

Senate

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1965

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God: At the day's beginning, we humbly bow at this shrine of our sustaining faith, that above the babel of crashing systems, we may hear the imperatives of Thy voice, as in these days of destiny Thou art sifting out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat.

Move our hearts with compassion, we pray, so that the vision of a unified world which denies the divisive heresy that east is east and west is west and never the twain shall meet will be fulfilled, so that for all Thy children may be solved the pressing problems of food and shelter.

Make us pioneers of the glad day when Western and Eastern hands shall be clasped in mutual concern for the liberty and dignity of every individual under all skies, as enmity shall give way to strengthened and expanded bridges of understanding and cooperation, tying together in a restless crusade peoples and lands, one in heart and purpose—though they be half a world away.

We ask it in the name of the Elder Brother of us all, who hath declared, "The field is the world." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 7, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (H.R. 4527) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels, aircraft and construction of shore establishments for the Guard, and it was signed by the Speaker pro tempore.

REVISION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH ON SOUTHEAST ASIA—VIETNAM

THE DOOR IS OPEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night, at Johns Hopkins University, the President of the United States delivered an address of profound importance to the people of the Nation. It is to be hoped that his remarks will echo in Vietnam and southeast Asia, in China and the Soviet Union, and that their significance will be appreciated throughout the world.

Mr. Johnson dwelt upon the meaning of the conflict in Vietnam and the purposes for which we have engaged ourselves in that distant land. They are, as he made very clear, the purposes of freedom, not of conquest; and of construction, not destruction. We seek the security of our freedom through the security of others, not by the domination of others.

The President left no doubt that this Nation prefers the course of peace in Asia, not a year hence or 6 months hence, but as soon as it is possible to still the guns of war. We have pledged our assistance for more than a decade to the people of South Vietnam, in order that they may have opportunity to pursue their lives and destiny in freedom. That is all that we desire in that sore-beset land. If others are prepared to accept this keystone of peace, peace can be achieved.

The door is open to the statesmen of this Nation, of Asia, Europe, and the world to find the way to that peace. The door is open to the leaders of Vietnam, North and South, to find a way to put aside the destructive instruments of war and take up the tools of national construction.

And the President has made clear that we are prepared to do our part with other nations to convert that peace, once it is obtained, into a dynamic peace, a peace of constructive benefit, not only to the people of Vietnam, North and South, but to southeast Asia as a whole. Mr. Johnson has stressed again, as he stressed in 1961, on his return from southeast Asia, that the fundamental need of that impoverished corner of the world is not for the implements of war, but for the energies of peace; not for the alienations of conflict, but for a great concentration of many nations on the immense social tasks of education, health, and of ending human hunger and want.

Mr. President, in the course of international events, there are moments of critical decision. That this is such a moment was recognized by the President in his profound statement last night. We

are at a crossroads in Vietnam, and not only for the Vietnamese and ourselves; the entire world trembles at it. It would be my hope that there exist in all the nations concerned—and all nations are concerned—the wisdom and perception to turn from the skidding path to war to the high road of a dynamic and constructive peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia. It would be my hope that at Geneva or in any forum, large or small, this wisdom and perception will begin to be displayed without delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the President on Vietnam be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT SHRIVER HALL, AUDITORIUM, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD.

My fellow Americans, last week 17 nations sent their views to some dozen countries having interest in southeast Asia. We are joining these 17 countries in stating our American policy which we believe will contribute toward peace in this area.

Tonight I want to review once again with my own people the views of your Government.

Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change.

This is the principle for which our ancestors fought in the valleys of Pennsylvania. It is the principle for which our sons fight in the jungles of Vietnam.

Vietnam is far from this quiet campus. We have no territory there, nor do we seek any. The war is dirty and brutal and difficult. And some 400 young men—born into an America bursting with opportunity and promise—have ended their lives on Vietnam's steaming soil.

Why must we take this painful road?

Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?

We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

This kind of a world will never be built by bombs and bullets. Yet the infirmities of man are such that force must often precede reason—and the waste of war, the works of peace.

We wish this were not so. But we must deal with the world as it is, if it is ever to be as we wish.

THE NATURE OF THE CONFLICT

The world as it is in Asia is not a serene or peaceful place.

The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest.

Of course, some of the people of South Vietnam are participating in attack on their own government. But trained men and sup-

plies, orders, and arms, flow in a constant stream from north to south.

This support is the heartbeat of the war. And it is a war of unparalleled brutality. Simple farmers are the targets of assassination and kidnaping. Women and children are strangled in the night because their men are loyal to the government. Small and helpless villages are ravaged by sneak attacks. Large scale raids are conducted on towns, and terror strikes in the heart of cities.

The confused nature of this conflict cannot mask the fact that it is the new face of an old enemy. It is an attack by one country upon another. And the object of that attack is a friend to which we are pledged.

Over this war—and all Asia—is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peking. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India, and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. The contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purpose.

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM

Why are these realities our concern? Why are we in South Vietnam?

We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over many years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. I intend to keep our promise.

To dishonor that pledge—to abandon this small and brave nation to its enemy—and to the terror that must follow—would be an unforgivable wrong.

We are also there to strengthen world order. Around the globe—from Berlin to Thailand—are people whose well-being rests, in part, on the belief they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of American commitment. The result would be increased unrest and instability, or even war.

We are also there because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. 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: "Whether shalt thou come, but no further."

There are those who say that all our effort there will be futile—that China's power is such it is bound to dominate all southeast Asia. But there is no end to that argument until all the nations of Asia are swallowed up.

There are those who wonder why we have a responsibility there. We have it for the same reason we have a responsibility for the defense of freedom in Europe. World War II was fought in both Europe and Asia, and when it ended we found ourselves with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom.

OUR OBJECTIVE IN VIETNAM

Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way.

We will do everything necessary to reach that objective. And we will do only what is necessary.

In recent months, attacks on South Vietnam were stepped up. Thus, it became necessary to increase our response and make attacks by air. This is not a change of pur-

pose. It is a change in what we believe that purpose requires.

We do this in order to slow down aggression.

We do this to increase the confidence of the brave people of South Vietnam who have bravely borne this brutal battle for so many years and with so many casualties.

And we do this to convince the leaders of North Vietnam—and all who seek to share their conquest—of a simple fact:

We will not be defeated.

We will not grow tired.

We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

We know that air attacks alone will not accomplish all these purposes. But it is our best and prayerful judgment that they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace.

We hope that peace will come swiftly. But that is in the hands of others besides ourselves. And we must be prepared for a long continued conflict. It will require patience as well as bravery—the will to endure as well as the will to resist.

I wish it were possible to convince others with words of what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes: armed hostility is futile—our resources are equal to any challenge—because we fight for values and a principle, rather than territory or colonies, our patience and determination are unending.

Once this is clear, then it should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

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 essentials of any final settlement.

We will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

There may be many ways to this kind of peace: in discussion or negotiation with the governments concerned; in large groups or in small ones; in the reaffirmation of old agreements or in their strengthening with new ones.

We have stated this position over and over again, 50 times—and more—to friend and foe alike. And we remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions.

And until that bright and necessary day of peace we will try to keep conflict from spreading. We have no desire to see thousands die in battle—Asians or Americans. We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toil and sacrifice. We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command.

But we will use it. This war, like most wars, is filled with terrible irony. For what do the people of North Vietnam want? They want what their neighbors also desire: food for their hungry health for their bodies and a chance to learn—progress for their country, and an end to the bondage of material misery. And they would find all these things far more readily in peaceful association with others than in the endless course of battle.

These countries of southeast Asia are homes for millions of impoverished people. Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle through weary hours to wrestle existence from the soil. They are often wracked by disease, plagued by hunger, and death comes early at the age of 40. Stability and peace do not come easily in such a land. Neither independence nor human dignity will be won by arms alone. It also requires the works of peace.

The American people have helped generously in these works.

Now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in the conflict-torn corner of the world.

A COOPERATIVE EFFORT FOR DEVELOPMENT

The first step is for the countries of southeast Asia to associate themselves in a greatly expanded cooperative effort for development. We would hope that North Vietnam will take its place in the common effort just as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible.

The United Nations is already actively engaged in development in this area. I would hope that the Secretary General of the United Nations could use the prestige of his great office—and his deep knowledge of Asia—to initiate, as soon as possible, with the countries of the area, a plan for cooperative increased development.

For our part I will ask the Congress to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort when it is underway.

And I hope all other industrialized countries—including the Soviet Union—will join in this effort to replace despair with hope and terror with progress.

The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than a hundred million people. And there is much to be done.

The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA.

The wonders of modern medicine can be spread through villages where thousands die for lack of care.

Schools can be established to train people in the skills needed to manage the process of development.

And these objectives, and more, are within the reach of a cooperative and determined effort.

I also intend to expand and speed up a program to make available our farm surplus to assist in feeding and clothing the needy in Asia. We should not allow people to go hungry and naked while our own warehouses overflow with an abundance of wheat and corn, rice and cotton.

I will very shortly name a special team of patriotic and distinguished Americans to inaugurate our participation in these programs. This team will be headed by Mr. Eugene Black, the very able former president of the World Bank.

In areas still ripped by conflict, government will not be easy. Peace will be necessary for final success. But we cannot wait for peace to begin the job.

THE DREAM OF WORLD ORDER

This will be a disorderly planet for a long time. In Asia, as elsewhere, the forces of the modern world are shaking old ways and uprooting ancient civilizations. There will be turbulence and struggle and even violence. Great social change—as we see in our own country—does not always come without conflict.

We must also expect that nations will on occasion be in dispute with us. It may be because we are rich, or powerful, or because we have made mistakes—or because they honestly fear our intentions. However, no nation need ever fear that we desire their land, or to impose our will, or to dictate their institutions.

But we will always oppose the effort of any nation to conquer another.

We will do this because our own security is at stake.

But there is more to it than that. For our generation has a dream. It is a very old dream. But we have the power and the opportunity to make it real.

For centuries nations have struggled among each other. But we dream of a world where disputes are settled by law and reason. And we will try to make it so.

For most of history, men have hated and killed one another in battle. But we dream

of an end to war. And we will try to make it so.

For all existence most men have lived in poverty, threatened by hunger. But we dream of a world where all are fed and charged with hope. And we will help to make it so.

POSSIBILITIES OF PEACE

The ordinary men and women of North Vietnam and South Vietnam—of China and India—or Russia and America—are brave people. They are filled with the same proportions of hate and fear, of love and hope. Most of them want the same things for themselves and their families. Most of them do not want their sons to die in battle, or see the homes of others destroyed.

This can be their world yet. Man now has the knowledge—always before denied—to make this planet serve the real needs of the people who live on it.

I know this will not be easy. I know how difficult it is for reason to guide passion, and love to master hate. The complexities of this world do not bow easily to pure and consistent answers.

But the simple truths are there just the same. We must all try to follow them as best we can.

We often say how impressive power is. But I do not find it impressive. The guns and bombs, the rockets and warships, are all symbols of human failure. They are necessary symbols. They protect what we cherish. But they are witness to human folly.

A dam built across a great river is impressive.

In the countryside where I was born, I have seen the night illuminated, the kitchens warmed and the homes heated, where once the cheerless night and the ceaseless cold held sway. And all this happened because electricity came to our town along the humming wires of the Rural Electrification Administration. Electrification of the countryside is impressive.

A rich harvest in a hungry land is impressive.

The sight of healthy children in a classroom is impressive.

These—not mighty arms—are the achievements which the American nation believed to be impressive.

And—if we are steadfast—the time may come when all other nations will also find it so.

We may well be living in the time foretold many years ago when it was said: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

This generation of the world must choose: destroy or build, kill or aid, hate or understand.

We can do all these things on a scale never dreamed of before.

We will choose life. And so doing we will prevail over the enemies within man, and over the natural enemies of all mankind.

THE PRESIDENT OF VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I believe most Americans will applaud President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University last night. I was much encouraged by it.

The President was certainly correct when he said that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement. Those of us who have been urging an attempt to open negotiations over the struggle in Vietnam should join in commending President Johnson's indicated willingness to participate, unconditionally, in discussions on the prerequisites for a peaceful solution. Even if the offer of discussions is rejected,

nothing has been risked by making it. Rather, our position has been strengthened in the eyes of the world. All Americans who have studied the problem in southeast Asia know that more than military might is required to meet the tremendous difficulty there.

The President's emphasis last night on developing the vast Mekong River area to provide food, water, and power for all southeast Asia represents a constructive and imaginative proposal which I hope all Members of the Congress will support.

In the days ahead, instead of serving as a bearpit for the hellions, I hope that this Chamber will be the center for a widening debate on the premises and principles which should underlie a sound American policy in southeast Asia.

I, for one, plan to continue to speak out on Vietnam. I know that other Senators will join in widening the dialogue for peace. There continues to be a great need for us to indicate what, in our judgment, might constitute an acceptable framework for a political settlement in southeast Asia.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I congratulate the Senator from Idaho upon the statement he has made. I desire to associate myself with the views he has expressed today and with the views he has expressed heretofore.

It was with great pride and a feeling of relief that I listened last evening to the magnificent address that our President made at Johns Hopkins University. Of course, all of us should realize that in this grim period of international anarchy, the 700 million Chinese and the other Communists throughout the world will not simply cease to exist, and that we are confronted throughout the world, as in southeast Asia, with the problem of striving honorably for coexistence with our neighbors or else facing ultimate co-annihilation.

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho for his statesman-like address.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall have something further to say later about the President's speech last night. I made a brief statement at that time. However, work on the voting rights bill is crowding me at the moment, so I presume I must first pursue that duty.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last night, in his speech to the Nation, President Johnson announced our Nation's willingness to participate in "unconditional discussions" looking toward a negotiated settlement of hostilities in Vietnam. The President made clear to all the importance of southeast Asia to the interests of America and American determination to see that our interests are protected and our commitments honored. There has never been any doubt in my mind—nor I am sure in the minds of anyone who knows and respects our President—that these interests and commitments would be upheld.

Nor, Mr. President, have I doubted that the President has a true grasp of the

complexities of southeast Asian affairs and the limitations which history and geography place upon their resolution.

There will be no permanent or lasting settlement of the problems of southeast Asia in our lifetime. Borders in Indochina now existent were established in 1954. There is nothing permanent about them. The pushing and shoving of the Laotian, Cambodian, the Thai, the Vietnamese, and the Chinese peoples on the small peninsula of Indochina have gone on for many centuries. They will continue for many more. The status quo in southeast Asia is one of change. We must recognize this and we must not cast our lot and the lot of the free world in a quixotic attempt to preserve a stability which does not exist. We should not, and we have not, pledged ourselves to such an effort.

What we have pledged is considerably less and considerably easier of attainment: We are pledged to maintain the right of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam. We are pledged to insure to these people the right to choose their own form of government unimpeded by interference from their neighbors. We are not obligated to preserve a particular government in power or to support one clique over another. It is not for us to say who will make up the Government of South Vietnam. That is for the South Vietnamese to say. It is certainly not for us to rule out the possibility of a coalition government, of a government wider in representation than the present regime.

There is great room for flexibility in our handling of the Vietnam struggle. As I said to this body on February 25 of this year, "We have more than demonstrated our determination and our power to insure that South Vietnam will not be engulfed by her neighbor to the north. We shall not be speaking from weakness when we go to discussions. As we play our cards in the Vietnam crisis we need have no fear, we have a strong hand and a skilled player."

What do we have to discuss? A great deal.

First. An end to the bombing which, were it to continue, would level the industrial capacity of North Vietnam; and a general cease fire in both North and South Vietnam.

Second. A resumption of trade between North and South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese are hard pressed for the rice which once they received from the south.

Third. The possibility of a return to the 1954 agreements with their pledge of noninterference in Vietnam affairs from the great powers.

Fourth. The possibility of mutual non-alignment pledges from both North and South Vietnam with guarantees of the maintenance of such pledges from the great powers.

Fifth. The declaration of a general amnesty in South Vietnam with the recognition that many non-Communists took an active and gallant role in the national revolution against the French and that many continued in honorable opposition to the Diem and military regimes. A coalition government can-

bracing these elements for the first time could well be possible.

Sixth. Understandings could be reached leading to general elections in both North and South Vietnam in due course, and leading also, in due course, to a referendum on the unification of these two countries which goes were one.

Seventh. The question of increased economic assistance for the short run and of the longrun development of the Mekong Delta for the benefit of all Indochina could be profitably discussed.

The above indicate the latitude in which we have to move as we seek an honorable means to end the shooting and killing now underway.

Mr. President, on February 19 of last year, in speaking of Vietnam, I said:

We must be willing to discuss anything with anybody who is willing to discuss in a rational and responsible manner. We are the greatest power on earth and we have no need to fear Red China and no need to fear negotiations.

I say that again.

On August 6 of last year, speaking in support of the resolution requested by the President on his policy in Vietnam, I said:

In the long run the only satisfactory way of coming out of this desperate situation, not only for the South Vietnamese, but for us must be arrived at around the conference table.

I say that again.

In another speech last summer, I supported the commitment of American military strength in Vietnam. I went on to say:

There is no reason, however, why at the same time as we fight we should not be willing to go to the conference table whenever and with whomsoever it serves our purpose to do so. We need have no fear of conferring. This is so because of our strength in the area and the war we are waging. The war shows our enemies we are serious and committed. We go to conference because we are willing to fight; there is no point to the fighting if we are not willing to confer.

I say that again.

And on February 25 of this year I said:

I welcome negotiations not because I believe the United States should or could pull out from its commitment in South Vietnam but because I believe that commitment lacks purpose, sense, and direction unless we are willing to work on all fronts, diplomatic as well as military, in our efforts to stabilize the area. "War is but a political instrument," said Von Clausewitz, and Churchill added, "We arm to parley." We arm and we war for nothing if we refuse to parley.

I say that again.

And so, Mr. President, I commend our President for his speech of last night. The American eagle holds in his claws not only arrows but also an olive branch. Our President made clear last night that in Vietnam, as everywhere else in the world, the olive branch, as well as the arrows, is part of our foreign policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first, I wish to commend the Senator from Alaska [Mr. HARRIS] for the constructive statement he has made on the Vietnam crisis. He has been one of the clearest voices on this subject for a long time.

It seems to me that the President's Baltimore speech of last night is by far the most constructive statement he has made on the Vietnam crisis. It represents a significant part of the course that some Senators have been urging for many months. It sets forth the willingness of this country to explore the possibility of a peaceful settlement without insisting on prior conditions before those explorations begin. It also recognizes that the basic problems of the people of southeast Asia are hunger, disease, and misery, and that the solution of those problems can best be found in regional cooperation under the auspices of the United Nations.

I had intended to make a rather lengthy address today on the subject of Vietnam. However, because of the urgency of the education bill, and also to give me some time properly to address the President's address of last night, I decided to hold off on giving my address until probably Tuesday of next week. At that time I hope to discuss quite in depth the historic background of our involvement in Vietnam and the course that has taken us to our present position in that part of the world, and then to make some further suggestions of steps that we might consider that would move us toward a settlement.

The news reports of our efforts in Vietnam for the past many months have centered on bombing raids, helicopter attacks on villages, and the growing casualty lists on both sides.

