring the struggle in Vietnam to a close has centered on Ho Chi Minh, rather than on Peiping or Moscow. To bombing north of the 17th parallel is now brought the additional pressure of the cooperative scheme benefitting all of North Vietnam's neighbors.

North Vietnam can be included if it is willing to stop attacking South Vietnam. But if it doesn't, President Johnson gave emphatic notification that Ho Chi Minh stood to see his territory and people injured rather than improved.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The United States no longer is just bombing; it has put its weight behind a constructive plan and those around the world who have been calling for an alternative to destruction, now have one. There was wisdom in choosing the Mekong River development skeleton plan already in existence and in inviting U.N. Secretary General U Thant to take the initiative in getting the plan off the ground and expanding it. The 21 countries already contributing to that development plan and the authority of the U.N. are brought into a direct relationship to the struggle in Vietnam. Thus it is not just a raw U.S. "imperialist" plot.

Except for countries with a revolutionary bias, this relationship should lean toward a settlement suitable to the Saigon government. The 17 nonaligned countries, led by Yugoslavia, which made a plea for peace negotiations to all parties concerned, can hardly be opposed to a development scheme that would touch a whole section of Asia and 50 million persons. The 17 need not accept at 100 percent face value the claim that the Vietcong is a tool of Hanoi in order to press for a settlement of the struggle that would leave the Saigon government in control of its own territory.

PRESSURE PUT ON OTHERS

The Johnson proposal definitely has put the pressure on the other side, relieving the United States of onus that had been building

up over the bombing in North Vietnam. Unimportant as the whole affair was, there is no doubt that the use of nonlethal gas by the South Vietnamese army, supplied by us, sharpened world opinion against us. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's path in defending our purposes and practices has now been eased and the critical Japanese have been given something else to think about.

The President's proposal hit Red China hard and Peiping is striking back with the full force of its propaganda machine. Southeast Asia blooming under other than Chinese influence is the last thing Peiping wants to see happen. The region is regarded as a Chinese preserve, and beyond that, for such a plan to get moving with U.S. dollars and moral backing would be a far cry from bringing U.S. imperialism to its knees, as Peiping says it must be brought. For the United States to put the United Nations and a cooperative plan to the forefront cuts straight across Communist propaganda.

MOSCOW'S DILEMMA CONTINUES

Peiping in its fury is losing sight of its only recent adoption of the Russian argument that any settlement in Vietnam must be between the United States and the Vietcong's political arm, the National Liberation Movement. It seems that after all, Red China does have a stake.

Mr. Johnson has not eased Moscow's dilemma a bit. On one hand the Russians might be pleased to see southeast Asia developed independent from China, and the President suggested that the Soviets should contribute to the scheme, but on the other hand there is the commitment to helping all revolutions. Russian irritation over its dilemma has been manifested the past few days by the worst cold war polemics that have been heard in the U.N. in a long time. These took place in an obscure committee where ordinarily nothing ever happens.

Peiping will do its utmost to prevent Ho Chi Minh from nibbling at the President's proposals. No one expects Ho to run up a white flag in broad daylight, but he has been given an opportunity to work his way out of his box with a certain amount of face saving.

The signals are still warning that a big attack on a Dien Bien Phu scale is in the making with the expectation that the South Vietnamese and Americans can be done in with one big swoop. If this is tried and fails, Hanoi may be ready to listen to U Thant.

Manned Space Flight's New Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert B. Hotz' editorial in the April 12 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology aptly describes the new era that our space program is entering. Mr. Hotz' analysis clearly describes the value of the Gemini program to our national security and to the Apollo lunar landing in this decade. He compares the current status of the Soviet and United States space programs and his reflections concerning this are important to all Americans:

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT'S NEW PHASE

The flights of the U.S. Gemini and the U.S.S.R. Voskhod spacecraft herald a new phase of manned space flight.

The Vostok and Mercury flights were aimed at determining man's ability to survive during prolonged space missions. The era begun by Gemini and Voskhod will determine his ability to operate spacecraft for a variety of useful purposes, many of them not even dimly discernible at present. This period in manned space flight is similar in many respects to the early years of World War I, when the airplane was suddenly transformed from the stunt and racing machine of the prewar era into the fighters, bombers and observation aircraft that dominated the western front.

The Voskhod and Gemini spacecraft are aimed at similar goals to extend the capability of manned space vehicles to a series of basic functions, such as:

Maneuvering in space: The technical feasibility of this has been demonstrated in the flight of Gemini 3, but a major effort remains to develop this maneuverability into an operational capability.

Extravehicular activity: This has been successfully demonstrated by the Soviet cosmonaut, Alexei Leonov, during the flight of Voskhod 2. It is a keystone in the process by which large structures can be erected for functioning in space.

Rendezvous and docking: Both Gemini and Voskhod are scheduled to demonstrate this function soon, using different techniques.

BROAD CAPABILITY

In this area, the achievements of whoever is first to accomplish a new feat in space will continue to attract major public attention. But the real significance of this second phase of manned space flight lies not so much in short chronological gaps between the first and second achievements, but rather in the broad capability being developed and the speed and certainty with which it is applied to specific operational tasks. For example, it is relatively unimportant that Cosmonaut Leonov did the first extravehicular maneuver in space if a Gemini astronaut expands this operational technique within a few months. Nor will the historic first maneuvers—both in changing orbits and changing orbital plane—of Gemini 3 retain much significance if the Soviet Voskhod accomplishes these same feats later this year. The interval between these two types of spacecraft demonstrating rendezvous and docking is not likely to be long or particularly significant.

Although both the United States and U.S.S.R. are committed to an attempt to land the first men on the moon, we believe that the most important aspect of this second phase of manned space flight, and of the third and operational phase that will certainly follow, will be in near-earth orbits. With the heavy U.S. commitment of resources to the Apollo lunar landing mission, it may appear to be both expedient and safe to defer the development of earth-orbital operational capabilities until after the financial and technical peak loads of Apollo have passed. We think this procedure could be a dangerous mistake.

The Soviets obviously have chosen the earth-orbital approach to their lunar landing mission. Therefore, they necessarily must develop rather fully their hardware and operational techniques in this area as a vital prelude to their lunar landing attempts and not as a postlude, in the manner of current U.S. planning. They also have made little attempt to conceal their primary military interest in the development of manned spacecraft operations in the earth-orbital area.

Thus, it is entirely possible that unless U.S. policy is drastically changed soon, the Soviets may have an opportunity to achieve the technical surprise in space that they so narrowly missed in the race to an intercontinental ballistic missile.

OPERATIONAL GOALS

If the United States had gone directly from Mercury to the Apollo program, there would be no chance to thwart this possibility of disaster. Fortunately, the Gemini program was conceived and properly expanded to provide not only a spacecraft system for developing the vital earth-orbital techniques but also for applying them to achieve operational goals. Gemini has been severely criticized in the daily press and the Congress for its rising costs and lagging schedules without much understanding of how the goals of this effort have been extended and its scope broadened. We think that in the years just ahead these same critics will switch to praise and thanks for the existence of the Gemini hardware and operational concepts as the national need for them becomes painfully apparent to all.

Now, the U.S. space policy planners are facing a decision on how best to develop fully and swiftly an earth-orbital operational capability during the same period that Apollo needs the hardest push to achieve an early lunar landing.

Because of the existence of the Gemini program it is still possible to do both without serious danger of being confronted with a major military surprise by the Soviets in the next few years. But some hard decisions are required almost immediately if this opportunity is not to slip from this Nation's grasp. National Aeronautics and Space Administration can contribute to this goal by pushing developmental testing of Gemini systems as a top priority. The Air Force should be able to develop the required operational capability by pushing its military orbital laboratory program based on Gemini hardware as fast as technically feasible. But nothing can be achieved without some swift decisions in the Pentagon and White House on the course of a sound military space program. The time is growing late.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the farmers, businessmen, and community leaders in the First District of Idaho anxiously awaited the announcement of the agricultural message and recommendations of President Johnson. In the past years, they have been plunging deeper into debt, hoping for better programs and prices. Since the date of H.R. 7097's introduction, I have received many letters about the wheat provisions of that bill, most of which could be called "less than enthusiastic". All are in accord with the stated objective of putting farm income into balance with that of other industries, but many are skeptical about the success of H.R. 7097 toward that end. One-hundred percent of parity for wheat domestically consumed is applauded widely, and most farmers would like to be assured of this absolutely. The discontinuance of export subsidies and certificates is not opposed, but nearly every one agrees that a 4-year program is necessary, rather than the 2-year pro-

posal. Diversion payments are necessary to reduce surplus production, but many say that a strategic resurgence of wheat, based on 50 percent of our annual domestic and export needs would be wise. Continuance of the feed grain program is regarded as a very important element for equitable farm returns, but the elimination of oats and rye from the base very adversely and inequitably affects many farmers in my area. Overall, I think the observation of a very astute farm reporter is accurate:

The present provisions of the farm bill will probably be condemned by faint praise.

A good analysis of the present provisions of the farm bill were made by a very highly regarded newspaper editor in my district. Under unanimous consent I included it in the RECORD:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Apr. 7, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON'S NEW FARM BILL

President Johnson's first major farm bill presented to Congress Monday offered no sweeping changes in philosophy—simply higher support prices for wheat and rice, with citizens paying more of the costs in grocery bills rather than taxes.

Despite prompt and vigorous criticism from the heads of two major farm organizations, the President's proposal is likely to be fairly popular with wheat and rice farmers. It probably will be accepted without much complaint by most consumers—who tend to object more to taxes than to higher prices for goods. And it will help ease the strain on the Federal budget, if Congress approves it—which seems likely for that reason alone, if no other.

The new bill did not develop an earlier hint by the President that farm legislation might be offered which would emphasize benefits to small farmers, rather than across-the-board subsidies to small and large producers alike.

Such an arrangement is economically feasible, perhaps under some variation of the controversial plan once presented by former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. That plan called for direct Federal subsidies to farmers proportioned on the basis of need, with consumers getting the benefit of lower costs of food products sold on an open, unsupported market.

However, this approach probably is not politically feasible. The "family-sized farm," which for many years was the foundation of American agriculture, is fast becoming a rarity. Farmers who work sections instead of acres also have their economic troubles these days—and vigorously insist upon their full share of any benefits provided by Government through direct subsidies or price supports.

Mr. Johnson's farm bill naturally did not satisfy the quarreling leaders of two of the Nation's big farm organizations.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, which generally represents small farmers looking to Government for aid, declared that "the major deficiency is the failure of the bill to provide the income that farm families and rural Americans need if they are to survive * * * It is high time that the direction of agricultural policies be given back to the Department of Agriculture or to people with experience in farming."

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which generally reflects the big-farmer view that the law of supply and demand should be allowed to function in agriculture, whatever the results to "submarginal" farmers was even more caustic.

The President's bill, he said, was "a hoax designed to trap both farmers and consumers." The proposals, he said, "would make farmers more dependent on Government subsidies for their livelihood, and at the same time raise the price of food to consumers, especially those with low incomes."

The gulf between these spokesmen obviously is too great for any farm bill to bridge. One wants higher price supports or subsidies to insure the survival of small farmers, with taxpayers footing the bill. The other wants an open market in agriculture without Federal subsidy and with many small farmers liquidated if necessary in a drastic "readjustment" based on survival of the fittest.

Neither alternative is politically acceptable to most farmers or consumers. As long as the wide gulf exists in farm opinion, any administration will be forced to seek some middle ground. Despite his earlier hints, this is what the President did.

Under the proposed bill, wheat grown for domestic use would be supported by Government at full parity prices—at about \$2.50 a bushel instead of the present \$2. Other wheat grown within acreage allotments would be supported at about \$1.25 per bushel—which is about the world price.

The Government would eliminate present export subsidies on wheat to be sold abroad. It would require millers to pay \$1.25 a bushel for domestic-use wheat, or 50 cents more than the present price. Millers and bakers would pass the extra cost on to consumers.

While the price of wheat has had little relation to the price of bread in recent years, the change probably would increase bread prices about a penny a loaf. A similar program would increase retail prices of rice from 5 to 7 cents a pound.

Thus, the wheat and rice growers would earn substantially more. Consumers would pay more at the supermarkets. The Federal Government would save some \$200 million per year.

Wheat and rice farmers might gain more than additional income from the arrangement. They might be exempted from some of the irate complaints from taxpayers about the cost of Federal price support programs—even though the taxpayers would be paying farmers more as consumers.

The Federal Government would save sizable sums in an arrangement which once again illustrates Mr. Johnson's tendency to shift Federal expenditures from long-established agricultural programs to some of the newer, long-neglected problems of the Nation's population centers and poverty pockets.

The consumers would pay prices for wheat and rice which would be artificially high in terms of world markets, but still a bargain as compared with other products they buy.

The new wheat-rice program proposed by the President isn't a dramatic new approach to the chronic problems of agriculture. Perhaps no such approach is possible unless farmers unite behind common objectives or until population pressures or wider world trade abolish the problem of crop surpluses.

The new bill does seem to represent a politically shrewd innovation to offer some relief to wheat and rice farmer—and the Federal Treasury—with consumers paying the bill in pennies instead of tax dollars.—B. J.

A New Look at Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the April 22, 1965, issue of the New York Review

of Books, the Washington journalist, I. F. Stone, has written an incisive review of two new books on Vietnam: "The New Face of War" by Malcolm W. Browne, and "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam. Mr. Stone's review is a welcome addition and insight into the complex problems facing this war-torn area. I urge all my colleagues to read the following review:

[From the New York Review of Books, Apr. 22, 1965]

VIETNAM: AN EXERCISE IN SELF-DELUSION
(By I. F. Stone)

("The New Face of War," by Malcolm W. Browne, Bobbs-Merrill, 284 pages, \$5; "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam, Random House, 312 pages, \$4.95.)

The morning I sat down to write this review, the Washington Post (March 25) carried the news that Malcolm W. Browne had been arrested and held for 2 hours by South Vietnamese Air Force officers at the big U.S. air and missile base at Da Nang. The incident is symbol and symptom of the steady degeneration in the conduct of the Vietnamese war. These two books by two newspapermen who won Pulitzer Prizes last year for their coverage of the war, Browne for the Associated Press, David Halberstam for the New York Times, record the agony of trying to report the war truthfully against the opposition of the higher-ups, military and civilian. The books appear just as the war is entering a new stage when honest reporting is more essential than ever, but now restriction and censorship are applied to black it out. Da Nang, the main base from which the war is being escalated to the north, was officially declared "off limits" the day before Browne's arrest and newsmen were told they could not enter without a pass obtainable only in Saigon, 385 miles to the south. "Newsmen," the dispatch on Browne's arrest said, "doubted such a pass existed." The incident occurred only a few days after the highest information officer at the Pentagon claimed that its policy on coverage of the war was "complete candor."