It is a refreshing addition to this grim news to hear the President set forth as clearly as he did last night, the possibility of discussions leading to a better life for the people of Asia.

After a good many years of mistakes and violence on both sides—and I emphasize that there have been mistakes and blunders on both sides—the Vietnamese conflict has degenerated into a complicated mess of the worst kind. There is no way to get out of that kind of problem in a blaze of glory.

President Johnson did not create it. That crisis has its roots at least 20 years in the past, going back to the end of World War II, when we made what I regard as a tragic mistake in supporting the efforts of the French to reassert their colonial control over this part of the world.

We have labored under two false assumptions, as I see it, in Vietnam. The first is that as an outside power we could successfully intervene in what is basically a civil conflict. The second false assumption is that we have tried to impose a military solution on an area of overwhelming political instability.

Last night the President pointed the way to a more hopeful course. What he did, in effect, was to combine realism with idealism in a way that should give pride to all Americans. He made it clear that we will keep our military commitments, that we will not be forced out of Vietnam by military action; but at the same time he made clear to the people of Vietnam and to the world that we have more to offer than bombs and bullets.

The President's pledge to negotiate with any of the governments concerned

without prior conditions, and to work for the goal of a demilitarized, rather than a militarized, Asia is clear proof of our concern for the real victims of the Vietnam war—the peasants and villagers.

In making his generous offer of help through the United Nations, President Johnson used a very meaningful phrase. He spoke of the "works of peace." Peace in Asia, as anywhere else in the world, means more than just the cessation of bombing. It means more than just stopping up from day to day regimes which have no wider concern than the prestige of an individual dictator. It means more than just continuation of an industrial factory status quo. It means, precisely, the kind of imaginative effort the President proposed last night, including regional development of water resources, including use of our own farm products, including spread of cheap electric power, including health programs, including expert and experienced assistance from the best people available in the field of international development.

It is time indeed to emphasize "the works of peace," for in the long run the best way to prevent the ravages of war is to work, constructively and intelligently, for the cause of peace.

President Johnson's proposals recognize both problems, the need to end the warfare in Vietnam as soon as possible and the need to move ahead with positive proposals for all of southeast Asia.

As the President so eloquently affirmed, all of the peoples of Asia, including North Vietnam and China, face the same kind of problems and the same aspirations. By emphasizing the areas in which we can cooperate, by urging the Soviet Union to join in that cooperation with us, we are offering a more serious long-term challenge to communism than any number of napalm bombs. The work of peace desperately needs to be undertaken, and as President Johnson made very clear, the United States is ready to make a significant beginning.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] for his comments on the President's address of last night on the subject of Vietnam, and also to indicate my very strong support of the statement of policy the President pronounced last night.

We have offered to take the first step, to go the long mile, to do everything in our power to terminate the hostilities and the war that exist in Vietnam. We have done this without surrendering our objective that the Vietnamese people should have the right to choose their own government, and to live in freedom without aggression. I believe this represents a major breakthrough in the international posture. I should expect the nations of the world would rally behind this pronouncement of the President.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am proud to have my hand in the velvet glove.

The glint of that iron was in the texture of the velvet glove. President Johnson's address at Hopkins University on the subject of Vietnam and the problems of southeast

It was a speech that bears careful study and rereading to measure the breadth of its impact.

To me, the major emphasis was not a proposal for a \$1 billion development for southeast Asia—as some of my colleagues seem to think—but on a very clear enunciation of our doctrine for Vietnam.

To the aggressors, the President of the United States has said that the United States remains ready to discuss "unconditionally" the many roads open to peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese crisis.

But he also warned them unconditionally—

We will not be defeated, we will not grow tired, we will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

If Hanoi concludes that in South Vietnam they have the makings of another Dienbienphu, they are mistaken.

We are not an economically racked Nation trying to hang on to a corner of Asia with a tiny force.

Hanoi should know—Communist China should know—that the United States has deployed only a fragment of its unparalleled military power.

President Johnson has repeated yet again—51 times—that ours is the path of peace—but that we are not going to let communism take the next step toward pushing the United States out of Asia.

With that view I stand foursquare.

On August 10, 1964, all but two Members of the Congress voted to support a joint resolution approving the President's determination "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent any further aggression."

We have seen that doctrine applied by the Commander in Chief with firmness—yet with restraint.

I am confident that the President intends to carry out that policy as Commander in Chief.

For not only has he invited the leaders of North Vietnam to show their good faith, he has also laid down the ground rules that the United States will require for settlement of this crisis.

We must have an independent South Vietnam—a country which will have insured the right to carve out its own relationship with other nations—not a satellite or a staging point for future aggression.

No one wishes to see any more American boys die in that far corner of the world. Nor does anyone wish to see "tyranny in a teacup" spread across the face of Asia, a threat so ominous that in time it would threaten all civilization.

I support as strongly as I can the President's forthright position on bringing peace to Vietnam.

Now, Mr. President, let us look just for a moment at the proposal to add \$1 billion to a cooperative United Nations effort to redevelop southeast Asia.

As I see it, the President is suggesting not an extension of foreign aid but a refocusing of American aims in those areas of the most wretched human misery.

The cost of military operations is infinitely higher and, if forced to escalate in the face of aggression, could be the highest of all costs.

The President's speech must be read in totality.

It must be reread by every American and, we hope, by every leader in Hanoi and Peiping.

I need not point out that when the United States accepted an invitation to assist the people of South Vietnam in 1954, it did so largely in economic support.

Sustained efforts from 1954 to 1960 were producing agrarian reforms, better rice and rubber production, new schools and better health.

It was North Vietnam which chose to substitute terrorism and warfare for economic progress.

After 2 years of bloody assassination and slaughter, the Republic of Vietnam appealed to the United States to help them.

President Kennedy responded promptly.

The ensuing years have led to a shifting, turbulent situation that led to frustration at home and abroad.

Some voices here in Congress have been raised in recent months urging that we stop the agony and negotiate now—or then.

But the President's response—and I believe it to be the correct response—is that we could not negotiate from a position of weakness. A man flat on his back—with his shoulders pinned to the mat is in no position to negotiate.

Thus, the President called for a systematic retaliatory response, stepped up air raids against the supply lines to the north.

The air attacks were not intended to be our ultimate answer but they have served their purpose.

They have provided just enough of a view of the iron hand so that now, when the President states we are ready to discuss peace, he speaks from a position far stronger than would have been the case had he followed the advice of those well-intentioned persons who counseled abrupt withdrawal and immediate discussion.

There is a quotation from the Gospel of the Buddha which underscores the attitude of the United States.

Asked if it is wrong to go to war to protect one's homes, families and property, the Buddha replied:

All warfare in which man tries to slay his brother is lamentable, but those who go to war in a righteous cause, after having exhausted all means to preserve the peace, are not blameworthy. He must be blamed who is the cause of war. Struggles must be, for all life is a struggle of some kind.

But he that struggles should look to it lest he struggle in the interest of self against truth and righteous.

The United States will move only in the path of justice, Mr. President. The President's speech must be read and reread carefully, for it must not be misunderstood either at home, or in Hanoi, or in the capitals of the world.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am one who long had urged the President to

make a major policy speech on Vietnam, and I was most pleased that the speech was forthcoming. It was a strong speech, for the first time clearly outlining, in public, the firm policy our Nation has for several months been following toward southeast Asia.

The President made it clear that the United States is ready to carry on the defense of South Vietnam until that country's independence is secure. He also pointed out the role of Communist China in the war; a belligerent, long-range role that makes the southeast Asian fight America's fight, too.

The President offered increased economic aid to the area. If this can be worked out, it could contribute measurably to the stability of the smaller nations of Asia, although we have not been particularly successful in past attempts to buy peace with dollars.

However, I have noted some lack of understanding of the President's speech among those elements who have pressed in months past for peace at any price in Vietnam. Some of these groups and nations have interpreted the speech as a major reversal of American policy and determination.

They are making a grave mistake if they see only the olive branch portion of our policy and not the sword.

In pledging "unconditional" talks, I believe that the President was forcefully restating what he has said many times before. America will talk to anyone, at any place, at any time in the quest for peace.

I should remind those who today cry "reversal" that "unconditional" talks do not in any sense mean unconditional settlement, or unconditional peace, or unconditional surrender.

I fully support the President in his definition of an acceptable peace as one demanding "an independent South Vietnam." And, I suggest that those clamoring for negotiations direct their message to the North Vietnamese.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, yesterday evening it was the privilege of Johns Hopkins University in my State, the State of Maryland, to be host to the President of the United States. During the course of the evening, the President delivered a most inspiring address to the people of Maryland, the people of the United States, and, indeed, to the people of the world.

The President in his address to the Nation outlined the objectives of our southeast Asia policy. His address came at a most opportune time. At a time when a number of responsible Americans had expressed doubts about our course, last night's speech was an assurance that we are proceeding in the proper direction.

At a time when some of our adversaries across the world are still scornful of our will to resist aggression, last night's speech was a reaffirmation of our firmness. At a time when all of southeast Asia longs for peace, the President's speech last night was a message of hope.

That part of the President's address which outlined a constructive alternative policy in southeast Asia that would assist the people of that strife-torn area of the world to help themselves offered a bright

glimmer of hope in the world in which we live today.

The people of both North and South Vietnam have every reason to wish for peace. In his speech the President stated that the United States is willing to sit down at any time with any responsible group to work out a constructive peace, so that young, independent nations can grow undeterred by warlike aggression. That statement must be a welcome ray of light in that section of the world.

Because of the President's speech, I think that all over the world today the respect in which the United States is held, and the hope of peace, are far stronger than they were last night.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday evening I had the distinct pleasure and great honor of accompanying President Johnson to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore where he delivered a major foreign policy speech on southeast Asia and, in particular, Vietnam.

In his speech, the President reassured the people of the world that the United States will continue to lead in the search for peace. He made it equally clear, however, that our military power will be used when necessary to stop aggression against our free world allies.

As a long time advocate of increased United Nations participation in the confrontation in southeast Asia, I was extremely pleased to hear President Johnson call on Secretary General U Thant to use his good offices to foster an economic development cooperation plan for that underdeveloped region.

I share the President's belief that we must intensify the fight against poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance. By fighting these problems, by replacing despair with hope, freedom becomes more tangible.

As the Baltimore Sun points out in its editorial today, the President's speech does not mean that peace will be established at once. It does, however, offer a challenge to the Communist side to match America's willingness to negotiate for a peaceful solution in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place "the President's speech" in the Record. I am sure that my colleagues will not want to miss reading this editorial which appeared in one of this country's leading newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Apr. 8, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson struck the right note in his speech last night at the Johns Hopkins University. He lifted the discussion of the war in Vietnam from the purely military measures to the higher ground of an American policy that puts the proper emphasis on our desire to search for a peaceful settlement and our readiness to contribute generously to a program of economic development for southeast Asia, which could include North Vietnam.

The President thus has supplied what, to many Americans, seemed to be a missing element in previous official explanations of this U.S. policy. His speech does not mean that peace will be established at once, since the

Communist side has yet to show whether it is ready even to discuss a settlement, but it widens the approaches to negotiations and it thus strengthens the U.S. position.

Mr. Johnson repeated his earlier statement that the United States would never be second in the search for peace and went on to declare that "we remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions." This is an important move forward from previous indications that discussions would be agreed to only after the Communist side stopped its aggression against South Vietnam.

The President was explicit in saying that he will ask Congress to "join in a \$1 billion American investment" in the economic development of southeast Asia when peace is assured, and in expressing his hope that U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, will use the prestige of his office and his own knowledge of Asia to initiate, "as soon as possible," with the countries of Asia a plan for cooperation in increased development. This helps to make it clear to Asians, as well as to others, that the United States is concerned first with peace rather than with military action.

In the President's speech there is an inducement for the Communists to end the war and an inducement for other governments to join in the effort to obtain a settlement. The present military action by the United States will continue and it should be noted that the President pointed out that patience and determination will be required to see it through, but everyone concerned should now have a better understanding of our policy and purpose.

We can all agree with the President's statement that we have no wish to see thousands of Asians or Americans die in battle, or to see North Vietnam devastated, and approved his promise that our military power will be used with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President's speech of last night is being described as the carrot that goes with the stick, the offer and the promise to go with the use of force. Presumably, the air raids on the North were designed to force North Vietnam to a conference table more or less on our terms.

Now, so the argument goes, we can say that we have offered to negotiate a peace and if the offer is not accepted it is the fault of someone else, not the United States.

Yet 2 months ago, when the air raids on the North began, American voices were saying that we had to step up our military activity so that we could bargain at the conference table from a position of strength. How often that phrase has been thrown out in Washington in the last few months. But I have never heard any explanation of why it is a policy that only our side could or should adopt.

Is anyone going to say now that North Vietnam should not undertake any negotiations from a position of weakness, but should increase her own military activity so that when any negotiations do begin, she can bargain from a position of strength?

I heard nothing in the President's speech that suggests to me he has any negotiations in mind at all. There was a lot of lipservice paid to the theory of peace, grandiose utopian verbiage was plentiful, and the dollar sign was liberally displayed, apparently in hopes of quieting criticism from abroad. But

there was no language that suggests that the United States is going to return to the rule of law in Southeast Asia or that we are actively seeking a peaceful solution to its problems. There was no word that the United States plans to go forth to observe either the United Nations Charter or the Geneva Accords of 1954.

All I heard in the President's speech was that the United States is going to continue shooting fish in the barrel as they are all dead. And yesterday an aircraft dropped 20 tons of rockets and napalm on a mission that resulted in the destruction of 7 trucks and the burning of 4 others. That is roughly 2 tons of bombs per truck and it makes me wonder if we are not already running out of targets.

One cannot read that address of last night without being struck by the peculiar shifting description of who is fighting in Vietnam. In one place we read that:

The first reality is that North Vietnam attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam.

Several paragraphs later we read that it is the deepening shadow of Communist China that is urging on the rebels in Hanoi.

Yet the enemy that the United States must deal with if there are to be peace negotiations for South Vietnam are the rebels within South Vietnam. They control much of the territory, much of the population of the country. In many districts they operate all the functions of government.

We will not have any real negotiations until we talk to the people we are fighting, and we will not have a genuine offer to negotiate from the White House until the offer is directed to the people who are fighting and not the shadows of them.

In short, what the President said was far more meaningful and significant than what he did say. He mentioned the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations, but not the obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter. He mentioned that South Vietnam will hold the elections in 1966, which is supposed to reunite Vietnam under one government. The most meaningful negotiations that could be held with the north are those that were supposed to have taken place in 1956, to work out details of a countrywide election.

I ask the President, when are we going to conduct those negotiations? The President is quite wrong in thinking he can call upon others to observe the 1954 agreement while at the same time he insists that South Vietnam is guaranteed as an independent country. The 1954 agreement did not provide for sovereign South Vietnam. It provided Vietnam, divided into two parts, to be reunited within 2 years by elections supervised by the International Commission. If the President wants independent South Vietnam, he should negotiate a new agreement. If he goes ahead with the reunification under one government. But we can

have it both ways unless we are expecting only to use this line as an excuse for war, and that is how we have been using it for 10 years.

Most of all do I regret the reference the President made to the United Nations and its Secretary General. Clearly, the President sought to invoke the sanctity of the United Nations while at the same time repudiating its most vital function—that of keeping the peace. I say to the President that U Thant could use the prestige of his office, and his deep knowledge of Asia, to initiate peace talks. The good offices of the Secretary General are infinitely more meaningful to peace than they are to the presiding over of a billion dollar development program. Surely the President well knows that peace must come to that area before any kind of development plan can proceed.

When, Mr. President, are you going to make use of the United Nations and of the Secretary General for the one purpose they were created to serve—to save mankind from the scourge of war?

Unfortunately, the American policy in Asia is not saving mankind from war nor from communism, either. And I fear that to continue the war, as we have been doing, is going to help communism make even more gains in Asia, because our policy tells the people of Asia that we would rather see them dead than see them live under Communist control.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. SALTONSTALL) and myself, I present a certified copy of a resolution entitled "Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Granting to Veterans of World War I Pensions Comparable to Grants to Veterans of American Wars Prior to World War I," passed by the house of representatives on March 23, 1965, and by the senate on March 29, 1965.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO GRANTS TO VETERANS OF AMERICAN WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I

Whereas the national policy of the United States concerning veterans of the United States has been to grant assistance to them in declining years by a pension, in consideration of their military services to their country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to veterans of World War I comparable to grants to veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the

United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth, and to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives of the United States.

House of representatives, adopted, March 23, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAHER, Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 29, 1965.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK, Clerk.

Attest: KEVIN H. WHITE, Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 359. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 150).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 702. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quillmett Tribe of Indians (Rept. No. 152); and

S. 795. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State (Rept. No. 153).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1870. A bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (Rept. No. 181).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN: S. 1744. A bill for the relief of Sydney Cecil Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1745. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOGHE (for himself and Mr. SARGENT):

S. 1746. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: S. 1747. A bill for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.; and

S. 1748. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: S. 1749. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to require the Council of Economic Advisors to advise the President regarding the effect of the importation of petroleum and petroleum products on employment in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. JOHNSON of North Carolina):

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress Building in square 782 in the District of Columbia, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON), the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARLSON) and the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), who comprise the Senate members of the Madison Memorial Commission, I introduced a joint resolution in a new form which has been worked out for the building of a new building for the Congressional Library, and certain important aspects in connection with that building to be dedicated to James Madison. The name for the entire building would be given the name of "James Madison Memorial Building."

At this time I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement with reference to Mr. Madison, who is, I think, unchallenged as the father of the Constitution of this country, be printed in the Record. I ask that the statement appear on behalf of the four Senators whom I have mentioned—the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARLSON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE THIRD LIBRARY BUILDING TO BE DESIGNATED "JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL LIBRARY" AND TO INCLUDE A MADISON MEMORIAL HALL

James Madison is unchallenged as the Father of the Constitution and chief architect of the Bill of Rights. Madison drafted the Virginia plan on which the Constitution was based. He knew the strength and weaknesses of all the ancient and modern confederacies and he was immediately recognized as the wisest man in the immortal assembly that had gathered to draft a new Constitution. He participated in the debates on every issue being absent from the Convention only for a few minutes on rare occasions. He had his own form of shorthand and recorded the debates and transcribed them at night by candlelight in his little Philadelphia boardinghouse room.

After the approval of the Constitution by the Convention, Madison went to New York and persuaded the Continental Congress to approve the Constitution and submit it to the 13 States. He then collaborated with Alexander Hamilton and John Jay in writing the Federalist Papers in support of the adoption of the Constitution by the States. Then he returned to Virginia and largely through his efforts and leadership in the Virginia Constitutional Convention the Constitution was adopted by a vote of 89 to 79.