What makes these books so timely, their message so urgent, is that they show the Vietnamese war in that aspect which is most fundamental for our own people—as a challenge to freedom of information and therefore freedom of decision. They appear at a time when all the errors on which they throw light are being intensified. Instead of correcting policy in the light of the record, the light itself is being shut down. Access to news sources in Vietnam and in Washington is being limited, censorship in the field is becoming more severe. Diem is dead but what might be termed Diemism has become the basic policy of the American Government. For years our best advisers, military and civilian, tried desperately to make him understand that the war was a political problem which could only be solved in South Vietnam. Three years ago the head of the U.S. mission spoke of the war as a battle for the "hearts and minds" of the people, and primarily the villagers, whose disaffection had made the rebellion possible against superior forces and equipment. To win that battle it was then proposed to spend \$200 million to bolster the Vietnamese economy and raise living standards. Though much of this money seems to have been frittered away, it was at least recognized that the military effort was only one aspect of the problem. Now we have adopted Diem's simple-minded theory that the war is merely a product of Communist conspiracy, that it is purely an invasion and not a rebellion or a civil war, and that all would be well—in Secretary Rusk's fatuous phrase—if only the North let its neighbors alone. This is the theory of the white paper and this is the excuse for bombing North Vietnam.

While the war expands, the theory on

which it proceeds has narrowed. Washington's "party line" on the war has been shrunk to rid it of those annoying complexities imposed by contact with reality. The change becomes evident if one compares the white paper of 1965 with the blue book of 1961. The blue book was issued by the Kennedy administration to explain its decision to step up the scale of our aid and the number of our "military advisers" in South Vietnam. The white paper was issued by the Johnson administration to prepare the public mind to accept its decision to bomb the north and risk a wider war. The change of policy required that rewriting of history we find so amusing when we watch it being done on the other side.

Four years ago the blue book told us that the basic pattern of Vietcong activity was "not new, of course." It said this followed the tactics applied and the theories worked out by Mao Tse-tung in China. It said much the same methods were used "in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos." If there is "anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation," the blue book said, "it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is supported with both personnel and materiel." This implied a conflict which was doubly a civil war, first between the two halves of a divided country and then between the Government and Communist-led guerrillas in one-half of that country.

The white paper disagrees. It abandons complexity to make possible simpleminded slogans and policy. It declares the conflict "a new kind of war * * * a totally new brand of aggression * * * not another Greece * * * not another Malaya * * * not another Philippines * * *." Above all * * * not a spontaneous and local rebellion against the established government." [Italic in the original.] The "fundamental difference," the white paper says, is that in Vietnam "a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state." This implies that there is no popular discontent in the south to be allayed, no need to negotiate with the rebels. The war is merely a case of international aggression and the aggressor is to be punished by bombardment until he agrees to call off the invasion. The rebellion can be shut off, all this implies, as if by spigot from Hanoi. The truth about the war has been tailored to suit the Air Force faith in "victory by airpower." This was Goldwater's theory and this has become Johnson's policy.

Browne's book sheds some sharp light on the white paper's thesis. The white paper says the war is "inspired, directed, supplied and controlled" by Hanoi. But Browne reports that "intelligence experts feel less than 10 percent and probably more like 2 percent of the Vietcong's stock of modern weapons is Communist made." He also reports that "only a small part of Vietcong increase in strength has resulted from infiltration of North Vietnamese Communist troops into South Vietnam." An astringent examination of the white paper and its supporting appendices will show that it really proves little more than this, despite the sweeping headline impressions it was intended to generate. Browne also tells us that "Western intelligence experts believe the proportion of Communists (in the National Liberation Front) is probably extremely small." He describes it as "a true 'front' organization appealing for the support of every social class." Browne declares the front a "creature" of the Vietnamese Communist Party and says it has "strong but subtle ties" to the Hanoi regime. For many Vietnamese, nevertheless "the front is exactly what it purports to be—the people's struggle for independence." This is what our best advisers tried to tell Diem. This is what our bureaucracy now refuses to see rather than admit past error and defeat, preferring to gamble on a wider war.

April 15, 1965

A1897

The really terrible message in these books is not that the bureaucrats have tried to deceive the public but that they have insisted on deceiving themselves. The Vietnamese war has been an exercise in self-delusion. David Halberstam tells us in "The Making of a Quagmire" that when the first Buddhist burned himself to death, Ngo Dinh Diem was convinced that this act had been staged by an American television team. The Buddhist crisis, as Halberstam describes it, "was to encompass all the problems of the Government: its inability to rule its own people; the failure of the American mission to influence Diem. * * * Observing the Government during those 4 months was like watching a government trying to commit suicide." The stubborn insistence of the South Vietnamese dictator on insulating himself from reality spread into our own Government. The most important revelation these two books make is the unwillingness of the higher-ups in Saigon and Washington to hear the truth from their subordinates in the field.

South Vietnam swarmed with spies, but apparently they were only listened to when they reported what their paymasters wanted to hear. Halberstam says that at one time Diem had 13 different secret police organizations. Browne provides a vivid picture of how our own intelligence agencies proliferated. The CIA, Special Forces, the AID mission, the Army, the provost marshal, the Navy, and the U.S. Embassy each had its own operatives. But they were not, in Browne's words, "one big happy family." On the contrary they "very often closely concealed" their findings from other agencies "because of the danger that the competitors may pirate the material and report it to headquarters first, getting the credit."

All this fierce application of free enterprise to the collection of information seems to have been of little use because of a top level political decision. "Ever since Vietnamese independence" (i.e., 1954), Browne reveals, "American intelligence officials had relied on the Vietnamese intelligence system for most of their information." This was "because of Diem's touchiness about American spooks wandering around on their own." In the interest of preserving harmony, "somehow the intelligence reports always had it that the war was going well." We circulated faithfully in orbit around our own satellite. Diem's men told him what he wanted to hear, and ours passed on what he wanted us to believe. Halberstam confirms this. In those final months before Diem's overthrow, "CIA agents were telling me that their superiors in Vietnam were still so optimistic that they were not taking the turmoil and unrest very seriously." John Richardson, then CIA chief in Vietnam, displayed a kind of infatuation with Diem's brother Nhu and his wife. Halberstam describes a lunch with Richardson in 1962, shortly after the New York Times sent him to Saigon, in which the CIA chief dismissed Nhu's notorious anti-American remarks as simply those of "a proud Asian." As for the tigerish Mme. Nhu, Richardson thought her "sometimes a little emotional, but that was typical of women who entered politics—look at Mrs. Roosevelt."

A persistent Panglossianism marked our entire bureaucracy up to and including the White House. General Harkins, our military commander in South Vietnam, said "I am an optimist and I am not going to allow my staff to be pessimistic." Halberstam describes a briefing at his command post after the battle of Ap Bac in January 1963, the kind of set-piece battle for which our military had long hoped and which they first described as a victory though it turned out to be a disastrous defeat. With "the government troops so completely disorganized that they would not even carry out their own dead," "a province chief shelling his own men" and "the enemy long gone," General

Harkins told the press a trap was about to be sprung on the enemy!

The enemy was the press. When the facts about Ap Bac could no longer be concealed, headquarters became angry "not with the system" that brought defeat, Halberstam writes, nor with the Vietnamese commanders responsible for it "but with the American reporters who wrote about it." Adm. Harry Felt, commander of all U.S. forces in the Pacific, gave classic expression to the bureaucratic attitude toward the press when he was angered by a question from Browne. "Why don't you get on the team?" the Admiral demanded.

When Halberstam, Browne, and Neil Sheehan, then with the UPI, visited the Mekong Delta in the summer of 1963 and saw for themselves the deterioration of the war, their reward for reporting it was a campaign of denigration. Rusk criticized Halberstam at a press conference. President Kennedy suggested to the publisher of the New York Times that Halberstam be transferred to some other assignment, a suggestion Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, to his credit, rejected. The bureaucracy counter-attacked through Joe Alsop, who insidiously compared the reporters on the scene to those who a generation earlier had called the Chinese Communists "agrarian reformers." The New York Journal-American wrote that Halberstam was soft on communism. A friend in the State Department told Halberstam, "It's a damn good thing you never belonged to any left wing groups or anything like that because they were really looking for stuff like that." Victor Krulak, the Pentagon's top specialist on guerrilla warfare, was vehement in his criticism of the press:

"Richard Tregaskis and Maggie Higgins had found that the war was being won, but a bunch of young cubs who kept writing about the political side were defeatists." The official attitude was epitomized by Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, on his way back from Saigon in 1961. He had laid the flattery on with a shovel, calling Diem "the Churchill of Asia." Halberstam reports that when a reporter on the plane tried to tell Johnson something of Diem's faults, Johnson responded, "Don't tell me about Diem. He's all we've got out there." A brink is a dangerous place on which to prefer not to see where you're going.

The hostile attitude toward honest reporting is made the more shocking because reporters like Halberstam and Browne, as their conclusions reveal, were critics not of the war itself but only of the ineffective way in which it was conducted. The forces for which they spoke, the sources on which they depended, were not dissident Vietnamese but junior American officers. Their books disclose little contact with the Vietnamese. The battle between the press and the bureaucracy arose because the newspapermen refused to report that the war was being won, but there was not too much reporting of why it was being lost.

For Halberstam the war was a lark, a wonderful assignment for a young reporter; his pages reflect his zest and are full of graphic reportage, though also marked by some egregious errors, such as locating Dienbienphu in Laos and attributing the origin of the agrovilles to the French whereas they really sprang from Nhu's mystical authoritarianism. For Browne the war was less romantic. The life of a wire service reporter on call 24 hours a day in so tense a situation is no picnic. His book is written in flat agency prose. Both men acquitted themselves honorably, in the best tradition of American journalism, which is always to be skeptical of any official statement. But both books are marked by that characteristic intentness

on the moment; the idea that the past may help explain the present appears only rarely. There is no time for study, and American editors do not encourage that type of journalism in depth which distinguishes *Le Monde* or the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*.

This defect is most damaging in reporting on the origins of the revolt against Diem. The average American newspaper reader got the impression that this was brought about by esoteric and long-distance means, by Communist plotters activated from Hanoi to engage in that mysterious process referred to in our press as "subversion." This is the closest modern equivalent to witchcraft. Halberstam's account of the origins is better than Browne's, but the real roots of discontent are touched on only peripherally. We get a glimpse of them in Halberstam's report that General Taylor after his first mission in 1960 recommended "broadening the base of the Government, taking non-Ngo anti-Communist elements into the Government; making the National Assembly more than a rubber stamp; easing some of the tight restrictions on the local press." The prescription was for a little of that democracy we were supposed to be defending, but Diem would not take the medicine. The accumulation of grievances, the establishment of concentration camps for political opponents of all kinds, the exploitation and abuse of the villages, the oppression of the intellectuals, the appeal of the 18 notables in 1960, and the attempted military coup that year, "the longstanding abuses" which finally led to the revolt, are not spelled out as they should be² and would be if U.S. reporters had more contact with the Vietnamese. In a flash of insight Halberstam writes:

"Also, though we knew more about Vietnam and the aspirations of the Vietnamese than most official Americans, we were to some degree limited by our nationality. We were there, after all, to cover the war; this was our primary focus and inevitably we judged events through the war's progress or lack of it. We entered the pagodas only after the Buddhist crisis had broken out; we wrote of Nguyen Tuong Tam, the country's most distinguished writer and novelist, only after he had committed suicide—and then only because his death had political connotations; we were aware of the aspirations of the peasants because they were the barometer of the Government's failure and the war's progress, not because we were on the side of the population and against their rulers."

This accounts for how poorly these reporters understood the central problem of land reform, how few realized that from the standpoint of the peasants, particularly in the delta, Diem's land reform policy, like his hated "agrovilles" and our equally unpopular "strategic hamlets," seemed to be mechanisms for reinstating the rights of the landlords who had fled during the long war against the French. Diem's downfall and the rebellion's success were largely due to the fact that he tried to do what even the Bourbons in France after the Revolution were too wise to attempt. He tried to turn back the clock of the revolutionary land seizures. In the name of land reform, many peasants found themselves being asked to pay rent or compensation for land they had long considered their own.

This lack of contact with the Vietnamese people and this fellow feeling for the junior officers who were sure they could win the war if only headquarters were different, also accounts for the weak way both books fizzle out when the authors try to supply some conclusions. Both oppose negotiation and neutralization. Halberstam is indignant with the indifference to Vietnam he encountered

¹ See the vivid account in his preface to Jules Roy's agonized and eloquent "The Battle of Dienbienphu," Harper, \$6.95.

² The best account is by the French historian, Philippe Devillers in "North Vietnam Today" (Praeger, 1962) edited by F. J. Honey.

on his return home. He believes Vietnam a legitimate part of our global commitment. He feels we cannot abandon our efforts to help these people no matter how ungrateful they may seem. For the ungrateful majority, the American presence had only succeeded in polarizing the politics of the country between authoritarian Communists and authoritarian anti-Communists; the former, at least, have the virtue of being supported by native forces. The anti-Communist minority was grateful, of course, and feared that with American withdrawal they would be treated as mercilessly by the National Liberation Front as Diem had treated veterans of Vietnam after 1954, although a specific provision of the Geneva agreement forbade persecution of those who had fought against the French.

The files of the International Control Commission from 1955 onward were full of complaints that ex-Vietminh had been thrown into concentration camps or executed without charge or trial. In any eventual settlement in Vietnam, the future of minorities must certainly be a matter for concern, but the notion that we have a mandate from Heaven to impose on an unwilling people what we think is good for them will strike few Asians or Africans as an object lesson in democracy. Browne's feeble ending is even worse. "Perhaps in the end," he writes, echoing the cliches of the counterinsurgency experts at Fort Bragg, "America will find it can put Marx, Lenin, Mao, and Giap to work for it, without embracing communism itself." This was the delusion of French military men like Colonel Lacheroy and Colonel Trinquier, who returned from Indochina thinking they could apply Communist ideas in reverse to the pacification of Algeria. When frustrated, they tried to turn their borrowed techniques of conspiracy and assassination against De Gaulle and the French Republic. To apply Communist methods in reverse, the favorite formula of our counterinsurgency experts does not make them any less unpalatable or dangerous to a free society. The basic tactic confuses the effect with the cause. To see wars of liberation, the Pentagon's dominant nightmare, simply as a reflection of conspiracy, to overlook the social and economic roots which make them possible, to prescribe counterconspiracy as the cure, is not only likely to insure failure but it tends to shut off debate on peaceful alternatives. Here the growing tendency of the Johnson administration to make it seem disloyal to question the omniscience of the Presidency is reinforced by the natural tendency of the Pentagon to see doubts about resort to force as unpatriotic. There is the danger here of a new McCarthyism as the administration and the military move toward wider war rather than admit earlier mistakes.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. _____ addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Con-

gress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

there is such a demand, the public must be awakened to the seriousness of the threat presented by the current plans of the port authority. It is for this important educational task that we ask your support.

The responsibility belongs to all of us.

¹ Directors of the World Trade Corp., under ch. 928, New York Laws, 1946; 1st report, Dec. 31, 1946; 2d report, Feb. 27, 1948; 3d report, Dec. 31, 1948.

² Port authority, "A World Trade Center in the Port of New York," Mar. 10, 1961, p. 25.

³ The New York Times, Mar. 21, 1961, p. 1: 2.

⁴ Ibid., Apr. 3, 1961, p. 13: 4.

⁵ Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

⁶ The New York Times, Mar. 24, 1961, p. 25: 1.

⁷ Ibid., Mar. 28, 1961, p. 1: 1.

⁸ Ibid., Oct. 20, 1961, p. 20: 5.

⁹ Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

¹⁰ S. Sloan Colt, in a statement reported in the New York Herald Tribune, May 25, 1962, under the headline, "The Declining Port of New York"; Austin J. Tobin, in a speech before the Fordham University School of Business and Alumni Association, Dec. 24, 1962, reported in the Christian Science Monitor under the headline, "New York Port Takes Inventory."

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ralph W. Goshen, WCBS radio editorial No. 310, "WCBS Questions Feasibility of World Trade Center Proposed for Lower Manhattan," Apr. 15, 1964.

¹³ Sam J. Slate, WCBS radio editorial No. 182, Oct. 4, 1962.

¹⁴ Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, pp. 31, 32.

¹⁵ The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 82.

¹⁶ Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 67.

¹⁷ Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 69.

¹⁸ Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, p. 28.

¹⁹ The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 64.

Dams—Not Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally two excellent articles that appeared recently in the New York Herald Tribune, commenting on President Johnson's great speech at Johns Hopkins University.

The first, an editorial, very properly rejects the charge that the President was trying to "buy peace" with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia. The second article, by David Lawrence, is the more remarkable because it comes from a writer who has, to put it mildly, not always been in agreement with Democratic Presidents.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the validity of the points made in these articles will be established by history, and that the President's address at Johns Hopkins

University will go down as one of the most statesmanlike of our era.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 11, 1965]

DAMS—NOT DOLLARS

The assertion by some Americans, in and out of Congress, that President Johnson was trying to buy peace with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia is very wide of the mark. Yet it is the familiar charge leveled at the foreign aid program. Because the programs are generally stated, for simplicity, in dollars, Congressmen and the public both tend to forget that what foreign aid means to the recipient is not dollars but dams—and roads, factories, harbor works and irrigation projects.

As President Johnson said: "The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Studies and preparatory work for the plan have been underway for years, under the auspices of the U.N. To complete so grandiose of scheme will, of course, require dollars—and, one may hope, pounds, francs, marks and even rubles. It will also require peace, and a degree of political stability in an area running from Burma to the South China Sea. But above all, it will require cooperation, among the nations of southeast Asia and among the industrialized countries that can give reality to the plan.

It is this complex of needs, rather than any simple purchase of peace with dollars, that gives real meaning to the Mekong River project. For by bringing many nations together for the purpose of raising the living standards of millions of underprivileged human beings the plan could accomplish much for the region and for the world. It would help the Burmese, the Thais, the Laotians, Cambodians and Vietnamese in very practical ways. And by setting up an example of genuine international collaboration, it would reduce tensions and hold up common goals for them and for those who would supply the aid. It is a great concept, difficult of achievement, certainly, but offering hopes far beyond any mere diplomatic horse trade.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S VIET SPEECH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's latest speech on the Vietnam situation is one of the best exposition of American foreign policy that has been presented since the "cold war" began. The advisers who helped to compose it also deserve credit because they accurately assembled the facts that make up the consensus of American thinking today.

The President avoided the mistake made by the United Nations in Korea when consent was given to participate in a cease-fire which never was followed by the signing of a peace treaty.

This time there is no self-imposed restriction upon the United States to withhold military action while peace talks are proceeding. The Communists cannot with impunity, therefore, string out peace discussions year after year while at the same time conducting clandestine violations of a cease-fire agreement.

So when Mr. Johnson declared that he would enter peace talks unconditionally, it means that the United States retains its freedom of action and can punish the enemy and retaliate whenever there are aggressive acts.

The key words in the President's speech are these: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Having said this, however, the President made a constructive suggestion along an entirely different line when he called for an international program for development of southeast Asia, starting with a cooperative effort by the countries of that area. He urged Secretary General Thant of the United Nations to use his prestige to initiate such a plan and invited "all other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union," to become participants. He added: "For our part, I will ask the Congress to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is underway."

This move has been wrongly interpreted by some as merely a kind of sop to those who have been criticizing the continuing of the war. Its significance is deeper. This is the first time that the United States in recent years has publicly declared a policy that goes beyond governments and into the hearts and minds of the peoples themselves.

Whether because of timidity or indifference, the United States has not carried on a campaign directly to the peoples of the Communist-dominated countries. It has not endeavored to show them how much better off they would be if they had a free government.

The President's speech doesn't necessarily imply that there is any intention to drive a wedge between the peoples and their totalitarian governments. But the United States, in its information programs overseas and in its policy speeches broadcast abroad, has too long neglected the importance of telling the peoples of the Communist and "neutralist" countries of the willingness of the American people to help them seek a life of individual opportunity and improved economic conditions.

In countries where the hand of the oppressor is stern there is no way to attain the kind of living conditions which prevail in the free countries except by the concerted will of a determined populace.

Too often the idea of revolution is scoffed at in the belief that armies are controlled by the dictators. But, as was evidenced in 1917 in the revolution against the czar, even the army participates in the revolt when public opinion definitely desires it.

President Johnson rightly discussed the need in southeast Asia for homes for millions of impoverished people. He said:

"Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle through until the night to wrestle existence from the soil. They are often wracked by diseases, plagued by hunger, and death comes at the early age of 40.

"Stability and peace do not come easily in such a land. Neither independence nor human dignity will be ever won, though, by arms alone. It also requires the works of peace.

"The American people have helped generously in times past in these works, and now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in that conflict-torn corner of our world."

This is a welcome note in the outline of American foreign policy. It needs to be followed up by radio and every other form of communication. For history has proved that, if ideas are conveyed to a few, they spread to many by word of mouth, which indeed is the most effective form of communication in existence today. The Communist governments will, of course, reject the proposal for economic aid, but the seed will have been planted among the people.

The President wisely did not discuss details. But he made it clear that the United States wants peace—not war. He also pledged American cooperation to achieve a better life not merely for the free peoples but for those whose rights have been so elegantly abused by their rulers.

The speech was remarkable because of its forthrightness and its scope. Sooner or later

A1880

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 15, 1965

peace talks will begin, and it looks now as if the advantage then will be on the side of the United States.

A Gratifying Example of Dedication by Another Peace Corps Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in our RECORD the inspiring story of another ambassador of good will in shirtsleeves. The news item is from the Paterson Evening News of April 13, 1965, and deals with a constituent of whom I am proud, Roy H. Elsenbroek, a member of the Peace Corps.

The closing paragraphs of the article so ably written by Bert Nawyn were particularly pertinent in the week before Good Friday and Easter, as they indicate the fact that religious principles can be translated into meaningful actions.

The article follows:

(By Bert Nawyn)

HAWTHORNE.—If anybody can change the American image abroad it will be Peace Corps members such as Roy H. Elsenbroek, who returned home last week from east Pakistan.

Elsenbroek, a handsome young man of 20 years, tells of his experiences in east Pakistan with enthusiasm changing into a somber mood as he reflects on the privations of the population in that country.

GRADUATE OF EASTERN CHRISTIAN SCHOOL
ASSOCIATION

Young Elsenbroek is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Elsenbroek, 122 Westervelt Avenue, and a graduate of the Eastern Christian School Association. He entered the Peace Corps on February 28, 1963, and ended his service 2 years later.

Renewing acquaintances, he plans to become either a missionary to bring spiritual, moral, and physical assistance to deprived people or to enter the U.S. Foreign Service.

Although they have the same government, East Pakistan is separated from West Pakistan by over 1,000 miles. In between them is India.

PRIMITIVE CONDITIONS

A comparatively small area, east Pakistan is about the size of the State of Minnesota. But there the similarity ends. While Minnesota has a population of 3.5 million persons, there are 57 million people crowded into east Pakistan, most of whom have no modern conveniences, no telephones, no television or radio, no sanitary conditions, people who live in villages and hunt leopards with bow and arrow when they prowls too close to the thatched huts.

East Pakistan is on the Bay of Bengal. About 90 percent of the population are Moslems. West Pakistan, where the Government seat is located, is a modern area compared to east Pakistan, where in the larger cities the major products are burlap, jute, fertilizers, and tea crops.

Young Elsenbroek had nothing but praise for the Peace Corps and what it is attempting to accomplish. He said "We came into the country, were welcomed by statesmen and high officials, and then took our place

with the lowest class of people, to help them and show them how they could live a better life."

Elsenbroek emphasized, "There are 7,000 Peace Corps members from 18 years to grand-parents. I met one man who was 76 years old, doing a good job.

"The Peace Corps in such countries as east Pakistan is changing the American image abroad. We used to send tractors and equipment to people who are illiterate. Many times they were told that this equipment was the gift of a Communist country. Now, these same people find Americans willing to give of themselves to plan a better life. This impresses these people."

Elsenbroek was accepted in the Peace Corps shortly after graduating from Eastern Christian High School, North Haledon. After a 4-day stay in New York City for orientation, lectures, and instructions, he left with 102 other volunteers for Camp Radley, Arecibo, P.R. Camp Radley was named after the first Peace Corps member who died abroad.

SURVIVAL STUDY

At Camp Radley, a month was spent in a rigid survival course which included rock climbing and instruction in survival methods. The main objective of the course was to strengthen physical, mental, and emotional resources upon which the Peace Corps member can draw to achieve the tasks which lie ahead.

From Puerto Rico, Elsenbroek left with 48 other volunteers for Brattleboro, Vt., where a course in "Experiment in International Living" was given.

It was here that Elsenbroek learned to speak Bengali, the east Pakistan language. The program for that country was divided into nine parts, consisting of the language program, area studies, international affairs, communism, American studies, technical skills, training, the psychology of effective functioning overseas, and Peace Corps orientation.

At Brattleboro, 20 Peace Corps volunteers dropped out. Disqualification of volunteers went on during the entire training course, which lasted 240 hours.

Elsenbroek left June 11, 1963, for a new life of service to others and adventure, arriving at Dacca, in east Pakistan, on June 14.

"It was like coming into a different world which could not be compared with anything in this country. On a corner intersection was a man selling meat. He had just slaughtered a cow in an open market and was slicing the meat as the people came up to purchase a piece. Millions of flies swarmed about. The temperature was over 100° and the stench was sickening."

SHORT LIFESPAN

Elsenbroek said that because of the high mortality rate of infants the average life is from 28 to 35 years. He remarked, "These people live on a daily menu of curry and rice. Vegetables are extremely hard to grow because of flooded conditions and the extreme heat, which almost every day climbs up to 120°."

At Chittagong, where he spent most of his time, Elsenbroek worked with engineer Grant Wells, of Michigan. While at Chittagong he received a citation from the Pakistan Government for devising and erecting a cyclone shelter.

East Pakistan each year is devastated by cyclones, with thousands losing their lives. The two Peace Corps members built a 150 person cyclone shelter which was approved by the government. More are now being built.

Peace Corps members in east Pakistan helped the natives build roads, schoolhouses, and other types of buildings. All these were constructed without modern machinery.

For extracurricular activities, Elsenbroek started ball clubs with the children, with whom he soon became a favorite. While in

Jamalpur, he started a basketball team for the natives.

What struck Elsenbroek as most impressive is that natives of east Pakistan are concerned with nothing but eating, sleeping and having children.

NO TAXES

He remarked, "People in the villages are not concerned over taxes because they don't pay any, they have no social life, no PTA's, no television, no religious organizations. They lead a very simple life, one of the simplest in the world. They don't complain, because they know of nothing better. Children have wooden carved toys. This truly is primitive life."

Peace Corps members are volunteers who are not paid for their tour of duty. According to Elsenbroek, some are disappointed when they arrive at their destination. He said, "A few of those coming to east Pakistan took the next plane back to the States."

Peace Corps members do not sign up for any specific length of time. Neither does a stint in the Peace Corps exempt anyone for service in the Armed Forces.

Elsenbroek said Saturday that he felt his Christian parental, church and school training was largely responsible in his decision to devote 2 year of his life in the service of others.

He concluded "Throughout the world, the American is pictured as being interested in materialism and what he can get for himself. The Peace Corps shows the world that the American is willing to give himself so that persons in underdeveloped nations might have a better chance in life.

When a Christian enters into this phase of activity, he has before him the sacrifice of one who gave His life on the cross of Calvary. This is why I want to continue in a life of service to others."

Johnson Proposal for Peace in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the Baltimore Sun this week, there was an interesting and illuminating editorial regarding Communist reaction to President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia. The text of the editorial follows:

REJECTIONS

The initial rejection by North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union of President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia were about should have been expected. They should not be allowed to rule out the possibility of peace discussions—but approached in a more roundabout way than a public acceptance of the President's proposition—nor should they be allowed to obscure the point that the President was moving in the right direction.