At George Washington's request, Madison became a candidate and was elected a Mem-

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7185

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have permission to extend their remarks in the Record on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the many small growers of burley tobacco in the State of West Virginia, I would like to say we are very pleased with the fact that an amendment was added in the other body, and adopted by the conference, for the protection of small burley growers. There are many such tobacco growers in my district, and for them this is their only source of cash income. I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and also discussed the amendment with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, and I am gratified that the provisions of this acreage-poundage bill contemplate future protection of the small growers of burley tobacco. It is in my district of West Virginia that the preponderance of burley tobacco is raised, and my many tobacco farmers are grateful for this protection.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SALK'S DEVELOPMENT OF VACCINE AGAINST POLIOMYELITIS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas April 12, 1965, is the tenth anniversary of one of the most significant medical achievements of our time, Doctor Jonas Salk's development of a successful vaccine against poliomyelitis; and

Whereas in the 10 years since the introduction of the Salk vaccine, there has been a 99 per centum reduction in the number of cases of polio in the United States; and

Whereas this dread disease which once at-

tacked in the ten years since the introduction as many as fifty-seven thousand Americans in a single year and made the summer months a time of fear and apprehension for parents across the Nation has now been eliminated as a public health problem; and

Whereas this great medical victory was won through a unique partnership between the American people and medical scientists like Doctor Salk, under the auspices of the National Foundation March of Dimes, and with the outstanding cooperation of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas a leading example of how this partnership is continuing and expanding is the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California; and

Whereas this institute was conceived as a research center where scientists of international reputation could come and map out the high strategy of man's fight for health; and

Whereas Doctor Salk and his colleagues from all over the world are now at work on projects aimed at discovering the basic concepts of life itself; and

Whereas from this research can flow the specific methods to control disease and to promote the health and better understanding of man and his full potential: Now be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Doctor Jonas Salk and the National Foundation March of Dimes be congratulated on this 10th anniversary of the announcements of the world's first effective vaccine against polio, that the Nation express its gratitude to Doctor Salk and to his colleagues concerned with this historic discovery and to the Foundation and that our confidence be expressed that the work of the National Foundation March of Dimes—especially its fight against birth defects—and of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies will bring about the blessings of better health for our society and all its citizens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES ROLE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. CRALEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my congratulations to President Johnson for his lucid, penetrating, and convincing presentation of the United States role in South Vietnam.

More than that, and I think I speak for many of my fellow Congressmen, I should like to express my deep gratitude and intense enthusiasm for his projected policies in southeast Asia.

President Johnson has indicated that while we will keep the sword bared, we will carry in the other hand the olive branch; that we welcome negotiation, an "unconditional discussion," with many or few, now or later, on the basis of old or new treaties. As he reminds us this is the only path of reasonable men and we would be reasonable men. We are, in other words, anxious and ready for peace in that far off land where our young men are dying, but if peace is to be negotiated, the interests of that helpless and hapless nation of southeast Asia; namely, South Vietnam, to which we are and remain committed, must be preserved. We will not embrace a peace that requires a desertion.

Moreover, I should like to applaud particularly and concur in President Johnson's positive program for southeast Asia. Not only are we endeavoring to terminate the use of military arms as rapidly as possible, but to commence an all-out war on poverty in that vast area of underprivileged human beings,

deprived not of the comforts of life alone, but of the necessities of human existence. The President perceives that our "weapons are symbols of human failure" necessary, but to be decried; that they should be supplemented, ultimately, and hopefully replaced, with the symbols of the greatness of our civilization; namely, material abundance, health, education. Specifically, his request for disbursement of food and clothing by means of our farm surpluses is a recognition of both a waste, on the one hand, and a want on the other. Finally, his request for \$1 billion as an investment in southeast Asian peace and progress appears to me as both judicious and enlightened.

The breadth and deep humanity of this message reminds one of the phrase, "no man is an island," a truism carrying with it profound responsibilities for all of us. The policy project for southeast Asia gives credit to the President and his administration whose chief concern is with unity, harmony, both at home and abroad; with peace, progress, humane enrichment for all men. In this view we become what we are, or let me say we acknowledge what is a fact, that we are citizens of the world, keepers of our brother, fellows of the human race.

We Americans do have a dream. Sometimes we forget to advert to it, but it is always there. It is our real "manifest destiny." It is this we must carry first and foremost to all the world; it is what makes food and money and volunteers significant. It is what this strong, wealthy, powerful Republic is really all about. The American dream is ancient in origin, but young in execution, in fact, it remains to be completed. This dream pictures all men as equal before their Creator and the law; as reasonable and perfectible, although weak and fallible. It draws no national boundaries, it knows no discrimination. The speech of President Johnson last night at Johns Hopkins University recaptures and recalls to us these principles, embodied in our Declaration of Independence and in the constitutional endeavors of the founders of this Nation.

The early settlers in America looked upon this new world as a city seated upon a hill, as a leader and an example to all the world. It is a long way from the Atlantic coast to Asia, but that far the American dream reaches today.

My colleagues, in the light of President Johnson's excellent and exceptional address, may I present to you a telegram and a suggestion which I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Peter Wambach of radio WCMB in Harrisburg, Pa. The message reads:

Congratulations on Johns Hopkins speech. It indicates once again that our President has the vision, the humanity and human kindness necessary in this time to bring men to peaceful existence one with another. Any program to accomplish its purpose must have a spark to lend interest to its promotion. I respectfully submit that your suggestions, in the committee headed by Eugene Black, be labeled the SAVE program—southeast Asia victory endeavor. To build, to aid and help is virtually to save and the word fits the purpose you have unfolded for this endeavor. The non-English

interpretation of the word, Latin, Spanish, et cetera is "knowledge" or "to know" or "connotes wisdom" and it would be so accepted in non-English speaking countries. I am hopeful indeed that this program will save southeast Asia and bring it to the future for which all men pray. Please accept this suggestion with my compliments and highest regards and let us get forward with the work.

I should like at this time to endorse and support this commendable recommendation from my fellow Pennsylvanian. I find it eminently suitable, imaginative, and meaningful. I should like to propose acceptance of this suggestion and that any ensuing legislation, forthcoming project, office, bill or otherwise be given the title of Save, embodying, as it does, the full meaning of our commitment in southeast Asia.

JOHNSON PLAN FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last night the President presented the Johnson plan for peace in Vietnam. The initiative taken by the President clearly poses a set of reasonable and constructive goals which would brighten the lives of all the peoples of southeast Asia, a ray of hope in a cauldron of trouble that has known the scourge of war for decades. The President has offered an economic bread and butter olive branch. The Johnson plan delineates the peace as an alternative to war.

If those who have been involved in aggression in southeast Asia are genuinely concerned with the welfare of the people they cannot but join in support of the President's proposals.

The President's speech was evidence both of our resolve to persevere against aggression in Vietnam and project our primary aim of peace, order, and a decent standard of living for all the peoples of southeast Asia.

BILLION-DOLLAR BOONDOGGLE

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has done well to clarify the position of his administration before the American people and the world. I approve of the declaration—with one exception, however, and that is his proposed new \$1 billion boondoggle to aid southeast Asia.

We should have long since discovered that money does not buy friends. We have already expended \$7,701 million in southeast Asia—without winning friends or influencing people.

To suggest that private enterprise invest its money, at its own risk, in such an uncertain area, is one thing, but to dump more millions of the American taxpayers' money over there, on top of what we have already done, means, it seems to me, that we will be going from bad to worse.

In addition to the amount quoted above, an unitemized \$2,304 million has been spent in the Far East.

FUNDS FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION BUT NOT FOR HEALTH CARE?

(Mr. SCHISLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a rather ironic situation. The AMA News published by the American Medical Association has been filled with articles denouncing the administration's proposed program of medical care for our senior citizens. All of us are familiar with the dire warnings issued by this official AMA publication of the dreadful results of Federal programs.

Yet in the February 22, 1965, issue of AMA News, there is a report of the great benefits derived from Federal funds in support of medical education in this country. The article quotes from a speech made before the 61st Annual Congress on Medical Education by C. Arden Miller, M.D., dean of the University of Kansas Medical School.

According to the report in AMA News, Dr. Miller told 1,000 educators at the conference that the Federal Government has been the most potent external force affecting medical education during the past 20 years. Dr. Miller said quite frankly:

Medical schools could not function without the financial support provided by Federal agencies in the name of research and research training.

The doctor also said "fear of Government control appears to have waged a poor contest against the need for increased funds" in our Nation's medical schools. He even went on to say that the hazards which some individuals and organizations predicted would accompany Federal funds for medical education, have not materialized.

The AMA News also puts Dr. Miller on record as saying:

Freedom of medical schools has increased as the limitations of relative poverty has eased; medical schools and medical education have not been sacrificed to external controls; and within recent years a new degree of autonomy has been introduced by general research support grants.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of the national campaign being waged by the AMA against a Federal health care plan, it is refreshing to discover in the AMA's own publication firm evidence that something good can come from Federal funds, even in the field of medicine.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, entirely proper to ask a question. If Federal funds can be used in the field of medical education, is it too much to ask why Federal funds cannot also be used to provide better care for elderly patients who visit these doctors who are trained in medical schools which benefit from Federal funds? Why should not the "most potent external force" in medical education also be available for use in meeting the health needs of our senior citizens?

There are, Mr. Speaker, 18 million senior citizens in our Nation awaiting the answers to these questions. They know that the training of doctors is essential to the well-being of our people, but they also know that their own health problems deserve proper attention.

If our doctors are receiving good training, Mr. Speaker, then surely their patients are entitled to the good care which the high standards of our medical profession demand but which the financial burden of high costs too often denies.

SNOOPERS IN YOUR MAIL

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this House has ever doubted that this Federal bureaucracy is now so large, so complex, and so confused, that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing, a story in this morning's Washington Post confirms this suspicion to a degree never before experienced.

On Monday of this week, during the House action on the Post Office and Treasury Departments appropriations, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the General Counsel's office of the Post Office Department, confirming my charge that there have been 14 seizures of first-class mail since December of 1962, under an agreement between the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service.

Furthermore, the General Counsel confirmed that the last seizure took place on October 27, 1964, and that the Department is continuing to seize mail whenever requested to do so by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Now comes Postmaster General Gronouski, presumably addressing a ladies' tea, since the story of his remarks is carried on the society page, and our Postmaster General says he learned about this innocuous practice of violating the fourth amendment to the Constitution, and ordered it stopped after a phone call to the Secretary of the Treasury last August.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Postmaster General and his General Counsel need to communicate. The General Counsel says the last seizure occurred in October, 3 months after the Postmaster General says he ordered it stopped. Furthermore, the General Counsel says seizures of first-class mail are still being done when requested by the Commissioner, while the Postmaster General says they are not.

I hope we can get to the bottom of this, and toward that end, I have been invited to appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures, which has been conducting hearings on mail cover. I look forward to doing so next Tuesday.

The editorial from yesterday's Washington Daily News on this subject, follows:

SNOOPERS IN YOUR MAIL

Since the U.S. postal service began, it has been axiomatic that first-class mail enroute to its destination cannot be seized and opened without a search warrant.

First-class mail, we have been assured over and over by postal authorities, is private property belonging to the person to whom it is mailed. It is protected against "unreasonable searches and seizures" by the fourth amendment to the Constitution—just as private households are.

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7185

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the many small growers of burley tobacco in the State of West Virginia, I would like to say we are very pleased with the fact that an amendment was added in the other body, and adopted by the conference, for the protection of small burley growers. There are many such tobacco growers in my district, and for them this is their only source of cash income. I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and also discussed the amendment with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, and I am gratified that the provisions of this acreage-poundage bill contemplate future protection of the small growers of burley tobacco. It is in my district of West Virginia that the preponderance of burley tobacco is raised, and my many tobacco farmers are grateful for this protection.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SALK'S DEVELOPMENT OF VACCINE AGAINST POLIOMYELITIS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas April 12, 1965, is the tenth anniversary of one of the most significant medical achievements of our time, Doctor Jonas Salk's development of a successful vaccine against poliomyelitis; and

Whereas in the 10 years since the introduction of the Salk vaccine, there has been a 99 per centum reduction in the number of cases of polio in the United States; and

Whereas this dread disease which once at-

Whereas in the ten years since the introduced as many as fifty-seven thousand Americans in a single year and made the summer months a time of fear and apprehension for parents across the Nation has now been eliminated as a public health problem; and

Whereas this great medical victory was won through a unique partnership between the American people and medical scientists like Doctor Salk, under the auspices of the National Foundation March of Dimes, and with the outstanding cooperation of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas a leading example of how this partnership is continuing and expanding is the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California; and

Whereas this institute was conceived as a research center where scientists of international reputation could come and map out the high strategy of man's fight for health; and

Whereas Doctor Salk and his colleagues from all over the world are now at work on projects aimed at discovering the basic concepts of life itself; and

Whereas from this research can flow the specific methods to control disease and to promote the health and better understanding of man and his full potential; Now be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Doctor Jonas Salk and the National Foundation March of Dimes be congratulated on this 10th anniversary of the announcements of the world's first effective vaccine against polio, that the Nation express its gratitude to Doctor Salk and to his colleagues concerned with this historic discovery and to the Foundation and that our confidence be expressed that the work of the National Foundation March of Dimes—especially its fight against birth defects—and of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies will bring about the blessings of better health for our society and all its citizens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES ROLE IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. CRALEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my congratulations to President Johnson for his lucid, penetrating, and convincing presentation of the United States role in South Vietnam.

More than that, and I think I speak for many of my fellow Congressmen, I should like to express my deep gratitude and intense enthusiasm for his projected policies in southeast Asia.

President Johnson has indicated that while we will keep the sword bared, we will carry in the other hand the olive branch; that we welcome negotiation, an "unconditional discussion," with many or few, now or later, on the basis of old or new treaties. As he reminds us this is the only path of reasonable men and we would be reasonable men. We are, in other words, anxious and ready for peace in that far off land where our young men are dying, but if peace is to be negotiated, the interests of that helpless and hapless nation of southeast Asia; namely, South Vietnam, to which we are and remain committed, must be preserved. We will not embrace a peace that requires a desertion.

Moreover, I should like to applaud particularly and concur in President Johnson's positive program for southeast Asia. Not only are we endeavoring to terminate the use of military arms as rapidly as possible, but to commence an all-out war on poverty in that vast area of underprivileged human beings,

deprived not of the comforts of life alone, but of the necessities of human existence. The President perceives that our "weapons are symbols of human failure" necessary, but to be decried; that they should be supplemented, ultimately, and hopefully replaced, with the symbols of the greatness of our civilization; namely, material abundance, health, education. Specifically, his request for disbursement of food and clothing by means of our farm surpluses is a recognition of both a waste, on the one hand, and a want on the other. Finally, his request for \$1 billion as an investment in southeast Asian peace and progress appears to me as both judicious and enlightened.

The breadth and deep humanity of this message reminds one of the phrase, "no man is an island," a truism carrying with it profound responsibilities for all of us. The policy project for southeast Asia gives credit to the President and his administration whose chief concern is with unity, harmony, both at home and abroad; with peace, progress, humane enrichment for all men. In this view we become what we are, or let me say we acknowledge what is a fact, that we are citizens of the world, keepers of our brother, fellows of the human race.

We Americans do have a dream. Sometimes we forget to advert to it, but it is always there. It is our real "manifest destiny." It is this we must carry first and foremost to all the world; it is what makes food and money and volunteers significant. It is what this strong, wealthy, powerful Republic is really all about. The American dream is ancient in origin, but young in execution, in fact, it remains to be completed. This dream pictures all men as equal before their Creator and the law; as reasonable and perfectible, although weak and fallible. It draws no national boundaries, it knows no discrimination. The speech of President Johnson last night at Johns Hopkins University recaptures and recalls to us these principles, embodied in our Declaration of Independence and in the constitutional endeavors of the founders of this Nation.

The early settlers in America looked upon this new world as a city seated upon a hill, as a leader and an example to all the world. It is a long way from the Atlantic coast to Asia, but that far the American dream reaches today.

My colleagues, in the light of President Johnson's excellent and exceptional address, may I present to you a telegram and a suggestion which I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Peter Wambach of radio WCMB in Harrisburg, Pa. The message reads:

Congratulations on Johns Hopkins speech. It indicates once again that our President has the vision, the humanity and human kindness necessary in this time to bring men to peaceful existence one with another. Any program to accomplish its purpose must have a spark to lend interest to its promotion. I respectfully submit that your suggestions, in the committee headed by Eugene Black, be labeled the SAVE program—southeast Asia victory endeavor. To build, to aid and help is virtually to save and the word fits the purpose you have unfolded for this endeavor. The non-English

interpretation of the word, Latin, Spanish, et cetera is "knowledge" or "to know" or "connotes wisdom" and it would be so accepted in non-English speaking countries. I am hopeful indeed that this program will save southeast Asia and bring it to the future for which all men pray. Please accept this suggestion with my compliments and highest regards and let us get forward with the work.

I should like at this time to endorse and support this commendable recommendation from my fellow Pennsylvanian. I find it eminently suitable, imaginative, and meaningful. I should like to propose acceptance of this suggestion and that any ensuing legislation, forthcoming project, office, bill or otherwise be given the title of Save, embodying, as it does, the full meaning of our commitment in southeast Asia.

JOHNSON PLAN FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last night the President presented the Johnson plan for peace in Vietnam. The initiative taken by the President clearly poses a set of reasonable and constructive goals which would brighten the lives of all the peoples of southeast Asia, a ray of hope in a cauldron of trouble that has known the scourge of war for decades. The President has offered an economic bread and butter olive branch. The Johnson plan delineates the peace as an alternative to war.

If those who have been involved in aggression in southeast Asia are genuinely concerned with the welfare of the people they cannot but join in support of the President's proposals.

The President's speech was evidence both of our resolve to persevere against aggression in Vietnam and project our primary aim of peace, order, and a decent standard of living for all the peoples of southeast Asia.

BILLION-DOLLAR BOONDOGGLE

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has done well to clarify the position of his administration before the American people and the world. I approve of the declaration—with one exception, however, and that is his proposed new \$1 billion boondoggle to aid southeast Asia.

We should have long since discovered that money does not buy friends. We have already expended \$7,701 million in southeast Asia—without winning friends or influencing people.

To suggest that private enterprise invest its money, at its own risk, in such an uncertain area, is one thing, but to dump more millions of the American taxpayers' money over there, on top of what we have already done, means, it seems to me, that we will be going from bad to worse.

In addition to the amount quoted above, an unitemized \$2,304 million has been spent in the Far East.

FUNDS FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION BUT NOT FOR HEALTH CARE?

(Mr. SCHISLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a rather ironic situation. The AMA News published by the American Medical Association has been filled with articles denouncing the administration's proposed program of medical care for our senior citizens. All of us are familiar with the dire warnings issued by this official AMA publication of the dreadful results of Federal programs.

Yet in the February 22, 1965, issue of AMA News, there is a report of the great benefits derived from Federal funds in support of medical education in this country. The article quotes from a speech made before the 61st Annual Congress on Medical Education by C. Arden Miller, M.D., dean of the University of Kansas Medical School.

According to the report in AMA News, Dr. Miller told 1,000 educators at the conference that the Federal Government has been the most potent external force affecting medical education during the past 20 years. Dr. Miller said quite frankly:

Medical schools could not function without the financial support provided by Federal agencies in the name of research and research training.

The doctor also said "fear of Government control appears to have waged a poor contest against the need for increased funds" in our Nation's medical schools. He even went on to say that the hazards which some individuals and organizations predicted would accompany Federal funds for medical education, have not materialized.

The AMA News also puts Dr. Miller on record as saying:

Freedom of medical schools has increased as the limitations of relative poverty has eased; medical schools and medical education have not been sacrificed to external controls; and within recent years a new degree of autonomy has been introduced by general research support grants.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of the national campaign being waged by the AMA against a Federal health care plan, it is refreshing to discover in the AMA's own publication firm evidence that something good can come from Federal funds, even in the field of medicine.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, entirely proper to ask a question. If Federal funds can be used in the field of medical education, is it too much to ask why Federal funds cannot also be used to provide better care for elderly patients who visit these doctors who are trained in medical schools which benefit from Federal funds? Why should not the "most potent external force" in medical education also be available for use in meeting the health needs of our senior citizens?

There are, Mr. Speaker, 18 million senior citizens in our Nation awaiting the answers to these questions. They know that the training of doctors is essential to the well-being of our people, but they also know that their own health problems deserve proper attention.

If our doctors are receiving good training, Mr. Speaker, then surely their patients are entitled to the good care which the high standards of our medical profession demand but which the financial burden of high costs too often denies.

SNOOPERS IN YOUR MAIL

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this House has ever doubted that this Federal bureaucracy is now so large, so complex, and so confused, that the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing, a story in this morning's Washington Post confirms this suspicion to a degree never before experienced.

On Monday of this week, during the House action on the Post Office and Treasury Departments appropriations, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the General Counsel's office of the Post Office Department, confirming my charge that there have been 14 seizures of first-class mail since December of 1962, under an agreement between the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service.

Furthermore, the General Counsel confirmed that the last seizure took place on October 27, 1964, and that the Department is continuing to seize mail whenever requested to do so by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Now comes Postmaster General Gronouski, presumably addressing a ladies' tea, since the story of his remarks is carried on the society page, and our Postmaster General says he learned about this innocuous practice of violating the fourth amendment to the Constitution, and ordered it stopped after a phone call to the Secretary of the Treasury last August.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Postmaster General and his General Counsel need to communicate. The General Counsel says the last seizure occurred in October, 3 months after the Postmaster General says he ordered it stopped. Furthermore, the General Counsel says seizures of first-class mail are still being done when requested by the Commissioner, while the Postmaster General says they are not.

I hope we can get to the bottom of this, and toward that end, I have been invited to appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures, which has been conducting hearings on mail cover. I look forward to doing so next Tuesday.

The editorial from yesterday's Washington Daily News on this subject follows:

SNOOPERS IN YOUR MAIL

Since the U.S. postal service began, it has been axiomatic that first-class mail enroute to its destination cannot be seized and opened without a search warrant.

First-class mail, we have been assured over and over by postal authorities, is private property belonging to the person to whom it is mailed. It is protected against "unreasonable searches and seizures" by the fourth amendment to the Constitution—just as private households are.

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7187

Unfortunately, it now turns out, this is so much hot air.

Through a tortuous interpretation of two separate legal codes, attorneys for the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Service have decided that IRS does, in fact, have the right to open first-class mail.

And for some time postal authorities have been intercepting the mail of certain tax delinquents and passing it on to the revenue boys, who search it to see if it contains anything on which they can levy to collect the taxes overdue.

This has been brought to light by Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, who put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an admission from the Post Office Department that there have been at least 14 such cases in the last 2 years.

The Department's legal eagles agreed with Representative HALL that the seal on first-class mail is supposed to be sacred. But, they explained, Congress also had passed the Internal Revenue Code. And in that code, nothing was said about exempting mail from seizure for tax collection purposes. So the Government lawyers decided this gave tax agents the right to ignore the fourth amendment and snoop into private mail.

Representative HALL doesn't think this is what Congress intended at all. Neither do we. And we think the appropriate House and Senate committees should look into the matter with a view to correcting the loophole in the law.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 12

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader concerning the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. First, I advise the House that we have completed the legislative business for this week and it will be our purpose to ask unanimous consent to go over after the announcement of the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, Monday is District day. There are no bills scheduled for consideration.

Tuesday and Wednesday there will be for consideration House Joint Resolution 1, the presidential inability and vacancy in the office of the Vice-Presidency legislation, which is to be considered under an open rule, with 4 hours of general debate.

The program for Thursday is undecided.

For Friday and the balance of the week there will be no legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, may I advise also that pursuant to a previous announcement, there will be no legislative business during the week of April 19.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I will advise the House that we expect to have up the conference report on the manpower retraining bill on Tuesday.

Also, I advise the House that Wednesday is Pan-American Day.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 60, the vote on H.R. 4257, the Manpower Development and Retraining Act of 1962, I am recorded at page 6462 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that bill as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Representative ALBERT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

[Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HARVEY of Indiana's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE DISPOSAL OF MUNICIPAL SEWAGE

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 the Committee on Government Operations issued House Report No. 204, "The Disposal of Municipal Sewage," a publication that merits close scrutiny at this time in view of impending consideration of the water pollution control bill recently reported out of the House Committee on Public Works.

Based on a study by the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, whose chairman is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], Report No. 204 states without qualification that America's streams are no longer able to cope with the ever-increasing loads of pollitional materials discharged into them. It points out that municipal pollution has increased substantially as a result of growing population, obsolescence of older treatment plants, failure to construct needed sewage treatment plants, increased interception of industrial wastes by municipal sewers, and the ever-increasing number of water-using devices—multiple baths, garbage grinders, automatic laundries, and so forth—in the home.

The report quotes testimony of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, James Quigley, our former colleague from Pennsylvania, who recommends a step-up in research by his department's regional laboratories as well as in universities and research centers.

Mr. Speaker, I have for some time recommended emphasized research in the field of water pollution, for the people in our part of the country have long realized that adequate supplies of fresh water are slowly being depleted and that a long rainless period could bring hardship and even tragedy into the homes of our area. I have proposed that the techniques of desalination might be applied to our brackish water problem, and last year I arranged for Dr. H. Beecher Charnbury, secretary of the Department of Mines and Mineral Industries of Pennsylvania, to visit the U.S. Navy desalination plant at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba with a team of experts in the interests of such a project.

Inasmuch as one of the specific recommendations of Report No. 204 is increased emphasis in research on municipal sewage treatment techniques, and because the water pollution bill as finally adopted will no doubt provide for expanded re-

search under the auspices of HEW, Congress should be reminded of a project currently in process under sponsorship of the Office of Coal Research. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced on November 16, 1963, that an 18-month contract had been consummated between OCR and a Cleveland, Ohio, firm for the use of coal in treating sewage and industrial waste.

As author of the legislation establishing OCR, I have, of course, been acutely interested in all activities of that Office, and I was intrigued with the plan to explore the utilization of the properties of coal as an absorbent, settling agent, flocculent, and filter aid for removal of sewage and industrial wastes from water. It is now my understanding that the experiment has already provided remarkable findings and that responsible officials in Cleveland are elated at the possibilities that may develop out of the project. Polluted water filtered through a bed of coal is shown to become crystal clear and free of visible impurities, after which the heating value of the coal combined with the intercepted solids may be used to provide incineration heat or to generate steam for use in other phases of the treatment process or for other purposes. Thus, while developing the use of coal as an agent in removing pollutants from water, the experimentation may provide a new market for as much as 10 million tons of coal annually.

With the 18-month life of the contract approaching expiration, it would seem important for both Congress and HEW to study whatever progress reports OCR may be able to provide. For this reason I am today inviting representatives of HEW and OCR to meet with me to discuss the most effective approach to expediting research in the field if indeed acceleration is feasible.

NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS IN WASHINGTON IN SEARCH OF SOLUTIONS TO THEIR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

(Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday was a busy occasion for six New England Governors who came to Washington in search of some solutions to their economic problems. There was a trying time—trying to walk both sides of "international commerce street."

For a visit with the Honorable Buford Ellington, head of the Office of Emergency Planning, the six distinguished chief executives assumed a most elegant international appearance—each a bon vivant in his own right whose tastes cannot be possibly satisfied with the prosaic products of one's native land.

They are extremely concerned over the decision to retain controls on residual oil imports, the suave New England delegation explained in most articulate global grammar. The Government's lid on incoming shipments from alien refineries tends to open domestic fuel markets to coal produced in this country, a condi-

tion that is counter to the philosophy of the New England Governors when they speak in behalf of world commerce and industry.

According to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], the Governors also had an important mission with Federal executive departments and with their delegations in Congress. By now—wearing their other hats, American made I hope—the Governors had suddenly turned protectionists, alarmed at the economic injury created by imported products. Their chore is recorded on page 6935 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 6:

One of the leading subjects of their concern is the problem of low-cost woolen imports, which are taking a heavy toll of jobs in New England.

There followed in the Record a presentation by Gov. John H. Chaffee, of Rhode Island. One point that should concern every Member of Congress is that in the past 10 years imports have taken a toll of 15,000 jobs in Rhode Island alone.

I abhor the trade policy which is so disdainful of American jobs, Mr. Speaker, and I agree that limitations should be made on wool imports to protect industry and labor in this country. Our New England friends should similarly object to the policy that permitted residual oil imports to increase by 167 million barrels in the past 10 years. That volume is equivalent to more than 40 million tons of coal in energy value, and to produce that amount could provide jobs for many more than 15,000 miners and railroad workers.

I only regret that the Governors could not have stopped in to see some of the coal area delegations so that we might have been able to learn more of their hybrid foreign trade theory.

In view of this unfortunate anomalous position, it appears that America's fuel producers are not going to receive from the New England Governors any semblance of the treatment they seek for their own area. For the time being, then, it is evident that we who are sympathetic to the domestic coal and oil industries will have to continue our stand without the support of our good friends from that part of the country.

But we have another ally which the wool interests, alas, may not be able to claim, and which must decide the issue in our favor in the weeks ahead. I refer to the interest of national security, and I consider President Johnson's speech of last night a most forceful argument in favor of continued and more rigid controls on foreign residual oil moving into this country. With the international situation so critical in view of Communist aggression in Asia and Communist agitation in Europe, it is mandatory that the Federal Government undertake at once to guarantee fuel sufficiency for our defense structure.

I trust that the Office of Emergency Planning which has been charged with the responsibility of making a determination—or at least a recommendation—on the oil import control program, will lose no time in providing the answers to these questions:

First. What military bases and defense plants are using foreign residual oil, and in what volume?

Second. Which are not equipped to convert on short notice to a substitute fuel in an emergency?

Third. Is there assurance of ample supplies of substitute fuels, and is there assurance that transportation facilities would be available to move those fuels?

I am confident that the Director of the OEP will seek the answers without delay, for he understands the vital issue involved in fuel security. If there is also some doubt about the availability of an adequate supply of wool for a military effort, the matter can be taken up in its order of importance.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES TO INVESTIGATE THE KU KLUX KLAN

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend of mine sent me the ADA legislative newsletter of March 2, 1965, because the letter so clearly sets forth the ADA policy relative to the House Un-American Activities Committee, with which I disagree. It occurred to me that the letter should receive wide circulation so I have asked permission to insert the entire letter in the Record. As I understand the situation the President has expressed satisfaction that the House Un-American Activities Committee is going to investigate the Ku Klux Klan. The letter follows:

[ADA legislative newsletter]

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE APPROPRIATION

Under the leadership of Congressman DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California, liberals registered the most votes against the House Un-American Activities Committee since 1946: 58 Congressmen supported recommitting the House Un-American Activities Committee authorization; 6 Congressmen paired for recommitment; 29 Congressmen opposed the authorization on the final vote; 3 were paired against it. ADA and ACLU worked in close cooperation with Congressman EDWARDS.

A. NEED FOR RECOMMITTAL MOTION

The basic strategy to increase opposition to House Un-American Activities Committee necessitated concentrating on the motion to recommit. A motion to recommit is a parliamentary device open to opponents of the pending bill or resolution. The motion is usually made by the most senior minority party member of the legislation's parent committee opposed to the pending issue. Next the most senior member of the minority party opposed to the bill may offer the recommitment motion. Since no Republican opposed the House Un-American Activities Committee appropriation on final passage, the recommitment motion had to be offered by a Democrat.

Congressman EDWARDS' recommitment motion referred the House Un-American Activities Committee authorization back to the House Administration Committee with instructions to hold public hearings on House Un-American Activities Committee's budget. If the motion carried, the committee's opponents and supporters could document their case on whether or not House Un-American Activities Committee should exist.

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7191

those who need jobs the most. Even the Department of Labor has noted the displacement effects of minimum wage extension and admitted that these are likely to be "concentrated among unskilled and inexperienced workers, including teenagers."

Several steps are called for. In the first place, collective bargaining contracts should permit lower wage rates for unskilled teenagers. Secondly, a broadening of training exemptions under the minimum wage laws should be granted by the Federal Government. Finally, as recommended by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee, a careful study is needed of the entire system of the Nation's economic security programs, both public and private, on an integrated basis and with particular emphasis on the employment consequences of these programs. In the Government sector, particularly, study is needed on the economic impact of the social security payroll tax and the level at which the payroll tax begins to act as a deterrent to adding new employees and as an incentive for the introduction of labor-saving machinery and equipment.

Until this administration displays a greater willingness to consider this aspect of the unemployment problem, we are unlikely to have much success in getting the chronically jobless back to work.

My letter referred to previously, follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1965.

DEAR _____: During my years of service as ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I have developed a deep concern about the high level of unemployment among teenagers as well as among other relatively unskilled and uneducated members of the labor force. Today's problem is likely to persist far into the future—and may even grow more severe—as a tidal wave of teenagers, including many dropouts, floods the labor market in the coming years.

It seems clear that one cause of the problem is the fact that accelerating technological advancement and the rapid growth in the service industries are creating a demand for more educated and more highly skilled workers. At the same time, many job opportunities on the lower rungs of the skill ladder are not expanding and may even be declining. Considerable thought has been devoted to this aspect of the problem.

However, too little attention has been paid to the degree to which certain public policies may act as impediments to the employment of unskilled and uneducated workers. Increasingly, economists are beginning to ask whether the minimum wage and the payroll tax, and perhaps even the Federal paperwork burden, may not have an important effect in reducing employment opportunities for the marginal worker and in speeding the introduction of labor saving equipment.

I am writing you and a number of other business leaders in the hope that your experience and that of your company might provide some badly needed insight into the relationship, if any, that exists between public policies, such as those I have mentioned, and the apparent decline in job opportunities for the unskilled and uneducated and the

introduction of labor saving equipment. Any information or experience on labor practices which have a bearing on this problem, even though not directly involving public policies, would also be appreciated.

Your comments would prove helpful to me in my own work on this problem as well as to my colleagues on some of the other committees that have jurisdiction in this area. If you wish, I would, of course, keep your comments confidential.

With appreciation for any assistance you can give me in this project,

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN ADMITS DUMPING

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman testified on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 before the House Committee on Agriculture. I suspect that millions of farmers like myself will wonder who has been getting all the money Mr. Freeman said we are making. I was so happy to learn that we farmers have been rolling in clover since 1961.

However, I discovered several startling admissions in the testimony. Mr. Freeman disclosed that out of 3 million farmers—we apparently lost another one-half million farmers since the January administration figures—only 400,000 earn even close to parity of income. It must sound impossible to anyone not connected with agriculture that such a low percentage of our farmers are earning a decent income, but Mr. Freeman went on to explain the reasons. In a rare admission of a practice long suspected, it was proudly proclaimed that the Commodity Credit Corporation has dumped some 500 million bushels of wheat and 30 million tons of feed grains on the depressed market in the last 4 years. I thank the Secretary for these figures and inform him that I have more exact figures if he wants them. Almost all of these sales have been at prices well below both parity and market prices. I might comment that the Secretary of Agriculture must consider 75 percent of parity as being adequate for the farmer since that is where he has kept it this past year with his dumping policy.

The sparkling climax of the Secretary's testimony came with this justification for these dumping practices. It was admitted that dumping depressed the market price for this reason:

We must not yield to the temptation to make prices so high the (Government) programs become unworkable.

So now in formal testimony we learn that the agriculture programs are being designed not to improve the welfare of the farmers, but to promote the extension of the costly bureaucratic machinery. I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will be interested in this philosophy of empire building within the executive branch.

INCENTIVE TAX TREATMENT FOR TEACHERS

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to correct certain inequities in current rulings by the Internal Revenue Service relating to tax deductions for educational expenses of teachers.

Under the current rulings, a teacher may deduct expenses incurred to maintain his position, but no deduction is allowed if the additional education would lead to a promotion. In other words, the rulings discourage those teachers who would voluntarily return to college for the purpose of becoming a better qualified teacher.

If my bill were enacted, all deductions now available to teachers would be continued. In addition, my bill would provide important improvements in the present tax treatment of teachers.

First. Teachers would no longer be required to rely upon Internal Revenue Service rulings. Their claims would be based on precise language in the Revenue Code.

Second. Deductible expenses would include: tuition and fees, expense of travel away from home, and up to \$100 per year for books and related materials.

Third. It would no longer be necessary for a teacher to be threatened with the loss of his or her position in order to qualify for a deduction.

Fourth. These deductions would be extended to include part-time teachers, thus easing the burden on many assistant college teachers.

Fifth. The travel expenses deduction would be extended to include travel necessary to pursue a course of study or to work on an academic degree. This would help the teacher working on a thesis or dissertation which requires out-of-school experimentation and fieldwork.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is necessary to encourage the better qualified teachers to improve their skills and remain within their profession. At a time when our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the need for more and better trained teachers, our tax regulations actually penalize the very teachers who are most interested in self-improvement and advancement. I believe that this bill should have the support of my colleagues who are seeking to improve our educational system. Surely, there is no better way to improve the quality of our children's education than to encourage their teachers to continue their professional training.

TRIBUTE TO AIRMEN FROM KANSAS FOR BRAVERY IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today as we contemplate the significance of the President's remarks on United States policy in Vietnam, it is important that all Americans recognize that our Nation is engaged in an undeclared war against the Communists in southeast Asia.

Americans are dying and many are missing or wounded in this war which the President last night described as "dirty and brutal and difficult." Approximately 400 American military men have paid the supreme sacrifice in defense of peace and freedom for the people of South Vietnam.

I rise today to pay special tribute to three young men from my congressional district who have died or are missing in recent actions in Vietnam.

The United States is indebted to Maj. Frank E. Bennett, 1418 Community Drive, Derby, Kans., who was killed in action Sunday during an air raid on a bridge and powerstation at Thanh Hoa, south of Hanoi. Major Bennett, a native of Providence, R.I., is survived by his widow, Dorothy, and five children. He was on temporary duty in Vietnam from McConnell Air Force Base in Wichita, Kans.

As a result of that same air action on Sunday, Capt. James A. Magnusson, Jr., 878 English Court, Derby, Kans., is reported missing. He also is permanently assigned to McConnell Air Force Base. Captain Magnusson, a resident of Mesa, Ariz., has a wife, Marian, and two children.

On March 11, 1965, another young Air Force officer, Capt. Richard D. Smith, 737 South Green, Wichita, was reported missing in action in Vietnam. Captain Smith's status is still listed as "missing in action" today. His wife, Sally, resides in Wichita and his mother, Mrs. Georgia E. Smith, resides at 807 South Crestway.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Bennett and her family and we pray that Captain Magnusson and Captain Smith will be found alive and returned to their families.