Communist doctrine, in the capitals of the oddly matched triumvirate of North Vietnam, Red China and the Soviet Union, requires the government officials to pretend that there is no North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, and to claim that aggression is being committed by the United States in its effort to help South Vietnam to maintain its independence. There is reason to believe that the real policy of each of these countries—policy that is affected by old na-

tionalist concerns as well as by the present split between the Chinese and Russian Communists over the leadership of the Communist Parties around the world—may impel each of them to a different approach to the possibility of ending the war in Vietnam. It is possible that these differences will figure in the diplomatic explorations which will continue.

It must be kept in mind, too, that the Communist side will not give up its effort to overrun South Vietnam as long as there is a prospect that it will succeed and will not cost too much. To suggest, as some have, that Mr. Johnson was trying to buy peace by his suggestion for a great economic development scheme, including the Mekong River program, is to turn the facts upside down. The President was suggesting that an investment in peace is better than an investment in war, and that if peace is established all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, will benefit. At the same time he was insisting that, while the door is open to peace discussions without preconditions, the United States intends to press its present military effort. Nothing decisive is likely to happen soon. Patience and firmness are essential.

Pan American Day

SPEECH
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which designates this day, April 14, 1965, as "Pan American Day."

Today marks the 75th anniversary of the first Conference of American States which was held here in Washington and from which has developed the bulwark of democracy and freedom in our own hemisphere—the Organization of American States.

Throughout the long life of this organization, which is the oldest of its kind in the field of international relations, we have seen the wisdom of its founders and the need for its stated purposes. Among the essential purposes proclaimed by the charter of the Organization of American States are two which are most familiar to us. These are, first that the Organization is to strengthen the peace and security of the continent, and, second, that it is to prevent possible causes of difficulties and to insure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states.

In the effective accomplishment of these purposes, this Organization of 21 American Republics has in recent times presented a solid front against the encroachment of any subversive political philosophy, particularly communism, which has threatened and continues to threaten its member states.

Threats to our continental security and solidarity have taken other forms. The Cuban missile crisis and the situation at Panama, of course, were epic examples.

As we rededicate ourselves on this Pan American Day to the principles which affirm the necessity for peaceful, cooper-

ative action through the Organization of American States, let us resolve to bring to the attention of each of its member states the need for legislation such as that which was recently considered within these very Halls. I refer to legislation which provides aid to education of children born to poverty and which promotes the health and economic welfare of older persons. It seems to me that this would advance in a meaningful way one of the least known purposes of the Organization of American States, and that is, the member states shall "promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development."

It is within the Pan American framework of peace, security and an enlightened and healthy citizenry that the member states, individually and collectively, can continue to observe Pan American Day with ever-increasing significance.

A Call to National Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 and 26 of this year the city of Tucson, Ariz., was the scene of a National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest. Here, for the first time, we saw some of the extent of the poverty suffered by Mexican-Americans, Indians and other minority groups in the States comprising the Southwest.

A number of participants in the conference have prepared a report entitled "A Call to National Conscience." Because of its great importance and relevance to our country's current anti-poverty program I want to call this report to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert the report in the Appendix at this point:

A CALL TO NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

The undersigned were invited to sit as a "jury" while spokesmen for the poor and representatives of both private and public agencies aired their views on the causes of and cures for poverty in the vast area of the American Southwest. The speakers had assembled at the recent National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest—and their testimony dramatically underscored the delinquency of leadership in and for this area.

THE NATURE OF SOUTHWESTERN POVERTY

We were convinced by the testimony presented there that poverty in the Southwest has characteristics that are unique in the national American scene. The great distances in the Southwest and the economic expansion attendant on two decades of post-war prosperity and population explosion mask poverty in the rural areas, in the cities, in the mountains, and in the desert. The economic expansion of these decades has given few benefits to the poor. In New Mexico an Indian lives on a reservation on less than \$400 a year, speaking little English, growing up in a culture that never developed concepts of competition, baffled by the white

man's world of aggression and materialism. In Texas a Mexican-American family of 12 subsists on a diet consisting principally of beans and corn, trying to maintain a marginal existence on the fringe of an affluent but hostile society.

We were told of the poverty of hope for the white "Anglo" migrant farmworker who, systematically and deliberately exploited by the big agricultural growers, ekes out a family existence on \$1,100 a year. He tries vainly to understand why a nation permits—in fact, invites—foreign laborers to compete under deliberately favored conditions. California growers were described as consistently preferring Mexican bracero labor.

We heard of the poverty of education and opportunity haunting the Arizona Negro who assumed he was escaping discrimination and inadequate schooling in the Southeast, only to encounter them again under more hypocritical circumstances in an area which exhorts its citizens to "stand on their own two feet."

Poverty in the Southwest is represented by some of the Nation's most abysmal housing, and it is perpetuated by an educational system that makes no provision for the special needs of its different ethnic populations. For in the Southwest, as elsewhere in the country, the most acutely impoverished are the ethnic minorities. They include 3.5 million Spanish-surnamed people whose backgrounds may be a blend of Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and Latin-American origins; seeking identity among the recently arrived "Anglos," these people find themselves regarded as aliens. Of the area's 2.2 million Negroes, only those in California have found anything of the better life they sought when leaving the "old South," and even there this "better life" consists largely of better ghettos and slowly improving education for equal job opportunities. The Southwest includes some 200,000 Indians of varied tribes, nations, and reservations who are shuttled back and forth from rural to urban life by a confusing series of Federal policies.

Several Southwestern cities have trebled in size in the historic population explosion of the past two decades. But Southwestern civic and community leaders have ignored the fact that this population growth would necessitate preventive action against the multiplying economic and social problems confronting the region. And so the same civic leaders have neglected the aggressive social improvisations which the development of a modern, urbanized society makes imperative.

With the spread of technology and the growth of business and industry, the original occupant of the Southwest, still rooted in his native and different culture, has been completely left behind. Educationally unprepared for the technical complexity of modern America, barred by racial, social, and economic discrimination from participation in the very society to which they belong, the poor of the Southwest remain overlooked, unwanted, and ignored—by the Southwest and by the Nation.

THE ATTITUDES

The testifiers at the conference in Tucson revealed conflicts, distrust, and intense competition between the relatively prepared "Anglos" on the one hand and the severally disadvantaged Indian, Negro, and Spanish-surnamed citizens on the other. This situation, aggravated by the widespread apathy of the responsible members of the power structure toward the problem of poverty, seems to us to portend serious social disorders in the future unless extensive social reforms occur. Here, in a five-State population of 30 million, are over 8 million living on annual family incomes of less than \$3,000. Possibly only the ethnic insularities and mu-

April 15, 1965

tual distrusts of the minority groups have so far prevented the coalescence of thought and action necessary to force social reform.

Apparently a Southwestern power elite of mining, oil, cattle, real estate, and agricultural interests tends to sweep social problems under the rug. Testimony indicates that the weight of this elite is arrayed against the economic and political weakness of minority groups and of the poor generally. The press, with certain exceptions, reflects the views of the elite and reinforces its dominance. The press also exhibits a persistent suspicion of social causes and the people involved in them, thus promoting a regional antagonism to coordinated family assistance, suspicion of private philanthropy for social causes, and resistance to public planning. It proclaims that social planning properly resides in the private sector, but it supports only minor endeavors by private agencies. These factors may account for the apparent indifference of private agency directors toward much-needed private and public social reforms. They may also account for the fact that welfare administrators seem to thwart the will of the Congress and of the Nation through welfare policies that, even charitably, can only be described as inhuman.

REGIONAL INFLUENCES

Poverty in the Southwest differs from poverty in other parts of the Nation because the Southwest itself is different. A major factor of this difference is the existence of a 1,500-mile border shared with a nation whose economic standards are 30 years behind ours—a border far more open than most Americans realize. As many as 3,000 immigrants per month enter to become permanent residents. More than 30,000 commuters swarm across the border on a regular basis to work at wages which, while substandard for the United States, make them comparatively well paid residents of Mexico. Many employers, particularly agricultural growers, profit handsomely from this cheap source of labor. This foreign labor force, willing to work at 60 to 90 cents an hour, depresses the southwestern economy which is already suffering from growing automation and excess job applicants.

The relative openness of the border has created another problem—that of "semi-citizens," Mexicans who have lived in the Southwestern States, particularly Texas, for decades. For various reasons they have not become citizens. Many of them have now lost track of the personal papers or witnesses who could establish the vital statistics prerequisite for citizenship applications. Many are old and incredibly poor. Lacking citizenship, they are ineligible for most public welfare or any kind of assistance except charity. They have no homes to return to in Mexico; in this country their lot is a form of aged peonage.

We come then to some suggestions, both general and specific, for attacking poverty in the Southwest. National attention to this region is obviously overdue.

SUGGESTIONS

First, the openness of our international border must be reviewed. Steps must be taken to regulate and reduce the flow of "border commuters." Congress must enact appropriate legislation and the State Department must effect international wage agreements with Mexico. The Labor Department needs its administrative hand strengthened so that it can halt commuters when there is a demonstrably adverse effect on the U.S. labor force. State—and, where necessary, Federal—legislation is needed to apply fair labor standards to the international worker as well as our own citizen. For poverty in the Southwest cannot be separated from poverty in Mexico while the inter-

national border remains no more than an inconvenience to commuters. The problem is international in scope and should be approached internationally, even to the extent of contemplating some kind of specific joint Mexico-United States aid to northern Mexico and establishing a minimum wage to the Mexican citizens' service here. It is not enough to treat the symptoms. We must endeavor also to cure or at least ameliorate the sickness, which, in this case, is the perpetual depression that exists in the north of Mexico and spreads into our vulnerable Southwest.

We urge that public welfare agencies, instead of wasting dollars trying to ferret out chiselers, apply that energy and more to rehabilitating the poor and reducing their dependency. The Federal Government must insure that the will of Congress is honored, particularly in Texas and Arizona.

We call upon the Southwestern agricultural States, notably California, Arizona, and Texas, to bring farmworkers under the protective canopy of State labor laws. These should include minimum wage laws; laws securing workers in their rights to organize; laws against discrimination and the like.

We urge grower participation in conquering the age-old problems of seasonal crops and wages while laborers have year-round family needs. We advocate total abandonment of the bracero immigrant labor concept. We request an interstate study of education for those to whom English may be the foreign or second language.

We appeal to the States of the Southwest to reduce the varying harsh residence requirements for old-age assistance eligibility and to achieve some uniformity in their welfare and other assistance programs.

Perhaps most important of all, we plead for a new regional attitude toward social programing not only for, but subject to the ideas of the less fortunate. Perhaps a privately funded regional entity should be created to give voice to the impoverished. The various social agencies of the Southwest both public and private—agencies concerned with health, family planning, education, preparation for employment, and housing—must abandon their aloofness and yield a major portion of their planning and decisionmaking process to the disadvantaged themselves. United funds, community councils, and other similar organizations should concentrate most of their time, funds and attention on the problems of the poor and, as they do so, involve these same poor at the highest levels of policymaking. We believe that a show of patience with the neophyte social planner from depressed areas will produce unheard-of dividends. It is not now being done.

Finally, there should be national respect for the cultural differences of the great Southwest. As one of the participants at the Tucson poverty conference so eloquently stated: "We have given too little awareness to the history of this land which has made us so affluent. In our haste we tend to equate material poverty with spiritual and cultural poverty * * *. The 'Anglo' must realize that many who are poor in the Southwest have rich and priceless traditions—a cultural kind of affluence which we need badly to share. As we undertake to rid the Southwest of poverty * * * we'll be working in a land of great beauty among peoples of great beauty. We must be sure that our efforts in no way erode the great gifts of diversity which we enjoy here—diversity of language, art, dance, ceremony, religion. And the 'Anglo' perhaps must learn better to place himself properly in the history of this region—the last to arrive here—in a sense, the newcomer. We owe to ourselves the obligation not to try to overcome differences but to preserve and honor diversity. For the 'Anglo' affluence it-

self badly needs the cultural enrichment of the ancient peoples of the Southwest."

Respectfully submitted.

Leonard Duhl, M.D.; Mr. David Danzig;
Mrs. Grace Montanez Davis; Mr.
D'Arcy McNickle; Dr. Laurence
Gould; Mr. Henry Saltzman; Paul
O'Rourke, M.D.; Mr. Steve Allen; Mr.
Henry Talbert; Dr. Julian Samora;
Mr. Bernard Valdez.

MARCH 1965.

One of the Most Charming Institutions of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most charming institutions of the Great Society is the incomparable Liz Carpenter. The wife of newspaper correspondent Les Carpenter, and a former president of the Women's National Press Club, Liz Carpenter is a delightful and effective press expert for Mrs. Lyndon Johnson and for the White House in general.

Few women in America have the genuine charm and spark which Liz possesses, and an article which appears in the New York Times, April 11, 1965, and is printed below is an indication of the recognition this lady so justly deserves:

FIRST LADY'S LADY BOSWELL
(By Nan Robertson)

(NOTE.—Nan Robertson is a member of the Times Washington bureau who regularly reports White House News.)

WASHINGTON.—It was November 22, 1963, in Dallas. Elizabeth Carpenter, executive assistant to Lyndon Baines Johnson, was riding in a black limousine from Parkland Memorial Hospital to Love Field. Emerging from a daze of horror and shock, she recalls: "I was aware suddenly I was riding along with the Vice President. I started scribbling what he might have to say when we got to Washington. I gave it to him."

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead. Mr. Johnson was about to take the oath of office as 36th President of the United States in a hushed, desperately hurried ceremony inside a jet plane parked on a dirty runway.

When the plane reached Washington, President Johnson read the brief speech Mrs. Carpenter had drafted (This is a sad time for all people * * *. I ask for your help—and God's!), then turned to her, "Liz, go with Lady Bird and be of any help to her you can," he said. He left for the White House.

In the car on the way home to the Elms, the mansion the Johnsons had bought from Perle Mesta, the shaken First Lady asked her companion what to expect. "There will be reporters there. They'll want to know your reaction," Mrs. Carpenter said.

"The way I feel about it? It has all been a dreadful nightmare, but somehow we must find the strength to go on," Mrs. Johnson blurted out.

"That is your statement," Mrs. Carpenter said.

to the effect that incendiary leaflets had been dropped over Selma, Ala., from a Confederate Air Force plane.

Nothing of the kind happened.

The Confederate Air Force has no affiliation whatsoever with any of the white supremacist groups, or with any civil rights group. It does not have even one member in the Alabama area, nor does it have any aircraft within 1,500 miles of Selma, Ala.