We have a solemn responsibility and a huge debt to these men—and to all Americans who are on the frontlines in the fight against communism. We must make certain that the sacrifices which have been made, and will yet be made by Americans in southeast Asia, shall not have been in vain.

Our goal must be peace with honor, and not peace at any price.

THE SHIFT OF POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, early in February the United States began retaliatory attacks against North Vietnam. Greatly encouraged, I wrote to the President on February 8, supporting these moves and expressing the hope that they were an indication of America's firm purpose in dealing with the Communist threat in southeast Asia.

On February 25 Secretary of State Rusk said:

What is still missing is any indication that Hanoi is prepared to stop doing what it is doing * * * against its neighbors. The absence of this crucial element affects the current discussion of negotiations.

On March 13 the President restated those exact words, and on March 25 said:

We seek no more than * * * a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia. At present, the Communists have given no sign of any willingness to move in this direction.

And now comes word that the Chinese Communists have ceased putting obstacles in the way of Soviet arms shipments to North Vietnam. And that North Vietnam has just appointed as its new Foreign Minister a Chinese Communist sympathizer whose appointment may well bring a more militant stand by Hanoi. And further that the Vietcong is today holding an American hostage, and threatening to kill him if the United States executes the terrorist who bombed our embassy on March 30.

Are these the friendly indications for which President Johnson was waiting before announcing our decision to negotiate?

For last night, the "paper tiger" indeed materialized with the President's announcement that he was ready to begin without prior conditions, diplomatic discussions to end the war in Vietnam, and that he would ask Congress for a \$1-billion American aid investment in southeast Asia that could eventually include North Vietnam.

Overnight we have changed our 2-month-old policy of firmness based on strength to one of weakness based on buying friendship. The problem is compounded by the fact that it comes at the very time that the Communists are again testing our resolve on the access rights to Berlin.

At the same time, the President stated that American "patience and determination" in prosecuting the war were unending.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we try telling this to the half-million Vietnamese soldiers who are vitally dependent on our aid to carry on their fight. For I am afraid that they might say, as I do, that American "patience and determination" ran out last night.

SEGREGATION IN THE SOVIET UNION—THE TRUTH VERSUS PROPAGANDA

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. REID of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the problems encountered by the United States in its drive for equal rights are spread the world over by the active Soviet propaganda mechanism. Stories of brutality and unequal treatment in the United States are sent out by the Communists as examples of the failure of our society. How people of other races are treated in the Soviet Union however, we seldom learn from the controlled Soviet press.

An article on the front page of the New York Times puts an interesting light on the situation behind the Iron Curtain. It is reported not by the official voice, but by 29 Negro students who felt the brunt of brutality and segregation at its worst. News items such as this one, based on real experiences within the Soviet Union, are small voices against the roar of propaganda, but however faint these voices, they provide the world with the truth about life on the other side.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1965] KENYANS CHARGE SOVIET BRUTALITY; STUDENTS FLY HOME AND TELL OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(By Lawrence Fellows)

NAIROBI, KENYA.—Twenty-nine Kenyan students told today after their return from the Soviet Union of misery, hostility, and beatings suffered while at a university in Baku.

"It was more of an indoctrination camp than a university," one student said. "Most of our studies were taken up with brainwashing and learning the Communist doctrine."

"It was hell," another exclaimed. "May God let us all forget that place."

"All the people hated us," one student said. "They just didn't like black people. If we went into restaurants, they refused to serve us. They don't allow you to dance with white women and if we tried to dance with a Russian girl in a club we were beaten up."

He pulled up the sleeve of his jacket to show a scar he said was inflicted during an attack on him by a group of Russian youths.

Cut off from the world and unwilling to stay in Baku unless they were given better protection, they said, the students staged a 2-week strike at the university.

When that failed to get results, the students moved in a body to the Baku railway station and camped on wooden benches there for 8 days. Finally Soviet authorities put the students, hungry and cold, aboard an Aeroflot plane for home. Two of them were women.

None of the African students at Baku were pleased with their lot, those who returned said, and the strike had been kept from growing larger because the African groups at the university were kept from communicating with one another.

The strike had begun with 84 students and was pared down by sickness to 77 students by the time they moved to the railway station.

There, in freezing weather and with only enough money to buy a few soft drinks and cakes at the station, many of the students fell ill and returned to the university. Others were bribed away with money or promises of women, they said.

By Sunday, when authorities gave them an ultimatum to return to the university or suffer the consequences, the 29 remaining students stood firm and were given 50 minutes to prepare for the flight home.

The Kenyan Government, which had been notified of the expected arrival of the students only after they were underway, had some officials on hand at the airport to meet the students and to rush them off to a dormitory at the Kenya School of Administration at Kabete, on the edge of Nairobi.

This morning, John Ole Konchellah, Assistant Minister of Education, met with students in a closed session for about 4 hours.

Afterward, Mr. Konchellah said: "The problem arose at Baku when the students wanted a transfer to any other university in the Soviet Union. There were allegations that they were beaten up, that the population was savage, hostile, would attack anybody among the students."

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7193

LEGISLATION TO DESIGNATE VIETNAM AS A COMBAT ZONE FOR FEDERAL TAX PURPOSES

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes.

Our men who served in Korea were granted tax exemption on their gross income. I am disturbed that the same consideration is not been accorded to our American military now involved in the ugly and brutal Vietnamese conflict.

Legislation has been pending in the Committee on Ways and Means since February 22 to amend the code and correct this injustice. As of today, the committee has not acted. I am hopeful my bill will recall this unfortunate oversight to the committee's attention.

It is my understanding that the same action can be achieved through an Executive order issued by the White House. Accordingly, I have written to the President as follows:

APRIL 8, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Today I have introduced legislation designating Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes. My bill is identical to a measure introduced on February 22 which has not yet been accorded action by the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is my hope that my action today will help arouse interest which will spur the committee to favorable consideration.

It is my understanding, however, that the President can accomplish the same ends by issuing an Executive order declaring the area as a combat zone. In view of the committee's delay, I would respectfully urge you to exercise this prerogative. I am sure you agree that it is unrealistic and unjust to deprive those serving in our Armed Forces the same tax relief granted to our military during the Korean conflict.

I know of your deep concern for our men in this critical matter, and am certain of your desire to relieve them of at least this much of the burden they are carrying.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

Let us hope that the Congress and the White House will show an equal concern in this matter.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer summed the situation up in an excellent editorial on April 6:

VIET INEQUITY

Denial to American military personnel in Vietnam of income tax exemptions that historically have been allowed in combat zones is one of the sillier examples of Government refusal to face the facts.

A request by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN that Vietnam be designated a combat zone for income tax purposes has been made to President Johnson.

Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the exclusion of gross income pay received by members of the Armed Forces while serving in a combat zone. But the President has not designated Vietnam such a zone.

Thus Americans being ambushed in jungles, shot down in low-flying helicopters and bombed in quarters within civilian areas are losing hundreds of dollars because the miserable conditions under which they are serving their country do not have the proper label.

Senator JOHN TOWER introduced a bill in January to designate Vietnam a combat zone for tax purposes. Regardless of how it is accomplished—by congressional action or Presidential directive—the same tax break that was given to Americans who served in Korea should be given to those risking their lives in Vietnam.

MEDICARE FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. REID of Illinois. On March 24, the House Committee on Ways and Means reported out H.R. 6675—a 296-page bill placing medicare for the aged under social security and containing many other amendments to the Social Security Act, with a total estimated annual cost of \$6 billion. No public hearings whatsoever were held on this far-reaching measure by the committee during this Congress. Furthermore, it was brought to the House floor under a closed rule which prevented any amendments being made by Members of the House of Representatives. In other words, the bill had to be accepted or rejected as a whole—with no chance for improvement or rejection of any single part.

Many of the provisions of this bill, such as the liberalization of benefits for which I voted last year and which I still support, have great merit.

Also, I feel that action is necessary to provide adequate medical care for our senior citizens who need assistance, as evidenced by the fact that I personally introduced an alternative plan to meet the need. I am convinced, however, that placing medical care for the aged under social security does not offer the proper solution to the problem. This feeling seems to be shared by the overwhelming majority of residents of my congressional district. Individual letters have been running 100 to 1 against the administration's medicare proposal, and 85.7 percent of the residents of my congressional district who answered my recent questionnaire expressed opposition to the administration's plan to place medicare for the aged under social security.

I plan to vote for the Republican motion to recommit H.R. 6675 with instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means to report out an alternative and more acceptable plan offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman BYRNES, ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee. This vote will not be a vote against either medical care or liberalization of social security benefits. In voting for this recommitment motion, I am voting for the following:

First. A voluntary and more comprehensive program of medical insurance available to all persons over 65 without

regard to social security coverage to be financed partly through premium contributions and partly from general revenues rather than through the regressive payroll tax called for by H.R. 6675. The Republican program covers the catastrophic illness up to a lifetime maximum of \$40,000 in benefits—and covers prescribed drugs which are excluded in H.R. 6675.

Second. A 7-percent across-the-board increase in social security cash benefits.

Third. Extension of benefits from age 18 to age 22 for certain children in school.

Fourth. Social security benefits for widows at age 60 rather than at age 62, and benefits—on a transitional basis—to certain persons currently 72 or over now ineligible.

Fifth. Liberalization of the definition for disability insurance benefits.

Sixth. Increase in the amount an individual is permitted to earn without suffering full deductions from benefits.

If this recommitment motion fails, I will have no alternative but to vote against final passage of H.R. 6675 in accordance with my convictions—and in so doing, I shall be voting against:

First. A compulsory program of limited medical care benefits for the aged under social security which I feel will surely lead to complete socialized medicine which has proven a failure in so many other countries.

Second. A threat to the very financial soundness of the social security system.

Third. A greatly increased tax burden on individuals still working and paying into social security to finance the medicare program for those already retired and who did not contribute to such program.

Fourth. A greatly increased tax burden on employers as their share of payments to the social security fund—the cost of which eventually must be passed on to the consumers in the form of higher prices on products.

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

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

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 60 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DR. JOHN H. BUCHANAN, OF
BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama

[Mr. BUCHANAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I am about to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, in 1952, my father, Dr. John H. Buchanan, of Birmingham, delivered a speech entitled "America at the Crossroads" which later in that year won a Freedom Foundation award. His words have proven prophetic and particularly pertinent at this point in our Nation's history.

This is my father's 79th birthday, and I have therefore chosen this day to request unanimous consent to include his speech at this point in the body of the RECORD.

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS
(By Dr. John H. Buchanan)

I come to you today not primarily as a minister. I come to you as an American citizen, speaking to American citizens. I hope the day will never dawn in this country when a man responding to a call of duty and entering the ministry feels by that decision he is disposed of any responsibility of citizenship in the land which he calls his own. I come representing no group. I come representing no political party. I come championing the cause of no political personality. I have the right, I think, as an American citizen (thank God, we still have that right) to stand on my feet anywhere and give voice to the convictions of my own soul.

I am the son of a poor Baptist preacher who left the practice of medicine to enter the ministry and gave his life in serving the smaller churches in the Southland. Since the day I was 17 years old, I have had to make my own way, pay for my own education. And, therefore, by the furthest cry I cannot be identified with any class other than the middle-class American. I am proud of the fact that I am an American. I look back with a degree of pardonable pride that from the Revolutionary War until this conflict that rages now in Korea members of my family have been on the battlefields of every war in which this country has engaged since its beginning. My wife went to Mississippi just a few weeks ago to bury the body of my nephew who was killed in Korea. It was on Sunday and my duty held me here. I think by virtue of the traditions of my family I have a right to speak my convictions as one American to another. Coming back in these recent years from tours abroad—summer before last from a visit to South America, Africa, and Europe, and this last summer again to Europe and the Middle East—to this blessed land, I have thanked God for the heritage that has been mine. A land where the fullest measure of freedom enjoyed on this earth is a heritage of every citizen.

It didn't just happen, gentlemen. In 1776 our Founding Fathers instituted on these shores a new political philosophy, a new conception of the relation of government to its citizens. For the 6,000 years of recorded history mankind had lived under the domination of some form of statism; but there was created here what was called in those early days "a noble experiment," a government organized not to control, not to direct the citizen, not to be his master, but rather a government to be his servant. A government whose only function would be to protect him in his right in the pursuit of liberty, of prosperity, of happiness. It was

something new. In one form or another through 6,000 years man had been the vassal of the state until they founded this Nation. You and I have enjoyed in the span of our lives the fruits of their wisdom. We have demonstrated that here in this blessed land the individual can come to his finest fruition when he is left free, untrammelled, unregimented, uncontrolled by the statism that held mankind in a partial slavery for 6,000 years. And, therefore, we've made more progress, and humanity has made more progress, under the guidance of free men since the birth of our Nation than in all the combined 6,000 years that preceded its birth.

But having said that, may I say to you, although you may not agree with me yet we'll still be friends if you do not agree with anything I say, there is just one thing you cannot question, my sincerity. I come with but one sincere motive—to awaken you, if you are not already aroused, to the fear and the apprehension that fills my own heart and mind today. In my judgment, this blessed America of ours faces right now the greatest threat that it has faced in all of its history. It is not a threat from forces without, but its jeopardy, in my judgment, lies in the threat of forces within our own Nation. I still have faith to believe that we have reservoirs of manhood, of material and of ingenuity which can be marshaled and organized and trained to successfully resist the invasion of any foreign foe. This, of course, will be a tremendous price. There is that danger and of it we are all aware. However, that does not, in my judgment, present the supreme threat to America in the year 1962.

We have already fought within the span of my generation two global wars. We may be on the threshold of a third world war. We have spent more billions of dollars and have sacrificed more millions of lives in these global conflicts than in any century of recorded history preceding our generation. The Congress that adjourned last December passed the largest appropriation bill in the history of this Nation, a defense bill to prepare us against the threat of a third world war. From what and from whence has come the thing that has plunged our world into two global conflicts? They came because of the clash of two ideologies, two philosophies of government, two ways of life.

There has been revived on European shores the old statism that kept mankind in the thralldom of semislavery to the state for 6,000 years. A philosophy known as the totalitarian form of government. Already it has taken into its fold 800 millions of people of our earth. Its aim and objective is to dominate the whole world. We have gone with our allies and joined battle against this philosophy. We have spent these billions of dollars and sacrificed these millions of lives to maintain the other ideal, which ideal is a philosophy of government and way of life that recognizes the dignity and the worth of the individual and guarantees to him the fullest measure of freedom. I am sure that none of us regrets the sacrifice we've made in the past in defeating the triumph of this totalitarian philosophy. We rejoice in the fact that there are still free peoples left on the earth. But, gentlemen, as certain as you listen to my voice today, there are certain trends and tendencies infiltrating our American life that if they go unchecked and unhindered, are as certain to destroy our democracy as the night follows the sunset.

I want to read an extract from a speech made by Lenin. You know who Lenin was. He, together with Trotsky, implemented Karl Marx's philosophy of the socialistic, totalitarian state. They helped to produce in Russia, in Germany and in Italy the totalitarian form of government. I quote from Dr. Preston Bradley, pastor of the People's Church of Chicago, who delivered this address on October 8, 1951. I haven't checked it in the library yet but I have checked with

some people who know Dr. Bradley and they tell me that he is a man of absolute, unquestioned intellectual integrity and if he gives this as an authentic quotation, it is documented. He said, speaking to a national convention, "Did you read the address that Lenin gave outside the walls of the Kremlin in the city of Moscow? Of course, you didn't. It is in English and it is published. That address outlined the pattern, and everything that Lenin said outside the walls of Moscow was worked out according to the pattern, and what was it?" He concluded that address by saying, "We will win the western world for communism without shedding a drop of a single Russian soldier's blood." And he said, "How?" and he went on with his unprecedented eloquence before a quarter of a million Russians who were underpaid and were hungry and were in revolt, and said, "We will create fear, suspicion; we will work inside by creating racial hatreds, religious antagonisms; we will pit father against son; wife against husband; we will inaugurate campaigns to hate Jews and to hate Catholics and to hate Negroes; we will inspire strikes and riots; we will plant the seeds of turmoil and we will cover it all with an inflation which will lead to economic disaster until we have 14 million unemployed people on the streets of the democratic country of imperialistic America. We will break their economy; we will send their dollar down until it is not worth 10 cents. We will destroy the future security from life insurance, from old-age pensions, until a life annuity that someone felt would be substantial for the last of life will buy but a loaf of bread. We will break their currency; we will break their spirit. We will frighten them; we will scare them. We will create political chicanery; we will confuse international diplomacy; we will do these things."

Remember, my friends, that this statement was made by Lenin outside the walls of the Kremlin. He indicated this would be the pattern by which they would wreck our Western World by working from within.

I have some friends who are far better capable of reading and interpreting history than I, who have given me 20 characteristics which they find as they go back and read the history of the lands where the totalitarian form of government has come into existence. Twenty trends, twenty characteristics that obtained in those lands; that produced or created eventually the totalitarian pattern of government. I'm going to read them. I suggest you go back and read your history and check for yourself to see if these historians have been accurate in their diagnosis. As I read them, I want you to make a diagnosis of our own Nation to note the trends that are current here and see how many of these characteristics have already infiltrated our American way of life. If human experience has taught us anything, it has taught us that there are some laws that are inexorable in their working. One of them is this: We have discovered that certain causes always produce the same effects. That law of cause and effect cannot be legislated out of existence or out of life. If these things produced as an effect the totalitarian form of government in the other places of the earth, what hope have we if they continue to infiltrate our American way of life, to escape the same effect here? Now what are the 20 characteristics which these historians tell me produced the totalitarian states in the premise?

The 20 trends are: (1) excessive borrowings; (2) a huge national debt; (3) unbalanced budgets; (4) deficits piled upon deficits; (5) confiscatory taxation; (6) extravagant public works; (7) subsidies to various groups of citizens; (8) concentration of powers in the Chief Executive; (9) sapping the independence of the courts; (10) administrative laws, regulation by men rather than by written statutes; (11) a planned economy for the Nation; (12) a greatly en-

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7197

of service which we confidently predict will be of long duration with success crowning his efforts.

"A wise son maketh a glad father."

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasant occasion indeed to join my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN], in paying tribute to a man who I love, admire, and respect and who has many achievements to his credit beyond being the proud father of our distinguished colleague from Alabama.

It has been my privilege to have known Dr. John H. Buchanan for many, many years. Dr. Buchanan was the pastor of my church, the First Baptist Church, in El Dorado, Ark. In 1934, he officiated at the wedding ceremony held in our church which tied the marital knot between my beloved wife and myself. For this act of his, I have had occasion to be grateful to him for as long as our marriage has lasted and this has been some time, in fact, for 31 years next month.

Unfortunately for El Dorado, but fortunate for Birmingham, he left us and spent more than 20 years at the Southside Baptist Church of Birmingham, one of the largest Baptist churches in the United States, and probably the largest in the South.

After retiring from the ministry, Dr. Buchanan devoted most of his time and energy to the problems of hospitalization for Baptist denomination in Alabama. As a spokesman for the Baptist hospitals, Dr. Buchanan came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1958 and pleaded for an amendment to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act which would authorize the making of loans in addition to the making of grants, so that the Baptist denomination might be in a position to avail itself of such loans for the construction of Baptist hospitals. So convincing and persuasive was his testimony that the amendment was enacted and many Baptist institutions have availed themselves of that privilege.