Immediately upon hearing of the false charge, I asked the Federal Aviation Agency to make every possible effort to learn the identity of the pilot responsible for dropping the leaflets. The FAA sent two inspectors to the Selma area from its southern regional office in Atlanta, Ga., and they worked throughout the night running down leads.

The FAA has reported to me:

Our inspectors talked to U.S. marshals, border patrol, National Guard, and FBI people; however, none was able to tell us from which aircraft the drop was made since there were several aircraft in the vicinity.

If the pilot can ever be identified, the Confederate Air Force is prepared to file charges against him for falsely representing himself as a member of that organization.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it highly proper to make this known to you and to the Members of this House, that there is no finer group of men, and no more dedicated Americans, who cherish and love this country and the principles on which it was founded, than the men who compose the Confederate Air Force.

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONTINUITY IN THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

(Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

-Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my vote to pass the President's succession bill, I wish to make my views on this subject clearly written in the RECORD.

For more than 1 1/4 centuries this Nation has played a dangerous form of brinkmanship with the highest office in our land, the office which today is without a doubt the most powerful and influential in the democratic world.

This bill, we have passed, will rectify previous inconsistencies and lack of concise planning in the following important processes: discharging the powers and duties of the President in the event of his disability or incapacity; and assuring the continuity in office of the Vice President.

It can readily be seen that hesitation and lack of direction in the above areas lead to potential paralysis of our form of government. Surely none can deny the seriousness of these voids in conjunction with the position our country assumes in the free world. That we have escaped the possible tragic repercussions of these omissions have, as the President has said, "been more the result of providence than any prudence in our part."

I am happy that we have acted with diligence and speed to pass this bill. This was a bill which cut across party lines; partisan politics must and were relegated to extinction so that we could concentrate on the most sacred of legislative pronouncements—the amendment of our Constitution.

The importance of the office of President need not be dwelled on; the importance of the office of Vice President has been indelibly written by the tragic events in November 1963. The Vice President, outside of his increased authority, participation, and responsibility as an elected official, must be a position which allows instantaneous transition to the powers of the Presidency. Under this bill we have a significant departure from previous law on the subject. It declares that when the Vice-Presidency becomes vacant, the President shall nominate a candidate who shall take office after confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. One of the principal reasons for filling the office of Vice President when it becomes vacant is to permit the person next in line to become familiar with the problems he will face should he be called upon to act as President. If we are to achieve this end, we must assure that the position will be filled by a person who is compatible to the President. Cognizance of this principle has led to major political parties to allow the presidential candidate to choose his own candidate for Vice President. In this way, the country would be assured of a Vice President of the same political party as the President, someone who would presumably work in harmony with the basic policies of the President.

The incapacity or disability of the President has also been resolved by this bill. The Constitution while offering procedure to fill the vacancy of Presidency, in case of death or our Chief Executive, is silent on the procedure when the President is incapacitated by injury, illness, senility, or other infirmity. The country's security and movement must not be entrusted to the immobilized hands or incomprehending mind of a Commander in Chief, unable to command.

We have passed a bill which will allow the transitions of power to move to the Vice President and back to the President in case of the latter's disability. The finalizing of this plan will lend continuity of power and leadership to the office of the Presidency. The past history of our country has illuminated sequences in which this country was stagnated due to a President's disability. I implored this House to act, and they have, to prevent the possibility that this Nation will be encumbered with an Executive who cannot act.

FARLEY ON VIETNAM

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly members of both parties have been fondly aware of a great American and patriot, Mr. James A. Farley, former Democratic National Committee chairman and Postmaster General, whom we affectionately call "Jim." Mr. Farley was in my district last week and was interviewed by an outstanding reporter, Mr. Jack Kofoed of the Miami Herald on April 7. On April 6, Mr. Farley's wisdom appeared in the Miami Herald strongly supporting the present administration's current policy toward Vietnam. I am happy to have this appear in the body of the RECORD for my colleagues' information:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 6, 1965]

FARLEY LAUDS VIET POLICY

Jim Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic National Committee chairman, declared here Monday he wholeheartedly endorses the Johnson administration policies in Vietnam adding that "we have no other choice in the matter."

"We're in there and it's our fight whether we like it or not," Farley told reporters during a brief stopover in Miami. "The thing I'm sorry about is that other nations are not giving us more assistance."

"I thoroughly approve of what President Johnson and the administration are doing in Vietnam and I think this is the attitude of a vast majority of the American people," Farley said.

He said he sees no danger of Vietnam accelerating into World War III "because of the potential nuclear strength we have."

The 76-year-old Farley, who just completed a 2-week business trip to the Caribbean area as board chairman of the Coca Cola Export Corp., said he believes "Lyndon B. Johnson will undoubtedly go down as one of the truly great Presidents of our country."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 7, 1965]

JACK KOFOED SAYS "THANKS" IS A WORD NOT TOO OFTEN USED

The phone jangled. I answered. The voice was strong, vigorous. It said: "Hello, Jack. This is Jim Farley."

Jim was chairman of the New York Athletic Commission when I went to work in Big Town. He was a man of Irish charm, keen intelligence, an unsurpassed knowledge of politics, and an amazing memory. Farley went on to maneuver Franklin Delano Roosevelt into the Presidency, and get him reelected by the greatest landslide of votes ever known in our history until Lyndon Johnson's election last year. For years Jim has headed Coca Cola's export division.

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BRAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MILESTONE IN EDUCATION

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago Daniel Webster, in speaking of the necessity for education in a democratic society said:

Education, to accomplish the ends of good government, should be universally diffused. Open the doors of the schoolhouse to all the children of the land. Let no man have the excuse of poverty for not educating his children.

Since that far-off day, the necessity for education in America has not diminished by so much as one iota; indeed, due to the industrial, technological, and scientific revolutions, it has increased tremendously. Education is still the primary means of accomplishing "the ends of good government." And yet for far too many Americans, poverty is a bar to educating their children. By acting wisely we did loosen that bar and made a giant stride toward an avowed goal of all who have the good of our Nation at heart—the quality education of every American child.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which I voted for closely adheres to the educational recommendations of our President. Its aims have the general approval of educational bodies, such as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers; of religious organizations, such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Agudath Israel of America, the executive council of the Episcopal Church, and the United Presbyterian Church; and of highly respected commentators of American life, including Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Walter Lippmann, and Dr. Robert M. Hutchins. I can also state that the bill had the backing of the people, some of the respected newspapers, and educational authorities in my State of Massachusetts. The following words from a telegram to our great Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK in connection with hearings on the bill are indicative of this support:

I have been instructed by the president of the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents to respectfully notify you that our organization wishes to be recorded as supporting H.R. 2362 and the extension of Public Law 874. We would greatly appreciate your support of these two measures.
 (Signed) WILLIAM A. WELCH,
 Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the RECORD with my remarks two editorials in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, taken from the Springfield Union, in my home city, and the Boston Globe, both printed on April 13:

[From the Springfield Union, Apr. 13, 1965]
 NEW SOURCE OF SCHOOL FUNDS

Is President Johnson's new aid-to-education program the doorway to the Great Society or the keyhole through which the Federal Government will assume control of the Nation's public schools?

Conceivably it could be either. But those who fear the evil of Federal control may be reacting too strongly too soon. The weight of evidence suggests that State and local authorities can make good use of the new benefits without diminishing their present roles.

For one thing, Federal funds will not be entirely new to many local hands. Springfield, for example, has had a generally favorable experience with money supplied to federally impacted areas.

Nevertheless, the act is a breakthrough to new ground. It will provide \$1.3 billion to 94 percent of the country's public school districts in the year starting July 1, with subsequent authorizations to be measured against needs. Massachusetts is eligible for nearly \$20 million, and Springfield for a portion of that.

The dominant philosophy of this measure—to improve the public education offered youngsters in poor neighborhoods—presents an unprecedented challenge to local administrators and policymaking boards. If lack of money has been an obstacle to spreading the quality of education around evenly in the past, this obstacle, at least, is being lessened.

The task will be to direct the funds where the most good will be done the underprivileged children, rather than on improvements where education already is good. Communities may have to face hard choices between elaborate new buildings, on the one hand, and additional teachers—perhaps with a bonus for special skills at inspiring slum inhabitants—on the other.

The national civil rights awakening and the war on poverty are very much involved. In fact, the antipoverty effort may overlap the educational effort at some points. That is one of the hazards of falling back on the admittedly cumbersome Federal machinery to finance local programs.

But it is hard to see how the hard-taxed States and localities can make the necessary advances in these areas without reclaiming a greater share of the Federal tax dollar. That is what is happening now, and it will be advantageous to the next generation of Americans if the present generation of administrators measures up to the challenge and opportunity.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 13, 1965]

MILESTONE IN EDUCATION

The signing by President Johnson of the \$1.3 billion aid-to-education bill is a milestone. It was preceded by decades of deadlock and bitter fighting, and in almost all the earlier struggles the sticking point was Federal aid to parochial schools.

The overwhelming Senate vote on the measure Friday night, in just the form the administration wanted it, was Mr. Johnson's greatest legislative victory. He was obviously deeply moved when he affixed his signature to it at the old Texas country school where he had his first lessons, and gave the pen he used to his first teacher.

He said then he deeply believed that "no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of our Nation."

Of the \$1.3 billion aid package for this

year, Massachusetts is slated to get a relatively small portion, about \$19.6 million. The reason lies in the distribution formula, which primarily aids schools in areas of poverty. The Bay State's percentage of children from low-income families (under \$2,000) is among the lowest of the States—namely 4 percent. The upshot is that the bulk of the "educational poverty" dollars will go to the rural Southern States. It may help their attitude in education for Negroes.

A more equitable formula may be worked out in years to come. But most Massachusetts residents will be content for now that a major general aid-to-education measure has at last been passed. They will recall the acrid row in 1949 over aid to parochial schools in the late Senator Robert A. Taft's bill. The bitterness reached its height in a public spat between Francis Cardinal Spellman and the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The cardinal later quarreled publicly with the late President Kennedy—who believed that direct Federal aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional.

The new measure will provide aid to private and church schools—but indirectly. For pupils in all schools it will provide textbooks, library facilities and a wide assortment of educational services they do not now have.

The main point of the administration is that the Federal aid will go to parochial pupils—not parochial schools. In this way it is hoped that the divisive issue will have been skirted, and that the law will survive a constitutional challenge.

That such a challenge will come is a certainty. There are sincere persons and groups who are all for Federal aid to education—but feel that the new law simply does not meet the constitutional test of the separation of church and State. But even if the high court should knock out this indirect aid to parochial schools, it does not mean that Federal funds would stop flowing into public schools. The two can be separated.

Even with the relatively small size of Massachusetts' allotment, its receipt here will be most welcome. The big lift, of course, would come with legislative passage of the Willis report recommendations, and a new tax program to relieve property owners.

The Federal Constitution is silent, specifically, on aid to religious schools, as well as to parochial pupils. The sooner the Supreme Court makes a definitive ruling, the sooner there will be an end to second-guessing and anxiety.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Mr. DE LA GARZA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, there is an organization headquartered near the city of Mercedes, in the 15th Congressional District of Texas, known as the Confederate Air Force.

This is not a warlike organization. It is not a political organization. I suppose one might properly call it a sentimental and patriotic organization. It has one purpose, and only one: to preserve and enshrine the World War II aircraft and to honor the pilots who flew these planes and helped to defeat the tyrannical forces that threatened to overrun the world.

I know personally many of the fine men making up this organization, and I join them in deploring the fallacious news accounts which appeared recently

We liked each other in the old days, but our paths were widely divergent. I saw him a few times during the Roosevelt days, and occasionally thereafter. But James Aloysius Farley's memory reaches far into the past. He isn't one to forget someone he liked when we were all younger and the world was not so tense.

When he passes through Miami on his way to South America, he calls, and we chat a bit. It is the kind of thoughtfulness that makes the world a warmer place in which to live.

My day was brighter because of his call. A small thing in itself, perhaps, but it is a continuation of small things that bring a lift to the heart.

Before Jim's call, the day had started well. I had written a piece about Debbie Reynolds when she was here. A note came from her in Beverly Hills, thanking me for being nice to her.

Thanks is a word not often used, particularly to columnists, so Debbie Reynolds' thoughtfulness, and Jim Farley's, gave me a great lift.

Courtesy is the most neglected of all attributes to a happy life. Lack of it causes thousands of deaths by automobiles, breaks up marriages, makes enemies of those who should be friends. People like Jim Farley and Debbie Reynolds are instinctively courteous because they are nice people, way deep down nice people. Everyone cannot only help make the days of others pleasanter because of thoughtfulness, but their own much happier, too.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XLVIII

(Mr. MULTER, at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles from the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1965 on the continuing crime crisis in New York.

The articles are a part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follow:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: COURTS, PUBLIC
CRITICIZED BY MURPHY

(NOTE.—In yesterday's "New York City in Crisis," the Herald Tribune documented the growing fear of violence in the streets and even the homes of New York as viewed through the eyes of its citizens. Today, Police Commissioner Murphy, three district attorneys, and the head of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association give their views as to what should be done.)

(By Barry Gottreher, of the Herald Tribune staff)

Charging that judicial decisions and public indifference have handicapped the police department's efforts to protect the city's 8 million people, Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy called yesterday for an urgent re-examination of the "delicate balance between individual liberties and the welfare of society as a whole."

"The weapons, which we have used with success in the defense of our communities, are being blunted by judicial decisions and rusted by public indifference," he said at the monthly luncheon of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

"We ask with increasing urgency for a new look, a new deal, a new frontier. We ask that you consider the road ahead and decide for yourselves whether this overprotection of the individual at the expense of the community will lead to Utopia or to a hell on earth."

The commissioner said he spoke of this not in bitterness or criticism but as a statement of fact.

He added that "when efforts are made, as they have been in the State of New York, to enact legislation formalizing basic concepts (of police authority), they are met with accusations of 'police state' and invasions of individual rights.

"These objections," he said, "come in large measure from well-meaning groups and individuals who pride themselves on their zealous safeguarding of individual rights. What they fail to realize, and what the community as a whole tends to overlook, is that the history of democratic society is a constant reevaluation of the delicate balance between individual liberties and the welfare of society."

New York's growing awareness of violence in the streets was heightened with the release of the crime statistics several weeks ago.