Dr. Buchanan has assumed leadership in all phases of Southern Baptist work. His accomplishments and the recognitions which have come to him because of his achievements are too many to list. It is a great privilege for me to stand in the well of this House today and to wish Dr. Buchanan, who is celebrating his 79th birthday, a happy birthday, good health and continued enjoyment of his retirement from the ministry in which he has served his denomination, his region and the whole United States so outstandingly.

In facilitating the outstanding and nationally known and recognized man of God, who has given his life to the ministry, Mrs. Harris and I wish for Dr. and Mrs. Buchanan many years of continued happiness and enjoyment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and to my other colleagues for their comments. I simply add to them that my father's

public image has been matched by the high caliber of his private life. He brought his religion home with him and in his dealings with his family lived out the religion which he proclaimed from his pulpit.

I would say in conclusion that the greatest gift I have ever received has been the name, JOHN BUCHANAN, because my father has made it represent all that is fine, all that is strong, and all that is Christian in a man. My name shall, therefore, always be to me both a challenge and an inspiration.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] in paying tribute to his father, Dr. John H. Buchanan, Sr., on the occasion of his 79th birthday.

Dr. Buchanan, an outstanding minister and past president of the Alabama Baptist States Convention, has had a long and distinguished record of service to his fellow man. Not only has Dr. Buchanan earned a position of high respect in his native Birmingham but throughout the entire State of Alabama as well.

I join with Dr. Buchanan's many friends in extending congratulations and good wishes to him on his 79th birthday and in wishing him many additional years of devoted service to the people of Alabama.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last night—as did millions of other Americans—I watched on television the address on Vietnam given by President Lyndon Johnson at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

The President's speech was an eloquent, admirable statement of American policy toward Vietnam and southeast Asia, and he is to be commended for making it.

I was particularly impressed by the dramatic and bold initiative seized by the President in proposing a massive program of cooperative development for southeast Asia.

By asking for the participation of the Soviet Union in such a project and including North Vietnam as among the recipients of assistance—once its aggression ceases—the President has issued a challenge to the Communist nations to prove their often-stated desire for peace in the world.

To use a popular expression—the monkey is squarely on the backs of the Communists.

While there is no doubt in my mind what the President meant in his address, there apparently has been confusion because of certain interpretations of his remarks.

Some commentators and some reporters and news analysts have taken one word in the President's speech and blown it out of all proportion. That word is "unconditional" as expressed by the President in his statement that the

United States remains ready for unconditional discussions.

This has been widely misinterpreted as a dramatic departure from past U.S. policy.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The President simply was restating what many of us always believed the policy of the United States in South Vietnam to be.

The President has promised that the United States will keep the pledge we have made to support the South Vietnamese against internal terror and external infiltration and aggression.

Where is the sharp departure from past policy here?

The President has declared that the United States must be prepared for a long continued conflict as we fight for values and principles in Vietnam.

The President has emphasized that peace in Vietnam demands an independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship to all others.

In calling for unconditional discussions, the President has not meant unconditional appeasement. The United States has never set any preconditions for negotiations on Vietnam. We have not called for unconditional surrender by the Vietcong or by those who direct them from Hanoi.

At the same time, we have recognized that negotiations would be fruitless until and unless there is some indication from North Vietnam that they are ready and willing to end their aggression against South Vietnam.

This is the position, in my view, that the President was so ably restating.

It is regrettable that in some quarters the principal object of the President's speech has been shunted to secondary consideration.

That is the bold move to stabilize southeast Asia and assist the peaceful progress of the people in that area through a multinational program of economic assistance, directed by the United Nations, in which Communist nations would be invited to participate.

Certainly the President in his address has dramatically presented a bold initiative for peaceful development in southeast Asia.

Even here there is no change in basic policy. The United States always has been committed to the economic and social development of the countries of southeast Asia so that the people living there might one day enjoy the fruits of modern, technological society.

What is new in this suggestion is the firm pledge by the United States to give a billion dollars to this effort, and the invitation to other countries, including the Soviet Union, to join us in this effort.

It is my earnest hope that those interpreting the President's remarks at Johns Hopkins will grasp its true meaning, lest friend and foe alike of this country be misled about America's firmness, determination, and intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident the people of our country and the peace-loving peoples of the entire world applaud and join President Johnson in his sincere

effort in the quest of peace and prosperity in southeast Asia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has shown by his Baltimore speech our firm determination to resist Communist aggression. He stated flatly he intends to keep the promise made by every American President since 1954 of support for the people of South Vietnam.

All of us recall the experience of the 1930's. Hitler moved from one aggression to another without being stopped—the Rhineland in 1936, Austria in the spring of 1938, Czechoslovakia later in 1938 and 1939. Finally in the fall of 1939 when Hitler moved into Poland because he had not been stopped before, a great war broke out.

The President, with his determination in Vietnam, is trying to stop a repetition of this history of the 1930's. We are taking limited risks now to prevent the big war which would inevitably flow from unchecked aggression.

Therefore, as the President said, we will do everything necessary to maintain the independence of South Vietnam, to help it to achieve freedom from attack. To the world the President proclaimed: We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw.

The President also appealed to the other side for peace which all reasonable men want. But until peace comes, we will use our power—with restraint and wisdom—but we will use it.

Much attention has focused on the President's remark about our readiness for "unconditional discussions." But, as the speech makes clear, there is a difference between discussions and negotiations. Discussions are much less formal. What the President is saying is that we are willing to engage in informal talks without conditions. And even those talks must be with governments. We will not talk with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, which is purely an agent and puppet of Hanoi.

The President made clear our conditions for settlement. South Vietnam must be independent. It must be securely guaranteed. It must be free from outside interference. And we do not expect it to adhere to an alliance or give us military bases.

We have no intention of using South Vietnam to threaten North Vietnam or Communist China, but at the same time South Vietnam must be protected against threats from them. It must be able to call in outside assistance if threatened.

As part of a settlement along these lines, we believe it important to undertake a major campaign for improving the lives of the people in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia. For that reason the President calls upon the countries of this area to work together and upon all the industrial nations of the world to join in a great effort for the economic advancement of these peoples.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his great speech to the American people and to the world last night has once more taken a stand on solid middle ground. He has taken a stand that will command very wide support both at home and abroad. But because it is a stand of moderation—a

stand on middle ground—we can expect it to be attacked by the critics on both sides. Indeed, this attack has already begun.

To be in favor of negotiations while clearly reaffirming our commitment to Vietnam is not appeasement. In the dangerous situation which we face in southeast Asia, and in our continuing effort to command the support of our allies, we must be willing to establish and maintain communication with our antagonists. We must be willing to search constantly for the honorable terms on which peace might be made. To do less would be folly. It would increase the risks of miscalculation. We might very well miss the opportunity—the strategic moment—when negotiations can be fruitful and can bring peace on terms that are acceptable.

The President made absolutely clear that he was not proposing to appease the enemy. He stated:

We will not be defeated. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

His definition of the kind of peace we desire will, I believe, command the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House and of the American people. He said that—

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

It is equally clear that those who say that the United States seeks to buy peace with economic aid badly misunderstand the character of the President's proposals. The President has outlined a picture of the southeast Asia that might be if war could be brought to an end, and has indicated American willingness to help build a better Asia with the help of the free world. Certainly this is the kind of Asia we would all like to see—an Asia developing in peace and freedom rather than an Asia ruled by communism and ravaged by war. I am certain that the American people will willingly join in making a contribution to the development of a free and independent Asia, particularly if such a contribution will help to check Communist aggression in that area and advance the cause of a peaceful world.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has put the world on notice that the United States will not hesitate to use its power to maintain peace. While our record in the world would seem to speak for itself, there are many seemingly short memories, and it is necessary from time to time that we make crystal clear what our intentions, our purposes, and our motives are. This the President has done at just the right moment.

We are dealing with a ruthless and cynical adversary who seeks to conquer by the use of force. As we have learned from bitter experience, failure to resist such an evil purpose cannot bring peace but more aggression leading inevitably to war. Resistance produces a language the aggressor can understand, and we are speaking in that language now.

Of equal importance, however, is the fact that the President has shown the aggressor ways to achieve vast improvement in the lot of the underprivileged peoples of his own country without use or threat of force. In other words we have shown not only our determination to support justice at any cost but our willingness to forgive and forget, once the aggressor has abandoned his destructive course.

There are some who might regard the expenditure of a billion dollars to help Asians help themselves as a very costly undertaking. I do not regard it so when the cost of war, not only in human lives and suffering but in material costs, is considered. These very heavy costs which we and our allies are now bearing are as nothing compared to the cost of unlimited war which would surely be the end result of a policy of weakness or capitulation.

I congratulate the President for the leadership he has given to the American people in a critical hour. I sincerely hope that this may prove to be a real turning point in the history of this generation.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last night the Nation and the world heard a speech from a man of peace—a speech which may well prove to be one of the crucial public addresses of our time. The speaker was the President of the United States. The subject was the continuing crisis in southeast Asia. The message was one of determination, of affirmation and of hope. I am proud to associate myself fully with that speech and with the vision and courage which animates the man who made it.

We have heard, Mr. Speaker, that we must be willing to negotiate the struggle in Vietnam. Last night, the world heard, in unmistakable terms, that the United States is willing to negotiate—that we will talk "with the governments concerned; in large groups or in small ones; in the reaffirmation of old agreements or their strengthening with new ones." Those who have demanded negotiation can ask for no more evidence of the willingness of this country to explore every possibility of peace.

But we also heard a courageous and unflinching expression of our determination not to let aggression succeed. We heard a clear statement of our intentions and our purpose—to help secure the independence of South Vietnam. The President made it crystal clear that we "will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command. But we will use it."

Those who have told themselves that we would allow the people of South Vietnam to have their freedom torn forcibly from them—those who believed that the patience of the American people was unequal to the task to which history has called them—those who hoped that we would turn inward and forget our commitments to freedom in our supposed preoccupation with comforts and material well-being—all of these have been placed on notice that the American will has been tested and found firm. There can be no doubt remaining in Hanoi or Peiping or in any quarter of the globe.

April 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7199

This Nation is ready to do what it must to defend freedom, and ready, too, to do what it can and what we would all prefer—to seek an honorable peace at the conference table.

This much of the President's speech, Mr. Speaker, was a reaffirmation of what we have said before. But it was a needed reaffirmation and one which must have warmed the hearts of men everywhere to whom war anywhere is the height of folly.

But the President said more. He did not content himself with voicing our determination not to be pushed around and our equal determination to negotiate with any government which will negotiate in good faith. He addressed himself, too, to the question of making peace workable, constructive reality in all of southeast Asia. In addressing himself to the concept of an international effort to help develop the vast resources of southeast Asia, the President offered to the people of that area hope—hope of peace with freedom and a better way of life.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, we heard a truly great speech. It was eloquent, and not that alone it can be praised. But deeper than its eloquence, Mr. Speaker, more glowing than its phraseology, was its pledge and its promise—a pledge of continued resistance to aggression, and a promise of a road to peace. Pray God, Mr. Speaker, that "his sound is gone out unto all lands and his words unto the ends of the world."

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President's speech last night in which he underscored our pursuit of a lasting peace in southeast Asia.

President Johnson spelled out with great clarity why we are deeply committed in South Vietnam. We are pledged to assist that small nation in defending itself from a thinly disguised aggression from outside its boundaries. He made it clear—as it should have been from the start to Hanoi and other Communist capitals—that we are not going to scuttle and run—that we are going to stand fast in South Vietnam until Hanoi agrees to peaceful terms.

Obviously even more than the fate of a single beleaguered nation is at stake. As the President said:

Let no one think that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to conflict.

A retreat either before or at a conference table would only convince the Asian Communists that they have the green light to take over South Vietnam, and proceed to the next names on their target list: Thailand, Malaysia, and the rest of the free nations in that area. I believe that if we were to withdraw our forces in Vietnam without securing our objective—an independent and secure South Vietnam—that we would probably be forced to return to a new trouble spot in southeast Asia within a year.

Now we must wait for a response from Hanoi. In the meantime, our military actions will not be indiscriminate, but American and South Vietnamese armed persuasion will be applied in measured amounts until Hanoi realizes the futility of further aggression. No one should be

deceived that a quick response is readily in sight. This could be a long, hot summer in Vietnam. But our military forces and power are more than equal to the task at hand. And I think that we will find the support of the American people in this difficult but just endeavor is more than equal to what is needed.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is now up to Hanoi. The leaders of North Vietnam can either choose to expose their hard-earned physical resources to destruction or they can choose the path of peace. They have the opportunity to share in exciting new plans for developing southeast Asia, and bringing not hunger and death to their nation, but a better life than their people have ever known. The Mekong Valley project alone promises to benefit some 48 million people in southeast Asia, and that could be merely the start of a new day for that whole area. Surely, North Vietnam's leaders cannot deny their people their rightful share.

As the President has said:

We hope that peace will come swiftly. But that is in the hands of others beside ourselves.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has defined the components for peace in southeast Asia with remarkable clarity and balance. He has in a statement addressed to the entire world demonstrated the unique capability of the United States to stand firm and resolved in the face of international terrorism and to devote its resources to meaningful peace and security.

He has shown that this country continues to support the rights of free nations to determine their own destiny, as an essential of real world progress. He has shown that he intends that this Nation will resist both the threat and the actuality of Communist aggression, as a basic tenet of our own security. He has given hope for the possibilities of peace and human welfare without pretending that their achievement comes easily or merely wishfully. He has made unmistakably clear that as the leader of this Nation he rededicates this Nation to the principle of respect for and pursuit of the highest conditions of men, and that this Nation does not commit itself blindly on the single, exclusive course of either thoughtless counteraggression or naive relaxation.

The power to achieve these goals does not rest solely with the United States. The behavior of the aggressor states is of course crucial to the search for security and order in the world. The willingness of other Western, industrialized nations to commit their resources to the task is essential. The capacity of nations from the less-developed, uncommitted world to hold a complete and unprejudiced picture of the problem rather than an emotional and distorted one also counts heavily. Yet the President has committed the United States to its maximum role in the effort, and has provided leadership for the rest of the world of unparalleled statesmanship.

Moreover, he has identified true peace for what it is, integrally related with the basic health, living standards, aspirations of mankind. With grinding poverty, disease, and hopelessness rampant

among great sections of this planet's population, there will inevitably be destructive discontent, turmoil, chaos. This is the basic fact of war and peace. So the President commits our national resolve and our great military power to bring about a cessation of naked, contemptuous aggression and simultaneously request assistance to attack the root cause of that violence. He does so with compassion and calm, and a pledge that the United States seeks these wider goals for itself as a member of the family of nations, as part of all mankind, and not with narrow interests or selfish designs.

There is one further point. By his emphasis on our willingness to pursue a peaceful settlement unconditionally, the President means what he says—there are no conditions, that this concept works both ways. We will not cease what military steps we regard to be necessary to convince the enemy that he will not be allowed to succeed in his aggression, such as our air strikes on North Vietnam. We will take the steps necessary to apply our great military power in the manner which is effective, that we will not tire or retreat.

So this great Nation will proceed on the path of resolve and reason, not gripped by emotionalism, not blinded to reality, contributing what resources we have, open to honest representations for peace, I support him. I am personally grateful to him. I am sure that the American people agree.

TO CARRY OUT PRESIDENT JOHN-SON'S DRIVE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM WE MUST BRING THE UNITED NATIONS BACK TO LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President in his forthright address last night has reaffirmed the United States objective in Vietnam: to negotiate a settlement which will give the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to determine their own future in peace, and then to let the United States depart.

This is an honorable objective. Either the North Vietnamese will negotiate toward that objective, or they will not.

In either case, the world needs a United Nations that has risen from its sickbed and is able to take part in the peacekeeping. That need is now.

If North Vietnam is willing to negotiate—if it is willing to talk about something other than the subjugation of South Vietnam by armed force—a revived United Nations, through its economic aid, its peacekeeping presence, and its election-supervising machinery, could be the indispensable ingredient of a settlement which includes the maintenance of peaceful conditions and self-determination for both portions of Vietnam.

A U.N. VIETNAM PEACE FORCE

If North Vietnam proves unwilling to negotiate, and the military action continuous, it is even more essential that the United Nations revive. We are now assuming the task, on a go-it-alone basis,

of preventing a Communist takeover of South Vietnam by force. South Vietnam is important. But it is not Hawaii or Alaska—or Japan or Formosa or the Philippines, for that matter. The farther away a battleground becomes from our essential national interest, the more important it is that the flag under which aggression there is repelled be that of the U.N. rather than that of the United States. If negotiations fail, therefore, I urge again what I have urged many times before—that the United States request the United Nations to participate in the defense of South Vietnam, with our help, until such time as a peaceful settlement can be negotiated, and that the United States offer to refrain from its unilateral role unless the United Nations, having been tendered its responsibility, rejects it.

But the sad truth—as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out in a fine recent speech—is that the United Nations, when the world needs it most, is nowhere within reach. Its General Assembly is powerless because its members are confronted by article 19, requiring that any member more than 2 years in arrears in its assessments “shall have no vote in the General Assembly.” Because of the failure of the Soviet Union and France to pay for various General Assembly peacekeeping operations, the members of the Assembly are afraid either to invoke, or not to invoke, article 19.

THE AUGUST 1964 RESOLUTION

And while the impasse does not affect the Security Council directly, with two out of five permanent members of the Security Council immediately involved, the Council likewise can hardly function while the General Assembly lies impotent.

Mr. Speaker, what can we do to bring the United Nations back to life, so that it may be available to help in the Vietnam crisis?

Let me first recall to Members the concurrent resolution passed by the House on August 17, 1964, and by the Senate on August 20, 1964. That resolution provided:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the Permanent United States Delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the United Nations of their assessments in arrears. It is further the sense of the Congress that if, upon the convening of the Nineteenth General Assembly, the arrears of any member of the United Nations equals or exceeds the amount of contribution due from it for the preceding two full years, the President should direct the Permanent United States Delegate to make every effort to assure invocation of the penalty provisions of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations.

It was not only the Congress which painted itself into a corner by that resolution. The resolution was specifically requested by the Department of State. On August 10, 1964, Secretary of State Rusk wrote to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to urge the enactment of the concurrent resolution. The Secretary of State said:

I consider it useful for the Congress now to take the additional step proposed in the concurrent resolution. It would strengthen the hands of the President and of the permanent representative of the United States at the United Nations in dealing with the problem of United Nations financing. The resolution would serve as a clear indication of the united support of the Congress and the American people for the vigorous and impartial application of the charter, and would demonstrate our determination that the obligations of the charter shall be given effect.

HISTORY OF THE U.N. ARREARS CRISIS

Let us review briefly the recent history of the U.N. arrears crisis, and how we got where we are.

By the time the 19th General Assembly convened on December 1, 1964, members owed the United Nations about \$148 million. Of this amount \$122,870,589 represented arrears on the two special peacekeeping accounts: \$34,898,227 for the Middle East force and \$87,972,370 for the Congo operation. Eight countries were more than 2 years in arrears and thus subject to the sanctions penalty of article 19 of the U.N. Charter. A dozen more were threatened by sanctions as of January 1 unless they made sufficient payments to avoid the penalty provisions by that time.