The shocking figures showed that in only 1 year major crimes of violence had risen 13.8 percent, assaults 13.9 percent (and, according to police, many are never reported), robberies 17.1 percent, forcible rapes 28.1 percent, murders and nonnegligent manslaughters 16.1 percent, and major subway crimes 52 percent.

Contributing to this crisis in crime, said Commissioner Murphy, an attorney, are "rising crime rates and billions of dollars lost by theft and vandalism. They wreak their havoc in needless deaths and injuries. They have as adjuncts the menace of drug addiction, the perversion of our moral standards, and the untold misery of homes broken by crimes of violence and sexual molestations.

"In fact, the fate and future of our young and our Nation are at stake. For those who follow us either must be strengthened to continue our fight or unfortunately become captives or collaborators of the forces of crime."

He said the police are "puzzled and bitter because too often they are ill supplied and ill supported by the community, which hides in its homes, ignoring the battle ranging around it," remain the primary deterrent against "complete criminal victory."

He was highly critical of the citizens' prevailing attitude toward the police and said that even if there were some 20th-century Paul Revere to awaken the citizenry to the growing crisis of crime, "he would—I fear—be met with false cries of 'brutality' and answered with a constant refrain, 'Let's not get involved.'"

Emphasizing that professional law enforcement officials do not and never will condone "brutalized extraction of confessions or other illegal acts committed in securing evidence of guilt," he maintained that "carefully controlled legal procedures do not create a gestapo.

"Police states," he continued, "are created when the community loses its perspective, accepts slogans and catchwords instead of facts, and when a government of laws is weakened by corruption of its judiciary, the abdication of its responsibilities by the bar and by the legislative branch—and by public apathy."

He hastened to add, however, that he did not foresee "that horrible day for this great Nation."

Outspoken and hard hitting in his charges of civil apathy and disrespect, Commissioner Murphy gave three specific examples of recent cases emphasizing what he called "some of our current problems."

In the first, policemen, with probable cause to arrest a suspect for robbery, arrived at a hotel where the suspect was staying only to be told that he was out. After explaining to the room clerk what they were after and their concern because the man was known to be armed, the police were allowed to enter the room.

The suspect was not there but the police quickly found a gun, with a clip and cartridges. When the man returned to his room, the police arrested him.

The court ruled, however, that the search for and seizure of the gun, clip, and cartridges was unreasonable, struck down the subsequent conviction of the defendant and ordered a new trial. According to the commissioner, the State will not be permitted to use the weapon in evidence at the retrial.

"Had the accused been in his room," said the commissioner, "the search and the seizure would have been reasonable because it would be considered incidental to his lawful arrest. The gun could then have been properly admitted in evidence and his conviction would have been upheld."

In the second case, a defendant and two companions who had been sitting in a parked car since 10 p.m. were arrested for vagrancy at 4 in the morning. After they had been booked, police searched their car and found two loaded revolvers, caps, women's stockings (one with mouth and eye holes, rope, pillow slips and an illegally manufactured license plate equipped to be snapped over another plate.

Though they were convicted of conspiracy to rob a bank, the conviction was set aside when the court ruled that the search and seizure of the articles was improper because the car had not been searched at the time of the arrest.

"Thus," according to the commissioner, "very convincing evidence could never be used. As Judge Cardoza said, 'The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.'"

In the third case, a policeman watched a man drag a heavy suitcase down the street one night, stop at a public bench, place the valise behind him and sit down. The policeman walked over to the man and asked him where he had obtained the valise.

"What valise?" the man answered.

REFUSES TO ANSWER QUESTIONS

When the policeman told the man he had seen him drag a heavy suitcase down the street and place it behind the bench, the man refused to answer any further questions. At this point, the policeman took the man—and the valise—into the station.

Though subsequent investigation disclosed that the suitcase contained articles that had just been stolen, the court ruled that the arrest was unlawful and the evidence of the burglary illegally seized because the policeman did not know the burglary had been committed when he approached, questioned and detained the defendant. Because of this, the case against the defendant was dismissed.

Concluding his talk, Commissioner Murphy said, "It is an established safety procedure that, before a plane takes to the air, a warning light flashes the words, 'Fasten your seat belts.'"

"I would suggest that every time an attempt is made to further limit the authority of law enforcement, your own warning light go on and that you be prepared to fasten your seat belts for the turbulent flight into the gathering storm."

VIEWS ON CRISIS SERIES

Earlier in the week, Commissioner Murphy offered a special statement of his views to the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" series. In it, he said:

"It is in the very nature of social and intellectual advancement that we the people impose limitations and rigid restraints on our police. We are a highly civilized society living in the midst of violence. The criminal mind has no principles; only contempt for society manifested in aggression, violence, and defiance of our laws."

Our system of justice frequently favors the criminal and frustrates law and order. But

in our advanced society we would have it no other way. When crime erupts in a neighborhood and tension runs high, the law abiding community calls for police action and indulges in wishful thinking; hoping for some master stroke to end the terror. But the police must deal with reality within the framework of established principles of justice and rules of evidence. This kind of challenge impels the police toward ever greater achievement; accomplishments which are reflected each day with an increasing number of arrests on the streets of our city. Last year, felony arrests rose 14.6 percent; misdemeanor arrests increased 17.5 percent.

If crime were purely a police matter there would be less criminal activity in New York City than in any other community on earth. Our police force is a militant, highly disciplined, smooth functioning organization second to none. Police strength is at an all-time high of 26,210. And we are still growing. Five hundred men are scheduled for induction in April and more in June. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, Mayor Wagner has recommended an additional increase of 1,000 men.

Increases in police manpower will undoubtedly improve the community's safety and repose. But I have no illusion that law enforcement alone can eradicate crime. A substantial reduction in crime requires the sustained and coordinated efforts of the courts, the legislature, educators, social scientists and clergy; all working in cooperation with police and supported by the great multitude of law-abiding citizens.

The police are not omniscient; nor can they be omnipresent. It would be impractical and unrealistic to station a policeman on every street and corner, at every business establishment, in every hallway, in every self-service elevator, in every backyard, in every alley; ad infinitum.

The responsibility for crime is not an exclusive police matter. The responsibility must be placed where it belongs on the criminal element and on the society in which crime breeds. The police are neither guarantors nor insurers of social behavior. In New York City, we have the best trained and best equipped law enforcement agency in the world. But we can offer no panacea. To look to the police for a miracle cure for the twisted criminal mind is to flirt with fantasy and ignore the world of reality.

The criminal element constitutes a very small minority but their conduct has great and terrifying impact on the entire community. A high degree of peace and good order is within our grasp. But it requires a massive attack by all of society: The courts, the legislature, teachers, clergy, sociologists, penologists, probation authorities and the great mass of people who respect the law—firm in purpose and united in action—can have a profound effect in achieving a more peaceful community.

In terms of improved public safety, the New York City police force is making more progress at a faster rate than any other law enforcement agency on earth. They will continue to work tirelessly and relentlessly to protect the public peace.

A CITY AFRAID: WHAT FOUR LAWYERS SAY

(NOTE.—Crimes of violence have soared in New York City and the fear of violence continues to spread among the city's 8 million people. As they have never been before, New Yorkers today are afraid—in their streets, in their parks, in their subways, and even in the privacy of their own homes and apartments. Here, for the Herald Tribune's "New York City in Crisis" series, four experts, the men who must supply the answers, explore the problems and offer possible answers.)

Frank D. O'Connor, district attorney, Queens County:

"There is a growing temptation to believe that somewhere in the process of law enforcement, criminal investigation and prosecution there is a magic switch that only needs to be thrown to solve the problem of crime. All of us in law enforcement sincerely wish there was such a switch.

"But reality is more complicated and stubborn. And to compound the problem is the fact that our concept of crime is changing.

"No field of human concern, therefore, is marked by more ferment and contradictions today than the criminal law.

"Some people cry out for rehabilitation and prevention, others for defendants rights, still others for swift prosecution and long sentences and still others for shorter sentences, etc.

"If all the suggested panaceas were embraced indiscriminately, the crime cost already second only to defense—would probably exceed the defense budget itself and still be of doubtful value.

"To devise a new, balanced and realistic attack on crime, we must see the whole problem and distinguish reality from illusion.

"Unless guilty people can be proven guilty, the law and all it can ever offer ideally by way of rehabilitation and prevention is at once academic and even laughable.

"And yet, law enforcement is being divested of many of the sound instruments of swift investigation and secure prosecution by courts concerned with antiseptic almost angelic methods of proof and with principally one phase of the problem—the rights of defendants. These rights are precious but they are only part of the complexus of problems and interests involved with crime. Layman and professional must try to see the whole problem and make a conscientious and enlightened study of all the values involved and then act. From a presidential panel to a metropolitan institute of criminology such study is already being considered.

"In my judgment, these are some of the more important areas where courageous and creative study and action must follow:

"The effectiveness of the policeman on the beat must be enhanced. His may not be the last word on the law but it is very often the very first. The law must be definite and realistic enough to enable him to act with dispatch and sureness.

"The public must accept a single standard of justice not a double one—when they are injured and when they are injuring.

"Some laws which are in a state of flux—like those involving gambling and narcotics addiction—must frankly be revised, pruned or outrightly abolished. Addiction is estimated to be related to approximately half of our urban crime. It is primarily a sickness and should be treated as such.

"First offenders should be helped in the fullest sense of that term. That does not mean excused or ignored.

"Fair and equal treatment, especially with regard to sentencing must characterize our justice.

"Courtesy and reasonable dispatch must accompany the handling of cases. Plea-taking should not be regarded as a subject for suspicion. Many factors enter into taking a plea and mercy may be one of them in some instances but so, too, may information. Its value to the system is also important as a factor in reducing the backlog.

"We must continue to develop and be able to use an ever improving 20th-century investigative technology on the 20th-century criminal syndicate.

"We must remember, however, that there is no ultimate magic in the criminal law. For the law establishes only an immediate context wherein other arts, disciplines, professions and sciences must be allowed to work their power ultimately over the moral character, mental and physical life of the offender

during a long period of time and under the most ideal circumstances.

"As a background of this professional re-evaluation of the criminal law, there must certainly also be a concurrent promoting of a fair and more humane society, for crime is still rooted, in part at least, in the other complicated social, economic and moral problems of our time."

Aaron E. Koota, district attorney, Kings County:

"The problem of crime basically is twofold. First are the underlying causes or conditions in our society which are conducive to crime. Within this category lie the absence of fair and equal employment and educational opportunities, poverty, discrimination, lack of proper housing and environment. These, however, present long-range problems to which are addressed the studied efforts of experienced and knowledgeable public officials and civil leaders.

"But how do you approach the second phase, which is the immediate problem of dealing with day-by-day crimes of violence? In the County of Kings, there has been a substantial increase in violent crimes. To meet this expanding challenge of the criminal, immediate and vigorous law enforcement is essential.

"A serious obstacle to such enforcement lies in the present confused and muddled state of the law in areas such as search and seizure, wiretapping, confessions, the right of the accused to counsel and the oft-competing claims to jurisdiction of the State and Federal courts.

"Prompt legislation to clarify these uncertainties is essential or law enforcement will face insuperable obstacles. What is essential to stem the tide of crime is not so much an extension of the powers of the police as it is a resolution of doubt concerning the extent of the present powers.

"An all-out assault by all law enforcement agencies within the framework of the law is imperative so that the streets, our parks, our subways may be made safe against the onslaught of the hoodlum and thug and restored to the decent citizens of our community where they rightfully belong. Thus can the city of New York maintain and enhance its reputation as a city of law and order.

"It is essential, also, that criminal business be dispatched with all possible speed. Justice delayed is justice denied. Where a backlog of cases exists, crime is encouraged. Since September 1962, following court reorganization and with the cooperation and counsel of the administrative board of the New York State judicial conference, of which Mr. Presiding Justice George J. Beidock is at the helm in the second judicial department, the backlog of pending cases has been considerably reduced, and our criminal calendars are reasonably up to date."

John A. Braisted, Jr., district attorney, Richmond: "As far as the court backlog in Richmond is concerned, there is a backlog which has been caused primarily by reason of the fact that in 1964 there were only six trial terms. We believe that the backlog will be taken care of or removed, because there now have been assigned 10 trial terms.

"My personal opinion on reducing crime is that there is a need to establish a more equitable balance between the rights of the public to be protected from criminal violence and the rights granted to a person accused of crime. Our appellate courts have liberally construed the rights of an accused at the expense of public security. Victims of crime have become the forgotten people. There is a direct relationship between the rate of crime and the probability of conviction. Since the probability of conviction and subsequent imprisonment have decreased as a result of these decisions, the rate of crime has increased. This is only one cause for the

tax dollars, and moving away from the use of export subsidies;

Assist small farmers by giving them special consideration in commodity programs wherever possible;

Help small farmers with the capacity and desire for growth to acquire the resources they need for an adequate size family farm operation, and at the same time help those who seek to earn a decent living in other than farming or who wish to retire to receive fair and just compensation for their assets; and

Provide the instrument for long-range adjustments in agricultural resources, recognizing that the need for balancing the supply of farm commodities with the demand will be of long duration.

Cut cost of farm programs, freeing resources so that the war on poverty, such as the food stamp plan, can be adequately funded.

The proposed wheat and rice legislation will mean higher incomes for farmers than the current programs. At the same time, the cost of the programs will be lowered. The tax dollars which are saved can go to finance the war on poverty, including the food stamp program which will make an adequate diet available to as many as 4 million needy Americans in the next few years. The increased value of the wheat certificate, if passed on to the consumer, might raise the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread by about seven-tenths of a cent (and in the case of rice would add 2 or 3 cents to the farm cost of a pound of rice). Should this happen the total effect would be to increase the costs of food which an average person consumes in a week by about 3.6 cents.

It can properly be asked: Will this be an imposition on consumers? I think not, and for these reasons: In the past 4 years the proportion of income an average American family spends for food has decreased as take-home pay has sharply climbed; both the quantity and quality of surplus food distributed directly to needy families have been greatly improved, and over 6 million persons now receive a better diet; by the end of the summer the food stamp program will have enlarged the food purchasing power of a million people in low income families by, on the average, more than a third; and we have launched a series of programs designed to help millions escape from poverty.

It is both unfair and unsound to deny the farmer an opportunity to get a fair return in the marketplace as do other segments of our economy. It is better to use the dollars we save through this program to provide the food which low income families need than to discriminate against the farmer in order to favor the consumer by 3.6 cents a week. This program enables us to act in the best interest of both the consumer and the farmer.

The feed grain program, which this year broke all records on participation and acreage placed in conserving uses, will be continued with important adjustments simplifying its administration. As this program continues to bring surplus stocks down by keeping production at reasonable levels, the position of graingrowers as well as livestock producers will be strengthened.

Since 1960 income to rice producers has climbed 44 percent from \$240 million to \$345 million and the cost of the rice program has increased 54 percent, climbing from \$117 million to \$180 million. The two-price certificate program recommended for rice will cut costs which are becoming prohibitive in the current program.

Through the use of graduated payments, a system long followed in the successful sugar program, the income for all rice producers would be increased and at the same time additional income for the smaller producer would be possible.

The bill also will extend the wool program, and will enable the small wool producer to earn a better income than he does now.

We are continuing to discuss with producers and other interested groups legislative proposals for cotton and dairy, and we are hopeful that widespread support can be found for proposals in both commodities.

Through the proposed authority to transfer and lease allotments, the part-time farmer who seeks to leave or the farmer who wishes to retire will get a fair return for his allotment while the smaller farmer who needs to expand to an adequate size family farm will be able to acquire the additional capacity he needs to efficiently use modern technology.

The cropland adjustment program will help the part-time farmer who wants to discontinue operations and the older farmer who wants to retire, and at the same time will help contain production and reduce the cost of the several commodity programs. Obviously it will be less expensive to keep land out of production on a long-term basis than to make the same adjustment year by year as we do now in the wheat and feed grain programs. Such a program will assist local communities to move cropland permanently into new conservation, recreation and beautification uses, thus enabling land resources to serve multiple purposes.

Both the cropland adjustment and the sale and lease of allotment features will be carefully supervised by the county ASCS committees to prevent abuses and any adverse effect on the local economy.

The proposals of the President are not a sliding-back or a no-gains program. These programs will provide higher income for the farmer. They will provide new opportunity for the farmer who wants to acquire the resources necessary for an adequate sized 20th century family farm, and they will give meaningful assistance to the farmer who wishes to retire or has the chance to earn a better living in another occupation.

And what are the alternatives?

Consider wheat, for example. This week—2 days from now in fact—I am required by law to proclaim marketing quotas on wheat. If no legislation were then forthcoming to arrest the inexorable march of events required by the old law, we would then have to hold a grower referendum by August 1.

If marketing quotas were not approved, price supports would be at 50 percent of parity or \$1.25 to wheatgrowers who produced within their allotments.

In the absence of feed grain legislation, price supports for corn in 1966 would be set between 50 and 90 percent of parity—at a level which avoids any increase in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This means that price support would have to be near the lower limit of the permitted range—in other words, near 50 percent of parity. A price support at 50 percent of parity—based on recent levels—would be around 78 cents a bushel.

Are there other realistic alternatives? Ask yourself whether a Congress willing to help the farmer but besieged by competing and conflicting proposals which portray the absence of a broad consensus in agriculture will be able to take constructive action. You know the answer better than I do.

I am here today to urge you as responsible leaders of sectional and competing interests within farm organizations and commodity groups, and the sectional and competing interests within farm organizations and commodity groups, to give the farmer the united leadership he deserves and must have if he is to profit from the improved climate of understanding and support that has developed in recent years.

I speak plainly and even bluntly to you when I say that the extension and strengthening of the commodity program this year before they lapse is your responsibility. The President is concerned. The Secretary of

Agriculture is concerned. We care deeply about the farmer and the Nation's well-being. And we have worked hard and consulted broadly to develop a sensible practical program that will increase income, cut Government costs, continue fair prices to the consumer, and help to ease the pain of adjustments that are taking place inexorably in agriculture. We have done about all we could do. The Congress waits now to hear from you. If you speak with a common voice that makes sense, I am confident the country and the Congress will respond in like manner. If you bicker between yourselves as farm organizations, and if subcommodity groups fight one another, each trying to get more for their group at the expense of the others, then the urban American and those who represent him in the Congress will say "a plague on all your houses."

Together we have fought many battles on many fronts to improve farm programs and to move closer toward parity of income. We have won some battles, and we have lost some. But since 1960 we have made real progress. Net farm income nationally is \$1 billion more than in 1960. Net income per farm is \$681, 23 percent greater than it was in 1960. Grain surpluses have been sharply cut. Public understanding of agriculture's importance and problems is much improved.

At this moment and in this year, in a very real sense, we are at a fork of the road. One fork has a sign that reads "unity and cooperation." It means continued hard work but it promises us progress. The other fork has a sign that reads "I want mine my way." It leads to friction, confusion, frustration and before the year is out, chaos in American agriculture.

The choice is yours; the benefits, or the agony of that choice, belongs to all farmers and the Nation.

DA

STATEMENT OF PROF. DAVID NELSON ROWE ON PRESIDENT'S JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SPEECH

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the President's remarks at the Johns Hopkins University on April 7, 1965, constituted an important policy declaration in the field of foreign affairs. One of the most perceptive analyses of the President's remarks, that has come to my attention, is a statement by Prof. David Nelson Rowe of the department of political science at Yale University. I am inserting this statement in the RECORD.

Professor Rowe is one of the foremost authorities in the Nation on the Far East. Consequently, his observations on the President's address deserve the thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

STATEMENT OF PROF. DAVID NELSON ROWE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, YALE UNIVERSITY

Most analyses of President Johnson's speech of April 7 have focused on the statement, "We remain ready for unconditional discussions." The commentators, for the most part, have emphasized the "unconditional" nature of discussions that might take place regarding a Vietnam settlement, without noting that the President carefully stated just prior in his speech, the conditions that had to be met before peace could come to Vietnam.

April 15, 1965

These conditions which the President stated in his speech were contained in the following passage:

"Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country.

"These are the essentials of any final settlement."

Logically, of course, if the government in North Vietnam were to agree to unconditional discussions on a settlement in South Vietnam, they would have to accept the preconditions laid down by President Johnson as stated above. In other words, the President would really seem to have stated in his speech the conditions of an unconditional discussion about peace in South Vietnam.

One is therefore justified in asking what, in this context, has genuine priority in administration thinking and planning about a settlement for South Vietnam, conditions or unconditional discussions? What does the President really mean? How can we know?

We do know this; namely, that the conditions the President laid down for a settlement in Vietnam have, in the past, been repeatedly rejected in specific terms, not only by Hanoi, but by the Chinese Communists and the Russians. Since the administration clearly knows this, is his tender of unconditional discussions in reality a thinly veiled offer to the Hanoi government that, if they will enter such discussions, the preconditions stated in the speech will be downgraded, de-emphasized, or even set aside?

In view of the clarity with which our objectives for South Vietnam have been stated in the past, it would not be surprising if the Hanoi government and its Communist backers in China and the U.S.S.R. concluded that any such setting aside of U.S. objectives for South Vietnam was clearly highly improbable. Along this line, the Chinese Communists have already described the speech as full of "lies," and we may expect more of the same, in their future reactions to it.

Perhaps another interpretation of the tender by the President of "unconditional discussions" is that discussions of a settlement can go on while the fighting still continues at the present level of intensity or at even higher levels of intensity. It is a fact, of course, that the U.S. level of participation in the fighting is steadily and materially rising, with notable increases in our military action in the area having taken place within some 36 hours of the delivery of the speech. At the same time, it seems probable that material increases in U.S. military manpower in combat operations in South Vietnam will be made very shortly.

To the Hanoi government this must mean simply that U.S. policy remains just what it was before the President's speech, namely, that we will employ any and all military means to secure victory in South Vietnam, and victory over North Vietnam if necessary to a South Vietnam settlement along our own lines, while at the same time we invite unconditional discussions.

The President's speech went a long way toward trying to avoid any such conclusion on the part of the Hanoi government, particularly in his open offer to that government that it accept a part of the profit to be secured from an offer of gigantic U.S. economic aid to southeast Asian countries. He thus implied that a victory for our policy in respect to South Vietnam did not necessarily imply the loss of North Vietnam's own independence at our hands. It must be noted that the development of the Mekong River for electrical power and irrigation, to which the President referred, is now in its preliminary stages, but that cooperation of southeast Asian countries in this work includes only Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and

South Vietnam. North Vietnam is conspicuously absent from this cooperative enterprise, and the President's invitation to Hanoi to join in is not very likely to gain any more support in Hanoi than his invitation in his speech to the U.S.S.R. to cooperate actively in this U.N. enterprise.

It is quite clear that Communist policy toward the Mekong River development is to stand aside, allow the free world and its allies to support the Mekong River project, and, in the meantime, to destroy the independence of all southeast Asian countries and subvert their governments by Communist takeover. This will, in their thinking, effectively secure for Communist regimes in southeast Asia, the future fruits of all such free world investment in this gigantic project as develop prior to Communist takeover of all southeast Asia. For them to think otherwise, and to join in with U.N. sponsored and free world financed development plans in southeast Asia, would, to them, be nothing less than suspension of the cold war and a contradiction of their hopes for victory over us in the hot war now underway in Vietnam.

Thus President Johnson seems to have given in to the hope that through a combination of economic inducements and military pressures, the current Communist program for the takeover of southeast Asia may be abandoned. No one can blame him for using economic inducements if he can, but, in the light of past history, can the administration really believe that anything but military action can stop Communist aggression? In fact, the President himself, in his speech, says: "The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied. To withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next. We must say in southeast Asia—as we did in Europe—in the words of the Bible: 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further.'"

There is, however, a totally dismaying parallelism in the so-called carrot motif in the President's speech, with the pre-World War II arguments of the appeasers, namely, that if we could only change Hitler's Germany from a have-not country into a have country (at the expense of other countries, of course), that German aggression would no longer be necessary, and being unnecessary, aggression would be abandoned. This argument, of the isolationists, appeasers and self-styled liberals of that day, has been proved, over and over again, to be as wrong in respect to Hitler's Germany, as it always has been in respect to the Communist aggressors of our own day. Yet it is constantly being preached both at home and abroad, in simplistic primitive-Marxist terms, that economic uplift is the key to alleviating and eliminating all human troubles, conflicts, and difficulties. The President, who seems to quote the Bible with such facility, should recall the Biblical adjuration to the effect that "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that issues from the mouth of God." This would seem to mean, at the minimum, that the limits of economic cooperation and mutuality lie at the boundaries of total disagreement about basic ideologies and values.

Here, again, the President's speech displays an utterly dismaying characteristic. I refer to his seemingly careful avoidance of any identification of the North Vietnamese regime as Communist, or of its own aggression against South Vietnam as a North Vietnamese Communist aggression.

In his entire speech, in fact, he uses the word "Communist" only once, in reference to Communist China. The paragraph in which this reference takes place is an important one. It identifies Communist China as the backer of Hanoi, and states that "the contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purpose." But nowhere in the speech is Hanoi identified as Communist.

One can only wonder at the possible purpose of this obvious attempt to disidentify communism from the Hanoi government and its aggression in the South. Is the President trying to adopt the old and now utterly discredited tactic of trying to "wean away" one Communist government from its Communist backer? Is this the political parallel in the speech, of the carrot motif in economics, i.e., let's all have peace and we will help you have prosperity and full bellies, too? That is to say, when we invite Hanoi and the U.S.S.R. both to join the Mekong River project, and refrain from inviting Communist China to do so, are we saying in effect, Moscow is a "good Communist," China is a bad one; you should join up with Moscow against Peiping?

Such a line is wholly understandable when coming from those who accept at its crude face value the Moscow line of coexistence and who attribute to the Chinese Communists a genuine departure from this line and an aggressive militancy toward the free world both qualitatively and quantitatively different from that of the U.S.S.R. But why does the President seem to feel that Hanoi's aggression in the South is backed any less by Moscow than by Peiping? Surely all the evidence is to the contrary. The efforts to make a distinction in this respect are invidious in the extreme. Moscow's longstanding doctrinal and material support to wars of liberation everywhere is surely well known.

Whatever may be the basis for the President's avoidance in this speech, of any Communist identification of labeling of Hanoi and its aggression in the South, there is no doubt that this avoidance embodies a genuine contrast with past official statements by both the President and the State Department. For example, the State Department publication of December 1961 (No. 7308) and titled "A Threat to the Peace North Vietnam's Effort To Conquer South Vietnam" fully and explicitly identifies North Vietnam and its aggression in the South with communism. By contrast with President Johnson's speech of April 7, 1965, this State Department publication uses the terms "Communist" or "communism" five times on its first page in referring to the war of the North against the South in Vietnam. And it identifies the Vietcong operating in the South as "Vietnamese Communist," and uses the term "Vietcong" on that same first page three times.

In the State Department white paper of February 27, 1965, entitled "Aggression From the North—the Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," as printed in the New York Times on February 28, 1965, the first half-column of newspaper contains six uses of the term "Communist," referring clearly to the "Communist regime in Hanoi," the "Communist program of conquest directed against South Vietnam," etc.

Finally, as recently as March 25, 1965, President Johnson himself called for an end to "Communist aggression" in Vietnam, and accused the "Communists" of being unwilling to enter into any reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security "of all in southeast Asia."

Thus his avoidance of any such reference to the Hanoi regime and its aggression in South Vietnam in his speech of April 7, 1965, takes on an added significance. It could not be accidental; it must have been planned carefully. It seems to be part and parcel of a definite change in emphasis in our policy toward southeast Asia in general. Under such a policy are we going to differentiate so strongly and definitely between good Communists and bad Communists that, in the end, we may persuade ourselves that there are some good Communists even in South Vietnam, and that it is to our interest to discover and treat with them by way of stabilizing the political situation there? Is this what the President's new policy of unconditional

discussions really will come to mean in the end? If so, it can be predicted that the President will fall to disabuse us of the truth, namely, that "Communist" and "aggressor" are synonymous terms.

The same avoidance of the identification of the Hanoi regime as Communist characterizes the reply of President Johnson on April 8, 1965, to the 17th so-called nonaligned nations which had urged quick negotiations on Vietnam. This is a much briefer document than his speech of the previous day, and it includes much wording taken directly from that speech. In it, after listing a number of specific components of North Vietnam's aggression in the South, the President states: "When these things stop and the obstacles to security and stability are removed, the need for American supporting military action will also come to an end."