Collection of payments to the regular budget has never been a problem. Arrears have never reached more than 15 percent of assessments, and members have without exception paid up before they have fallen more than 2 years behind. The problem centers on the two special peacekeeping accounts and on the political unwillingness rather than the financial inability of some members to pay their assessments for these operations.

The chief delinquents are the Soviet Union and France. When the 19th General Assembly opened, the Soviet Union alone owed \$56,509,686 on the Middle East and Congo accounts; France, which has paid all its Middle East assessments and even made voluntary contributions to the Middle East force but has paid nothing to the Congo operation, owed \$17,031,152.

Both these countries have made their position on the arrears problem quite clear.

FRANCE AND RUSSIA REFUSE TO PAY

The French representative has repeatedly expressed the view that only peacekeeping operations authorized by the Security Council under chapter VII of the charter are compulsory, and only expenditures authorized by the Council for such operations are obligatory. Decisions of the General Assembly, including resolutions on financing, are in the French view recommendatory rather than obligatory, binding only on those members which accept them. Thus, the French argument is that the UNEF and Congo peacekeeping assessments are not obligatory expenses of the organization in terms of article 17 of the U.N. Charter, and that the sanctions provision of article 19 is thus not applicable.

The Soviet argument goes one step further. The Soviets insist that peacekeeping operations are the exclusive pre-

rogative of the Security Council. From the Soviet point of view, both the Middle East and Congo operations were illegal, since the Middle East operation from the beginning, and the Congo operations later, were handled by the General Assembly. Thus, the Soviets also contend that there is no legal basis whatsoever for the compulsory collection of funds for these operations, and that article 19 is not applicable.

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT'S OPINION

The French and Soviet positions run diametrically counter to an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice handed down in July 1962. Because the U.N. Charter contains no explicit budgetary provisions concerning special peacekeeping accounts, the U.N. General Assembly asked the Court for its opinion concerning whether peacekeeping expenses should be considered “expenses of the organization” within the terms of article 17 and therefore obligatory. The Court said yes. Thereupon many of the countries which have previously been unwilling to consider these assessments obligatory, such as the Latin American countries, accepted the view of the Court as settling the matter. Both France and the Soviet bloc countries, however, have never agreed to the advisory opinion of the Court, and were quick to point out that the Court's opinion, being advisory rather than a judgment, lacked binding force.

Thus, while on the surface the problem of collecting peacekeeping arrears appears to be a straightforward question of collecting funds which members are obligated to pay, in fact it is a complicated constitutional issue deriving from concepts of what kind of organization the United Nations should be.

The Soviet Union and France, by insisting that only the Security Council can bind members to support peacekeeping operations, are in fact insisting on great-power control of U.N. peacekeeping and are refusing to give in to majority rule in the General Assembly.

“EVERY EFFORT” TO ABOLISH ARTICLE 19

The majority of U.N. members, on the other hand, by accepting the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, have adhered to the principle that a General Assembly majority can exact financial support for peacekeeping operations from all members, even from those which oppose a particular peacekeeping action.

This brings us to the concurrent resolution of last August calling on Ambassador Stevenson “to make every effort to assure” that the delinquent Soviet Union and France be denied the right to vote under article 19. Starting with the convening of the General Assembly last December, Ambassador Stevenson did make “every effort.”

As the 19th General Assembly limped on, U.S. officials labored to convince other member nations to support loss of vote sanctions if the issue came up. But the United States could never count on the necessary majority to back sanctions.

The reason was not that members felt the Soviet Union, France, and other de-

April 8, 1965

linquents should be absolved of their obligations or that they agreed with the Soviet and French position. A number of countries which supported the U.S. position of collective financial responsibility for peacekeeping expenses expressed strong reservations about applying sanctions against the great powers, because they feared that the consequences to the United Nations of applying sanctions would be far more serious—possibly fatal—than the consequences of a moratorium arrears.

U.N. MEMBERS DRAW BACK FROM INVOKING
ARTICLE 19

The Indian representative, for example, told the General Assembly on December 14, 1964:

We met here on December 1 in an atmosphere of confrontation. I am glad the confrontation has been avoided. It would indeed have been disastrous for the Assembly and the Organization itself if we had decided to vote on the question of whether or not article 19 of the Charter was applicable to the Members who had not contributed toward the costs of peace-keeping operations in the Congo and Gaza. The result of the vote either way would undoubtedly have led to a considerable diminution in the strength and vitality of our Organization. While we ourselves believe in collective responsibility and have contributed millions of dollars toward the costs of peacekeeping operations and have also supplied thousands of troops and tons of material to the United Nations, we at the same time recognize that no Member State can be compelled to contribute either troops or funds to such operations.

So also the delegate of Senegal said at the 19th General Assembly:

To deprive the Soviet Union of its right to vote would be to create a disequilibrium fatal to the United Nations and, finally, to peace. We believe that the application of article 19 is not desirable and would be inopportune. The United Nations cannot live with the United States alone, nor with the Soviet Union alone.

Even a close friend of the United States, Canada, warned of the danger of a collision course and urged compromise at a meeting of the special U.N. working group on financing in early October:

At this moment these (peacekeeping) differences have set the membership on a collision course which, if not diverted, can only have very grave consequences for the Organization whatever the outcome. It follows, therefore, that it is in the interest of each of us to make superhuman efforts to formulate a modus vivendi for the future to which we can all subscribe. If our search for such a modus vivendi is to be made in good faith, then we must recognize that each of us will have to accept some modifications of previously held positions and make concessions to the points of view of those who differ with us, concessions made freely as a contribution to the common objective of finding an acceptable solution.

The issues which confront us involve the strongly held views of sovereign nations—no solution that relies on intimidation will work. On the other hand, if we are to make any progress, we must count on the readiness of each delegation, when confronted with the hard choices which inevitably will arise, to weigh very carefully the consequences of allure to reach agreement. It is the hope and expectation of my delegation that when such tests arise each member government will decide in its own interest that the importance of maintaining the United Nations as an effective organization for peace and

security outweighs other considerations which may previously have seemed to be of overriding importance.

THE ASSEMBLY ADJOURNS INGLORIOUSLY

In the course of the brief 19th General Assembly session it became apparent that the vast majority of the U.N. membership wanted to prevent a confrontation on article 19 at all costs. In fact, the subterfuge to which the Assembly succumbed in order to avoid voting turned the Assembly into a parody before the end. Because there were two contenders for one of the seats on the Security Council, the Assembly President held consultations in his office with each delegation in order to take their votes privately rather than provoke a showdown in the Assembly. As one delegate wryly remarked: "We go into the back room and vote and then say we have not voted." The consternation which arose on next to the last day, when the Albanian delegate proposed that the Assembly resume voting, subsided only when U.S. Ambassador Stevenson announced that the United States would not raise the arrears issue in connection with a vote on a proposal by the President to rule the Albanian suggestion out of order, since the President's proposal was a procedural rather than a substantive issue. The Albanian proposal was duly ruled out of order by a 97-to-2 vote. And so the Assembly session ended.

The scene made good television viewing. But this was the only official vote of a session which was scheduled to consider over 90 agenda items. Those who want to turn the U.N. into a mere debating society had succeeded beyond their wildest dreams.

Where does all this leave us?

If the United States invokes article 19 when the Assembly reconvenes in September, the United States may well be on the losing side of the vote. This would be a blow to the prestige of the United States in the United Nations. It would weaken the organization. It would increase discontent with the U.N. among the Congress and among our citizens.

On the other hand, if the United States should come out on the winning side of a confrontation over article 19, it might well be a pyrrhic victory. The Soviet Union has threatened to withdraw from the U.N. if its vote is taken away. So might France. To be victorious at the cost of sending the United Nations the way of the League of Nations offers little satisfaction.

BECAUSE OF THE DEADLOCK, THE U.N.
CANNOT BE USED TODAY

Perhaps the worst course of all is to muddle ahead as we are now, with the U.N. incapable of action, and with a collision facing us when the Assembly reconvenes in September. As the congressional resolution now stands, the executive has no alternative—unless it wishes to disregard Congress clear expression of last August—but to move to invoke article 19. That the resolution was passed by the last Congress, rather than this Congress, seems irrelevant. It is still the unrepealed voice of Congress. It must be listened to, just as the administration keeps listening to another

resolution passed by the last Congress—that endorsing the President's firm stand in Vietnam.

I believe it most unwise, Mr. Speaker, for Congress to continue the executive in this inflexible position where it must, whatever the consequences, invoke article 19. We hoped that a tough position on article 19 last December would work—but it failed. We must now put the executive in a position where it can revalidate the U.N., so that the U.N. may be requested to play a peacekeeping role in Vietnam. For this, the executive needs flexibility. We should not wait until tomorrow. The time to repair the U.N. is today.

NEEDED: A NEW RESOLUTION

Accordingly, I have today introduced House Concurrent Resolution 386, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the permanent U.S. delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the United Nations of their assessments in arrears.

House Concurrent Resolution 386 retains the first sentence of last year's concurrent resolution, directing the U.S. delegate to continue efforts toward securing payment of arrears, but strikes out the final sentence relating to the invocation of article 19.

By striking this final sentence, Congress would in no way be directing the executive to desist from efforts to make nations in arrears pay up. The sentence of the resolution which would be retained assumes that the executive would continue diligently to exert all possible persuasive pressure on delinquents to honor their obligations. The executive would still be able to invoke article 19, if deemed wise; it could still threaten to invoke article 19, if tactics call for this. But it would not be compelled to invoke article 19.

THE U.N. REHABILITATED

With the article 19 obsession out of the way, a revived U.N. would then be available for a U.S. request for U.N. action on the Vietnam question. If the Security Council failed to act, the question could come before the Assembly under the uniting for peace procedure.

As long as the threat of invoking article 19 hangs over the General Assembly, however, no such solution is possible. As the concurrent resolution of last August stands, it is the sense of the Congress that the U.S. delegate to the U.N. should invoke article 19 whenever an issue comes up for a vote in the General Assembly. If we went before the U.N. tomorrow with the Vietnam question, as we should, we would frustrate ourselves because our first order of business would have to be a demand for a confrontation under article 19.

I wish to make it clear that just as I am not proposing that the United States should cease efforts through negotiation to get France, the Soviet Union, and other delinquent to pay up their Assembly peacekeeping obligations, so also I am not suggesting that deadbeatism in general in the payment of U.N. obligations should be condoned. Article 19,

whatever its weaknesses, was written into the charter for a purpose—to discourage nonpayment. Up to the 19th General Assembly it had never needed to be invoked because members have without exception paid arrearages on the regular U.N. budget before they have fallen 2 years behind. Several Latin American countries, for example, which had allowed themselves to fall more than 2 years in arrears, recently made substantial payments in order not to fall under the sanctions provision. Article 19 has even exerted some beneficial pressure with regard to peacekeeping assessments, for a number of countries made arrears payments to the peacekeeping accounts during late 1964 and early 1965 to avoid the sanctions penalty.

NO DEADBEATS ALLOWED

No member should be allowed to get away without paying his U.N. obligations simply because he does not feel like paying them. But the refusal of countries like France and the Soviet Union to pay peacekeeping expenses for political reasons poses a problem of a wholly different order. The United Nations is not a world government, but an assembly of sovereign states which, by ratifying the U.N. Charter, pledged to work for certain goals within the international community. Each member, however, still has the freedom to consent to or oppose specific actions of the organization. The current crisis over financing peacekeeping has simply proved what should have been self-evident: that it is unrealistic to expect sovereign nations to support peacekeeping actions which they consider inimical to their own best interests and which they have explicitly objected to.

This is indeed the central issue of the current U.N. financial crisis: Can we expect sovereign nations to pay for peacekeeping operations which they oppose? For example, if a General Assembly majority should decide to launch a peacekeeping operation in South Africa which the United States considered an illegal intervention in the internal affairs of another state, would we not balk at paying for it?

VOLUNTARY FINANCING IS NEEDED

In sum, it appears that the assessment method of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations is simply not feasible, and that in considering possible methods of financing future operations we should turn back to ad hoc solutions, mainly to schemes of voluntary financing. Because of the publicity of the Middle East and Congo operations and of the article 19 issue, it is frequently forgotten that of the more than a dozen peacekeeping operations undertaken by the United Nations, only two—the Middle East and the Congo—have been financed by the special assessment method.

Over half of them—smaller operations involving truce commissions, military observer groups, or U.N. mediators—have been financed out of the regular budget. Thus, for example, U.N. mediators have been sent to Palestine, Jordan, Laos, and Cambodia/Thailand. Military observer groups or special U.N. commissions have gone to Indonesia, Greece, Palestine, Korea, India/Pakistan, and Lebanon.

Several more extensive peacekeeping operations have been financed on a voluntary basis. The 1950-53 Korean war was financed completely through voluntary contributions, with 37 countries contributing manpower, money, materials, or all 3. Several recent peacekeeping actions have also been financed by some kind of voluntary scheme. Thus, the costs of the U.N. temporary executive authority in west New Guinea, operating from October 1962 to May 1963, were divided equally between the Netherlands and Indonesia. The U.N. Yemen observation mission, from June 1963 to September 1964, was paid for by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic.

THE CYPRUS PRECEDENT

The best precedent for the future is perhaps the Cyprus operation, initiated in March 1964. Involving some 6,000 troops, approximately the same number as the Middle East operation, it is being financed wholly by voluntary contributions. Eight different countries have provided troops for the force, and a large number of countries have made financial contributions toward the more than \$6 million needed quarterly to finance the force. Although the Secretary-General has been forced several times to make special appeals for funds, eventually the necessary contributions have been forthcoming, and the Cyprus force has now been in operation for nearly a year.

The purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 386 is clear. It is not to encourage capitulation, but to allow compromise. For too long now the United Nations has been deadlocked over the arrears problem. There are only two ways of breaking the deadlock: (1) by a potentially disastrous confrontation on the arrears issue; or (2) by persistent negotiation to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on what I consider the basic issue at stake—how to preserve the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization.

FREING THE PRESIDENT'S HAND

It is time to look to the future possibilities of the United Nations rather than to the past difficulties. Indeed, a solution of the arrears problem may be easier if a scheme for the future can first be worked out which will meet some of the objections of certain members. According to a dispatch from the United Nations today, the Secretary General has advocated a solution for the peacekeeping problem under which permanent Security Council members which oppose or abstain may be exempted from financing the peacekeeping operation. Clearly, an incident of such a solution is going to have to be easing up on our tough article 19 position against the Soviet Union and France.

There is no getting around this: no solution is possible so long as members rigidly insist upon the positions they now hold. The United Nations cannot function effectively so long as the threat of article 19 hangs over it.

I hope that the administration will support House Concurrent Resolution 386, and that the Congress, by promptly passing it, will free the administration's hand to rehabilitate the U.N. Then the

U.N., if its members have the will, can play its rightful role in bringing peace to southeast Asia.

CLEVELAND ARMY TANK PLANT-- EMPLOYMENT ASSURED UNTIL OCTOBER 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, announcement will soon be forthcoming of the award of multiyear contracts for the manufacture of the 155-millimeter self-propelled howitzer, M-109, and the General Sheridan armored reconnaissance airborne assault vehicle, XM-551, in the Cleveland tank plant. The M-109 production period will run from June 1966 until August 1968. The XM-551 production period will run from September 1966, until October 1969. Since the chassis of these new vehicles will be similar to the M-114 and experimental models have been made in the tank plant and the tooling for these advance model is in place here, it is almost a certainty that General Motors will be able to retain the workers presently employed. In addition, many more skilled and specialized workers will be needed to produce these sophisticated vehicles.

The Army officials involved in these negotiations and procurement, should be complimented for their fairness in handling the situation. There has been much misinformation and emotions flared many times in the process of contract bidding and awards. The underbrush that many thought was there never really existed. The main point, however, is the end result, that is, many Cleveland families will be assured of continuing and steady employment. I am most happy and pleased to make this announcement to the people of Cleveland and particularly the workers at the tank plant. I have worked in a cooperative spirit with the Secretary of the Army to secure these contracts and the results are gratifying to me. In the course of this work I also enjoyed the full support and cooperation of Ed Skinner, president of United Auto Workers, local 755.

The people of Cleveland will be proud of the contribution they will be making to the security of our country and the free world by producing these modern, hard-hitting, powerful combat vehicles. I have obtained details on the characteristics of these vehicles which I feel is of interest to all concerned.

GENERAL SHERIDAN ARMORED RECONNAISSANCE AIRBORNE ASSAULT VEHICLE, XM-551

This vehicle will fire the new Shillelagh missile as well as a 152-millimeter conventional round. The Sheridan will be used in armored cavalry units for reconnaissance and security, and in lieu of the tank in airborne divisions. This vehicle will be deployed worldwide for this role. Design and development of the vehicle were accomplished in the Cleveland plant by the Cadillac Division General Motors Corp.

The unique feature of this vehicle is that the gun will fire a conventional 155-millimeter shell and the Shillelagh missile from the same barrel. The Shillelagh missile will seek out the target and can be fired from safe distances far beyond the gun range of

yesterday's violations (for 10 years back) of voting registration practices that are to be outlawed. And its provisions to deprive a few States of the South (a punishment obvious to all) of the power to establish a literacy test for all voters irrespective of race or color is in further violation of the Constitution. There is something dreadfully wrong as we stated in a previous paragraph, when one shouts about enforcing the Constitution, and 5 minutes later endorses and asks for passage at once of a law that is as filled with holes of an unconstitutional nature as a sifter.

The idea of depriving, and mind you, the South only (and only six States) of any voter qualification other than age and residence is a death sentence, but the punishment is meted out in stages. The torture chamber of medieval England would be a good comparison. While we do not agree or endorse all that Liberty Lobby says, we are in complete agreement with the description of that periodical below as the death is carried out in stages:

"First, the rise of a new class of Southern State politician—a breed of demagogues—coming into political power on a wave of pie-in-the-sky promises of free State money for everyone.

"Next, the futile attempts to carry out those promises by taxing the farms, business, and industry of the South at ever-increasing rates, even while failing to satisfy the demands of the poor for more * * * and more and more and more.

"Then the flight of business and industry from the unbearable demands of the welfare state, and the tragic streams of white refugees—following their jobs to the North and West.

"Finally, the necessary establishment of the all-black States as Federal reservations, populated only by Government bureaucrats and their Negro dependents, but—unlike their counterparts on the Indian reservations—represented in Washington by a powerful voting bloc of nearly 40 Congressmen and 8 Senators."

Unless every thoughtful American who dreads the dismemberment of his country as much as Abraham Lincoln did will write not only his Congressman and both Senators, but every Congressman of his State, and as many Senators as feasible, they are unlikely to be able to withstand the pressure for passage. The distinguished Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON deserve special praise, as does BILL TUCK.

And if this bill passes, it will be a greater victory for the Communists (whether or not they have had anything to do with it) than our defeat in Korea.

Upbeat Thinking by GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from Freedom in Education, entitled "Upbeat Thinking by GOP," referring to the Republican alternate education proposal:

UPBEAT THINKING BY GOP

The Republican education aid bill may very well prove, in the long view of history, to be of greater significance than the Johnson education program.