This clearly refers to American military action against North Vietnam as currently being carried on, for later on in the statement he promises the withdrawal of our forces from the South only after "conditions have been created in which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own future free from external interference."

The reply to the so-called nonaligned nations repeats the proviso for peace in Vietnam made in the speech of April 7 and quoted on the first page of this memorandum, above. At this point it will be well, in view of all that we have said, to point sharply at one component of the President's prescription for peace in Vietnam; namely, that Vietnam should "be tied to no alliance."

Does the President thus prescribe a non-aligned South Vietnam or a neutral South Vietnam? If so, would he dictate this condition for South Vietnam both to the aggressors in Hanoi and to the people of South Vietnam as well? What if the people in South Vietnam resist any such proviso? Would we then be prepared, as in the case of former President Diem himself, to connive at the removal from power there of any elements that resisted our view? If so, is this our understanding of self-determination and independence for South Vietnam, to which President Johnson so strongly subscribes?

In fact, of course, neutralization for South Vietnam, as with Laos previously, would almost certainly end in steady, if slow, Communist takeover. The President actually implies then when he specifies for South Vietnam the necessity of having new ways and means of assurance that aggression has in fact been stopped. But he understandably avoids any stipulation in either his speech or his statement to the 17 nations as to just what these new ways and means could be apart from continued deep and pervasive U.S. involvement in South Vietnam, together with a firm commitment to that government, after pacification, that U.S. force would be quickly available to stop further aggression in that country from any source whatever and of whatever sort. This is the essential which has been lacking in respect to Laos, with thus far disastrous results for that country.

In this connection, the reactions from abroad to the President's speech are of great interest. Among these is the reaction of Tran Van Huu, former Premier of South Vietnam and an active advocate of neutralization for his country. He described the President's speech as comforting and specifically interpreted it as advocating the idea of neutralization.

Surely what has recently happened to India demonstrates that in the face of Communist aggression the only neutrality that is possible is one which is tied to defense arrangements with the West which will help provide the sanctions necessary to prevent that aggression. This is the posture which India, after much suffering at the hands of the Communists, and much soul searching,

has finally come to adopt. But is this neutral? And can it be based upon the President's prescription that such a country "be tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country"? The President, and all of us, will have to face up to the reality that in this world where Communist aggression endangers everyone, genuine neutrality is an impossible dream. In the world today, the only people that can genuinely mind only their own business are those who combine with others of like mind to do so and to protect their right and opportunity so to do.

Cambodia is another case in point, and in southeast Asia. Can anyone deny that Cambodia's heretofore rather dubious neutralism has become a much more positive thing vis-a-vis both Hanoi and Peiping since the Americans started bombing North Vietnam?

Seen in this light, the President's simultaneous talk of neutralization for South Vietnam and the continuance of strong military sanctions against North Vietnam, can at the best merely confuse our friends and allies in southeast Asia and elsewhere. At worst, it can convince them all that we are preparing another Laos-type surrender in the shape of coalition government including in the future those native to either North or South Vietnam and whom we now no longer term "Communists."

Finally, should we perhaps conclude simply that the recent statements by and from the President are merely political? Are they meant only to offer something for everyone? In view of their inherent contradictoriness, this is a tempting view. But if they are merely political it would seem that they are so for both domestic and foreign consumption. British Empire reaction, with the possible exception of Australia, seems uniformly approving. The French think the speech did not go far enough, that the President should have openly stated the possibility that all Vietnam must eventually be united under Hanoi with a government either Communist or neutralist. But of course they are forgetting that such overtness on the part of the President could hardly escape arousing an intensely hostile reaction among the majority of the American people and their Congress. It is hard to escape the conclusion that after the President's latest efforts to justify the policy of his administration have been studied and digested by the American people, they will be even more doubtful as to the real and ultimate purposes and intents of that policy than they ever have been before. And if finally our military actions in Vietnam purchase nothing but another negotiated sellout of Vietnam as was the case with Laos without such military action on our part, the defeat of our Nation will thus be all the greater.

THE ELECTION RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC., REPORT

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. RUMSFELD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the issue of fraud at the ballot box is of continuing concern to all Americans. In recent correspondence with Republican National Committeeman Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas, my attention was called to a report compiled by the Election Research Council, Inc., which dealt with alleged irregularities in last November's elections in the State of Arkansas.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD my correspondence with Mr. Rockefeller and the text of the report compiled by the Election Research Council, Inc.

The correspondence and material referred to follow:

MARCH 17, 1965.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Republicans in Arkansas are deeply concerned that discussion of proposed legislation regarding voting rights has not touched on one of our major problems—protection of votes once they are cast.

Assuring the right to vote is not enough when coercion is used to influence the outcome of elections or if the votes are improperly counted.

Certainly, voting rights must be guaranteed, but rights should not end with the privilege of registering or even casting a ballot.

Additional safeguards are indicated, and I urge that you make every effort to see that such protection is given consideration before any new legislation is enacted.

Currently, when local authorities choose to frustrate citizens' attempts to assure themselves of honest elections, there is very little if any effective recourse to Federal authority, even though Federal elections may be involved.

In the near future, we will send documentation to illustrate that of which we speak.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER.

MARCH 18, 1965.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: As I promised in my letter of March 17, I enclose a copy of the Election Research Council, Inc., preliminary report on absentee voting in the Arkansas 1964 general election.

I believe this nonpartisan study clearly illustrates why more consideration must be given to protecting votes once they are cast.

Please give your closest attention to incorporation of safeguards for the votes of all our citizens into any new legislation.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER.

APRIL 9, 1965.

Mr. WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Tower Building, Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR WIN: I am very grateful for your recent letter calling attention to the importance of guarding against fraudulent voting in legislation protecting the right to vote. The casting and counting of fraudulent ballots means a dilution of the vote of honest men and is tantamount to a deprivation of their right to vote.

The report of the Election Research Council is an important document. I plan to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD next week. I am also calling to the attention of Republican members of the Judiciary Committee and of our task force on voting rights your correspondence and report.

If we need fuller information about the situation in Arkansas, I shall ask Bill Prendergast to get in touch with you about it. One item that would be helpful would be newspaper clippings dealing with voting irregularities. I notice the report that you sent referred to articles that have appeared in the Pine Bluff Commercial. Copies of these and other news stories and editorial comment would be very helpful in focusing attention on the evil which should be corrected.

It might interest you to know that the report of the joint congressional committee on Republican principles, which I headed in 1962, had the following to say about voting fraud: "The right to vote is denied by fraud in the casting or counting of ballots as surely as by exclusion from the polls. Republicans

April 15, 1965

urge vigorous investigation of fraud at the polls and recommend corrective action."

Very best regards and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

THE ELECTION RESEARCH COUNCIL, INC.,
REPORT, FEBRUARY 21, 1965

The first postelection report of the Election Research Council summarizes activities and findings of the council from November 3, 1964 to date. It does not purport to be a comprehensive summary of election irregularities occurring in the November election. To compile such a summary would require the full time and effort of scores of people over many months.

Rather than cover the entire field, the council has attempted to concentrate its efforts in the area of absentee voting. The reason for this is apparent. Until the requirement was imposed by amendment 51 that voters must register in person, the absentee ballot boxes were subject to manipulation almost at will.

For example, anyone could purchase poll tax receipts for an assortment of gravestones, and then apply by mail for absentee ballots. The county clerk, seeing that the applicants were listed in the poll book, would then send the ballots and voters' statements to the designated address. The ballots would be returned and counted.

It is generally agreed that there was more purging of absentee ballots this general election than ever before. This was due in part to the intense heat generated by the presidential and gubernatorial races and the controversial nature of some of the amendments on the ballot. Local option and other local issues also played an important part in many areas. Despite this widespread casting out of ballots, our preliminary studies indicate that the total of 30,930 ballots actually counted was bloated with fraudulent and invalid votes.

As previously indicated, our studies are incomplete at this time and we are therefore unable to specify exactly how many of these votes were fraudulent or otherwise invalid. If the ratio established thus far continues, it is probable that well over half of the 30,930 absentee votes are invalid. It is well to point out that this estimate does not take into consideration those voters who were not qualified voters either because of residency or other reasons. Neither does it take into consideration those applications with doubtful reasons for voting absentee listed.

A superficial leafing through applications and voter statements gives firm purchase to the proposition that residency and reason-for-absence requirements were not enforced. If these factors were considered, it is doubtful that there were 10,000 valid absentee votes cast in the general election of 1964.

Now that registration of each voter in person is required under Arkansas constitutional amendment 51, the problem of non-resident voters will be minimized. But, as the following report reflects, many of the abuses occurring in absentee voting could have been avoided if county clerks were more conversant with the absentee voting laws and with their duties in connection with it. For example, if an invalid application is received into the office of a county clerk, that clerk does a disservice to the voter by issuing him a ballot and voter's statement. Without an application in legal form, the ballot should not and may not be counted. Properly, the clerk should refuse all illegal applications and request the voter to make new application in legal form.

An additional problem encountered by the council was the inaccessibility of some records. Many fraudulent votes were no doubt cast and counted in the absentee boxes because some county clerks refused to allow

public inspection of the absentee applications in advance of election day. This was certainly the case in Jefferson County, and we speculate that this would have been the case in Madison County to a greater extent than the few affidavits in our files reflect.

In many counties, we found conscientious county clerks who welcomed inspection of the records and who had a broad knowledge of our absentee voting laws. In those counties, in nearly all instances the absentee voting laws were followed to the letter with the result that illegal votes in those boxes were kept to a level below 10 percent. To name just a few, we were particularly impressed with the offices of the county clerks in Mississippi, Lonoke, Izard, Calhoun, Drew, and Lawrence Counties.

Although our investigation of the November election is by no means complete, we present some of our findings to date:

A. NURSING HOMES

The absentee boxes were utilized by many nursing homes in the State as a means of bloc voting in the November election. Of course, this is not a novel procedure. Following the Democratic primary, for instance, the GPW Negro nursing home administrator, Newport, Jackson County, was charged with commission of a felony after he purportedly forged the absentee applications of 44 patients, one of whom had been dead for some months.

But this November the political activity in nursing homes hit a new high. The reason can be found in a letter written by Charles A. Stewart, executive secretary of the Arkansas Nursing Home Association, to its constituent members. That letter is as follows:

(First, a memorandum to Governor Faubus concerning legislative proposals is set forth.)

"You will notice from the above memorandum that a great deal of work has been done toward the three State classification of nursing homes. We feel very sure that with your help and 100 percent effort from all the nursing homes in the State of Arkansas, that we can put this plan into effect in full in early 1965. To do this we still must do several things. We must have the complete cooperation of as many State senators and representatives as possible and this is where you come in. We may and we will ask you to do some things which will require some work and a little money, but we cannot stress strongly enough that this is a must. We must have your help. One of the first things that must be done is that we need your help in securing a poll tax for each of your nursing home patients who do not have a new poll tax receipt and a poll tax receipt for each of your employees. It will be necessary for you to contact each employee and each patient to see if they have a new poll tax receipt which will be good for the November election. These may be bought until September 31 of this year.

"After making this survey of your own nursing home or nursing homes then we ask you to go to your county courthouse and secure poll taxes for every patient and every employee who does not have one. After doing this it is most important that we have, in this office, a list of these patients and employees with their poll tax numbers. There are about 7,000 nursing home patients in Arkansas at this time and an estimated 5,000 employees, you can see how effective, politically, that a stack of these listings with poll tax numbers will be to us. This is an effort that requires the help of every nursing home in the State. Cooperation by half of the nursing homes simply will not get this job done.

"Again let us say that this is the most ambitious program that the nursing homes in Arkansas or any other State have ever undertaken. We have plans to change the entire regulations of both the health department and the welfare department and effect

a complete new pay scale which will more equitably reimburse you for the care you are now giving your patients.

"We are most sensitive to the fact that the present rate of payment of \$105 by the welfare department is woefully inadequate to care for those intermediate and skilled care patients who need care the most. The responsibility of caring for these patients is shared jointly by the State welfare department and the owners and administrators of the private nursing homes in Arkansas. We strongly believe in the future of proprietary type nursing homes. We want to make them stronger, and better, but at the same time that responsibility shared with us by the State welfare department must of necessity be truly shared in equitable reimbursement.

"This brings us to the summary in our memorandum to the Governor. Even though this new program will probably go into effect in early 1965, you need help now. The small raise we have asked for is dictated by the small amount of funds available to the welfare department for the balance of this year. We cannot assure you now that our request will be granted; we can assure you we are doing our best.

"Sincerely yours,

"CHARLES A. STEWART,
"Executive Secretary."

The Pine Bluff Commercial, some 2 months ago, carried an article on voting practices at the Kilgore Nursing Home in Jefferson County. The newspaper pointed out that at least three of the Kilgore home voters were also on the list of persons who had been committed to the State hospital for the mentally ill. Two of the names of voting patients corresponded with the names of persons adjudged mentally incompetent in Jefferson County.

The Commercial interviewed one patient at the Kilgore home who stated that he couldn't say whether he voted or not, but that if he had, he didn't know for whom he voted.

The Commercial also determined that the home maintains a "political" folder, containing all of the poll tax receipts for the patients. The home paid for some 60 of the poll taxes. The administrator of the home, Mick Vaskov, stated that political materials had been received from the Nursing Home Association, including a brochure favoring amendment 55 (legalized gambling).

The council submitted the applications for poll tax receipts, the applications for absentee ballots, and the voters' statements accompanying the ballots for some sixty of the patients in the home to its handwriting analyst, who detected a number of forged signatures, and in fact stated that in his opinion many of the "x" marks of patients who presumably could not write were forged, 18 by one person and 13 by another. The analyst has formed an opinion as to the identity of the person making the 18 marks.

In absentee box number four, where the Kilgore patients were voted, only about 126 votes were cast. That box markedly deviated from the Jefferson County averages, being overwhelmingly in favor of Governor Faubus, and amendment 55 (legalized gambling), and overwhelmingly against amendment 54 (voter registration).

Other Kilgore nursing homes are located in Dallas County, where seventy patients voted absentee. Strenuous objections were raised to counting many of these votes where the patients had been transferred from the State Hospital for Nervous Diseases in Benton to the homes, but the votes were nonetheless counted.

The election officials of the absentee box in Saline County disqualified all the absentee ballots cast by or for patients at the Doyle Shelmutt nursing home in Benton during the November election, because all applications had been delivered to the county