For the Democratic proposal labors under

the author's own genius for compromise. Herbert Bayard Swope once put it this way: "I cannot give you a formula for success, but I can give you a formula for failure—which is: Try to please everybody." Which might suggest that the Johnson bill, though apparently assured of passage, may contain the seeds of its own future difficulties.

The Republicans have come up with an aid bill that neatly sidesteps the church-state controversy and provides complete equality of treatment for every taxpayer and school-child. The GOP in Congress is surely to be commended for performing with ability the classic role of the minority. The concept of grants of up to \$200 to parents of school-children, tied in with a college tax-credit proposal, as advocated by the Republicans, is certainly bold and imaginative; it is worthy of a more serious response from the Democratic opposition than being labeled as mere warmed over Goldwaterism. Indeed, it resembles more closely the classic junior GI bill of rights in calling for direct grants to parents, and its college tax-credit features are modeled directly on Democratic Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill which came within two votes of passage in 1964.

If it is conceded that the chief drawback of the GOP proposal is that it does not guarantee assistance to education (the aid being in the form of cash and credits to individuals), a correction can be found in the original GI bill itself, which the Republican spokesman referred to when introducing their proposal. Grants under the GI bill did indeed go to the individual, as with the Republican bill, but they were negotiable only for education expenses at an accredited school.

It may well be that the GOP proposal could cause both parties to pause from the argument long enough to review the issue in the light of the GI bill. Surely the Democratic leadership should stop long enough to consider how much could be gained if they would disengage themselves from the clutches of Madam Compromise and try aiding the individual. How much indeed would be gained if future aid programs of both parties were designed to meet the needs of the ultimate object of our concern in education: the student.

In any event it must be acknowledged that the Republican proposal has advanced the day when America can put aside the discussion of the religious faiths of her children and concern herself with the educational needs of these children, not their creeds. CEF applauds this advance and wishes it well.

A Teenager's Thoughts on Negotiations Over Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the President's speech last night at Johns Hopkins University in which he reversed his prior position of negotiation only from strength and committed us to another Korean truce talk marathon, I submit to my colleagues what one American teenager is thinking:

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
 April 7, 1965.

Representative GROVER,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the New York Times that mail is mostly in favor of negotiations

on Vietnam. I am opposed to it. Whenever we negotiate with the Communists we bargain and compromise our rights, not theirs. These negotiations would be no different.

I am in support of any measures needed to win the war in Asia. We cannot keep allowing communism to grow and still expect to have a free world. People who say we have no business in Vietnam (Is WAYNE MORSE serious or does he just like to debate?) are wrong. Even if we weren't concerned about the independence of Vietnam (I say independence because we refuse to guarantee a free government) it is a vital link in the geographical containment of communism. We must protect our form of government using whatever means are necessary. In international affairs the end justifies the means, to a reasonable degree. My only question is why weren't effective tactics used months ago? All Americans must remember that if the North Vietnamese and Red China wanted peace, all they would have to do is stop their aggression and subversion. It seems some people want the United States to be a real big brother, never hurting or striking back, never getting angry, never going on the offensive itself. We are at war in Asia, yet our governmental policy is to achieve stalemate. Why not attempt to beat North Vietnam? If we are successful, then it is free. If we are half successful, we have a compromise (with the south free). Now, if we are only half successful, we have lost.

I do not want war. I would be crazy if I did, for I am still in high school and will probably have to go into the service within the next decade. But we must protect ourselves and our beliefs.

Sincerely,

BOB DIETZ.

Farmer and the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial, entitled "Farmer and the Market" from the April 7 issue of the Washington Daily News:

FARMER AND THE MARKET

One of the featured points in the argument the Johnson administration has offered for the catchall farm bill just sent to Congress is that it would save the Treasury an estimated \$200 million. And still increase income to farmers.

A taxpayer saving of \$200 million in less Federal subsidy to farmers and an additional \$100 million assigned to raising crop prices would both come from hiking the prices of what the consumer buys.

It adds up to this: In exchange for the iffy prospect that as a taxpayer he may be stuck for less to prop up farm prices, the consumer would pay more for the food he buys—another penny a loaf for bread, for instance.

By stretching hard, we can dimly see a possible virtue in this. It could be interpreted as the first feeble step toward restoring the marketplace, instead of the Government, as the controlling factor in farm prices. This is, or ought to be, the ultimate purpose of any farm program.

But his bill, if anything, tightens Federal controls over farming—at least in feed grains, rice, wheat, wool, and land use. (The cotton scheme will come later.)

Agriculture Secretary Freeman says the farmer ought to look more to the market for

April 8, 1965

A1730

his income than to the Government. But how can he do this when the Government goes as far as it does in telling him how much he can plant, outbidding the market for his products, and otherwise entrapping him in redtape?

In sum, the new bill is mostly a rehash of the type of farm legislation which has been in effect the last 30 years. The result of that legislation is an enormous Government hoard of farm products, a drop in farm exports, a decline in farm income and higher prices for consumers. Not to mention a huge cost to the taxpayers.

President Johnson is said to be planning a blue-ribbon commission to review the whole monstrous farm program. We need another Government commission like a cotton farmer needs another boll weevil. But if this is a sign that the administration at last recognizes that somehow the Government has got to get at least most of the way out of the farm business, it may be a hopeful sign.

So far, progress to that end has been nil.

A Man Named William and "The Good Old Days"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Erich Klossner, of Pullman, Wash., recently made an excellent speech at the annual speech contest of the toastmasters. His speech is entitled "A Man Named William and 'The Good Old Days'" and I was so impressed with his articulate and well-expressed remarks that I wanted my colleagues to have an opportunity to read Mr. Klossner's speech. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

A MAN NAMED WILLIAM AND "THE GOOD OLD DAYS"

(By Erich Klossner)

Mr. Chairman, fellow toastmasters, and guests; at a time when the world seems to be preoccupied by so many cross-purposes of mankind, let us reflect a little while on what a man named William so often referred to as "The good old days." Some of you may recognize in William a likeness to some individual you have known. Who William was is not important. But what William was, and the things he stood for, could be of interest.

William was a member of a past Midwest generation, who, if asked to make an ice-breaker speech in toastmasters, would decline on the grounds that he had had no education. As the oldest in a family of 10 children he soon became aware of the meaning of responsibility, which allowed him only one 3-month period of formal classroom education. But in the practical school of hard knocks he absorbed the impact of clearing 160 acres of scrub oak, hickory, and maple, not with power machinery, but by hand with ax and saw; with pick and shovel. Too many times he saw this land he had cleared, washed over by the adjacent river before the crops of wheat and corn could be harvested. So, after 40 years of such hand-to-mouth existence, having learned the carpentry trade through intermittent periods of apprenticeship, it was quite by chance that he became interested in a brochure featuring the advantages of a small northwest town of 1,100

inhabitants, which was bound to grow because a State agricultural college had been established there just 12 years before. It looked like a real opportunity for a carpenter.

So, at the age of 41, with his life savings of \$250 in his pocket, and a family of six for whom to establish a future, William headed westward to this promised land. Today there are scores of buildings still sturdy and habitable because of his skill with the tools of his trade. Sixty years ago, when an exceptional construction plan called for a circular stairway, the contractor consulted the college manual arts department for a procedural technique on how to lay out a circular stairway. The head of the department advised him to turn his problem over to William—he was the logical choice for such an assignment. In later years one of William's most treasured possessions was a textbook on manual arts, published by this same head of the manual arts department. It was inscribed: "To William, a master of his craft."

This was the uneducated man who would be amused by such later-day slogans as: "A chicken in every pot"; "the New Deal"; "the Fair Deal"; "the New Frontier"; the "Great Society." Because he was uneducated he could not follow the logic of killing off little pigs and plowing under growing crops as a means toward better times. Because he was uneducated he felt that Government tampering with the currency and devaluing the dollar was just another way of adding water to the soup. Because he was uneducated he frowned on the practice of cash price supports and subsidies for idle lands. As an uneducated individual he never shared the advantages of a minimum wage law, sick leave with pay, unemployment compensation, nor old-age public assistance programs. In his uneducated way he argued that wealth and prosperity could not be legislated, but had to be achieved through the mechanics of productive enterprise, motivated by the individual's faith in his own potential.

Thus in his later years, because of the bureaucratic takeover of much that was once the individual's responsibility, he often pondered "the good old days." The good old days when it was deemed safer to hide a few savings dollars in a baking powder can stashed away in the rear of the kitchen cupboard, rather than trust it to a bank whose deposits were uninsured. The good old days when summer dust on the highways and winter mud on Main Street was ankle deep. The good old days when the fire department consisted of one hose cart, drawn by whatever dray outfit was first on the scene, perhaps in time to wet down the smoldering ashes. The good old days when the leg-weary farmer followed behind a team of horses pulling a single-blade plow; when it required a harvest crew of 32 hands to accomplish what 3 men and a combine can do today. The good old days when scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid and consumption cut the span of life expectancy to 20 years less than it is today. The good old days of which the contemporary Joaquin Miller wrote: "Oh, these battles, they last so long, from babyhood to the grave."

But for William they would always be the good old days because he was on his own. Every barrier of economic frustration provided a challenge and incentive to the end of his 95 years. By the time of his final exit he long had known the lateness of the hour; the shadows falling from the cross of age, on narrowing trails that vex and circumvent. Now we enshrine him and "the good old days" in memory, like a flower, its blooming done—reverently preserved between the gently folded pages of sacrifice, diligent application and honest intent. The good old days? Did they ever exist? Of course that answer must depend upon your viewpoint. But a man named William—he did exist; he was a reality; he was my dad.

A Newspaper Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Copley newspapers have rendered distinguished service from Illinois to California. Many of us in Washington are familiar with their work through the articles by Herbert Klein, editor of the San Diego News. The St. Louis Globe Democrat, December 26-27, 1964, printed a book review by Louis La Cross, editor emeritus of the Globe Democrat, reviewing the personal history of the newspaper Copleys, entitled "The Thin Gold Watch."

Mr. La Cross, who is a distinguished St. Louis editor, made comments which are of interest and which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues:

THE COPLEYS—ILLINOIS TO CALIFORNIA: A NEWSPAPER SUCCESS STORY—"THE THIN GOLD WATCH," A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE NEWSPAPER COPLEYS

(By Walter S. J. Swanson (Macmillan) reviewed by Louis La Cross)

This story of the Copleys and the Copley chain has its roots in Illinois, but the Copleys really struck it rich in the newspaper business in California and the chain now has been extended to Hawaii.

The founder, Col. Ira Clifton Copley, bought his first newspaper in Aurora, Ill., in 1905 and before his death in 1947 had acquired 24, though when he turned over the command to his adopted son, Jim, in the symbolic, thin gold watch ceremony, the total had been reduced to 14. Jim remains the head man with papers in Illinois at Springfield, Elgin, Aurora and Joliet; in California at San Diego and other cities.

Ira Copley's family was in the utility business and this is where he got his start. The parents moved from New York to Aurora to establish a gas-light company. Ira, who was born in 1864, went to Yale. He returned from school to find his family in dire circumstances due to competition from the development of electricity. The Yale-educated son had to earn a living by turning to manual labor including ditch digging, until the family's gas firm made a comeback. Ira's career became many sided: soldier, utility magnate, newspaper owner and politician. Politics really got him into the newspaper business—he bought the Aurora paper to bolster his political career. It did—he served 12 years in Congress.

A member of the Illinois National Guard, the "colonel" title was acquired during his service in the Spanish American war.

The thin gold watch tradition was established when the citizens of Elgin, where Copley had a paper, decided to give him a testimonial dinner and to present an Elgin gold watch with I. C. Copley enscribed across the front. The citizens' thoughtfulness did not extend to remembering to pay for the gift. So Copley footed the bill and the watch became his most highly regarded possession, which he passed on to his adopted son, Jim, as the symbol of management.

The selection of Jim to direct the newspapers caused another adopted son, Bill (from different parentage) long a resident of Paris, to file suit for an accounting of the \$26,000,000 estate. A court order settled the claim and Jim was assured full command.

The story includes wealthy publishers who crossed the Copley path in California: E. W.

I am not saying that this is your sole salvation in the area of economic development. One of our national political figures had a line to read in a speech which said in effect that a certain program was not a panacea for all problems. He read the line this way: "Now I want you to know that I am not saying that this is a panacea for all your problems."

And I am not telling you this program is a panacea for all your problems.

I am saying simply that I think it can be of significant value in your economic development program because of the depth and diversity it will give your own programs. We also have our regular loan program with loans for the smallest to the largest small businessman. We have our procurement assistance program to help small business get its share of Government contracts. We have our management assistance program and our small-business investment company program to assist in management training and in creation of equity capital.

We are also participating in the war on poverty and, under the Economic Opportunity Act, we are working with a number of Mississippi communities that have indicated an interest in helping to build stronger small-business sectors in deprived areas where jobs and opportunities are most desperately needed.

We are working, for example, at Corinth which has a community action program and intensified vocational training already underway.

We are hopeful that a small business development center will be set up here in Jackson as headquarters for this type of loan and management assistance program here.

The liberalized loans under this economic opportunity program range up to \$25,000 and extend for terms of up to 15 years.

A community must have a small-business development center before being eligible for this program because it must be a broad-based effort. It requires the support of business and labor and government and universities.

At this center applicants for assistance are interviewed and their business problems analyzed. Those that make sound proposals are referred to the SBA office. If a loan is made the center follows through with guidance and counseling.

We have a national program called Score—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—which we have meshed with this program in some areas. Retired businessmen who have volunteered their services counsel and advise small businessmen with problems. More than 800 of these volunteers are at work on problem cases and individuals granted poverty loans.

The first poverty loan went to a fruitcake bakery in St. Charles, La., to increase its output and to add praline production and pecan sales to its activities. This enterprise began as an effort by a consumers cooperative with a membership of 800 rural families.

These loans to deprived areas not only build opportunities and create jobs. They have a healthy effect in other dimensions. They build community leadership and a sense of civic responsibility. Businessmen want a community that is healthy in all dimensions. Their interests and the best interests of the community are one and the same. And so they work for their community. They work to improve it and create a better environment.

And so the effect of poverty loans is sociological as well as economic. We are, as I said, working with a number of Mississippi communities on the application of this program in their areas. We feel that this program, coupled with community development, can add a new dimension to your great record of progress.

This is a way to give the free enterprise system an opportunity to create opportuni-

ties and expand the economy in a free, competitive market.

These programs provide keys to opportunities for thousands of Americans.

They give them their opportunity to achieve fulfillment in our democratic society through our economic system—not through handouts.

These loans fill a gap in private financing in areas that commercial institutions are reluctant to enter. We prefer that private financing make these loans and we even provide guarantees up to 90 percent to banks that will make them. It is only as a last resort that SBA steps in with a direct loan.

And so we feel that with our programs we are helping in some small way to build a better America of tomorrow.

We believe that we can be of assistance to you in building the Mississippi of tomorrow.

You are laying a firm foundation for growth.

You are expanding your economic development effort.

You are intensifying business and industrial research.

You are seeking out new industry—and you are searching for new world markets to channel trade out through your three ocean ports.

You are looking ahead into the unique opportunities offered by space exploration.

You are looking forward. And when you look ahead you move ahead. We at SBA are ready to work with you in any way that will help you.

A golden era of economic development is within your capability and capacity.

We wish you the very best in your efforts to reach this new dimension of progress.

Thank you.

**Resolution by State of Hawaii
 Legislature**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of our fair State of Hawaii have deemed it a great honor to have this august body take time to commemorate the anniversary of Hawaiian statehood, as it did on March 18, last.

As an expression of appreciation the Hawaii State Legislature, in the name of the people of the 50th State, adopted a concurrent resolution thanking the Congress for remembering Hawaii statehood day.

Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the RECORD:

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY HAWAII
 LEGISLATURE**

Whereas the Congress of the United States on March 18, 1965, generously gave of its invaluable time to commemorate the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman CARL ALBERT led the tributes to Hawaii and magnanimously announced that the United States is a better place by virtue of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, extraordinary leader of the battle for the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill, truly praised the Congressmen of Hawaii, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA and PATSY T. MINK; and

Whereas Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK was bestowed the signal honor of presiding as acting Speaker on this memorable occasion; and

Whereas Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA eloquently declared that the Hawaii Statehood Act was "the greatest civil rights legislation of the 1950's": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1965, the senate concurring, that it does hereby extend its heartfelt thanks to the Congress of the United States for commemorating the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Congressman CARL ALBERT, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK.

An Appeal to Our Elected Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I had a personal visit from Professor Bowers, of Bradley University, representing a number of professors at Bradley who conceived a statement of their views with respect to the situation in South Vietnam. I think it would be fair to point out that this statement was completed before the professors had any knowledge of the President's speech on this subject last night. Nevertheless, while I certainly do not agree or subscribe to the views expressed by these professors, but feel that they have the right to be heard and I am therefore at their request asking unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

**AN APPEAL TO OUR ELECTED
 REPRESENTATIVES**

We, the undersigned, members of the Bradley University faculty feel that the American policy of escalating the war in Vietnam, since February 7, 1965, is fraught with enormous dangers for the future of mankind.

A major war in Asia will not contribute to the solution of the cold war conflicts and problems between the Communist bloc and the Western Powers. With approximately one-third of the human race now living under Communist control, we cannot, we dare not, undertake to shoot them all off the planet. The problem is one of finding some way of living on the same planet with the Communist bloc, as we have begun to do with the Russians after some 40 years of effort. We believe the problem is not primarily a military one. After more than 10 years of military efforts in Vietnam it seems clear to us that a military solution has failed. Our bombing of military installations has not brought the Vietcong to reduce their activities in the south, nor has it brought Hanoi closer to negotiating a settlement. Rather, escalation of the war encourages greater unity and determination within the Communist camp. It has encouraged the

April 8, 1965

A1742

pro-China faction in Hanoi, and discredited the group in Moscow interested in peaceable coexistence and reducing tensions.

We urge our Government to take immediate steps to negotiate a cease-fire and to work for a political settlement in Vietnam before all of Asia is inflamed in a massive war.

We urge our Government to support the Mekong River valley project or the economic aid program for North and South Vietnam, which was recently suggested by President Johnson. We believe realistic bargaining can better proceed upon the basis of a constructive program, rather than from the multiplication of atrocities on both sides. In the nuclear age military victory is a concept use of bigger and bigger weapons leading toward the ultimate use of nuclear bombs a step toward the suicide of all mankind.

H. W. Bach (political science), James C. Ballowe (English), Steven Blume (English), William L. Bowers (history), Lester H. Brune (history), Margaret L. Carter (English), Edgar L. Chapman (English), Joy Dedman (English), Romeo Garrett (sociology), Arlen J. Hansen (English), John H. Harvey (foreign languages), Ernest Ising (physics), Myrtle Kent (English), B. P. Lathi (engineering), Brendan Liddell (philosophy), Robin Linstromberg (economics), James Morrison (sociology), Richard Oehling (history), Carleton Smith (sociology), Reed Smith (political science), Philip Weinberg (engineering).

A Forgotten Texas Hero: Col. Leonard Williams, 1800-1856

**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. George W. Winningham, of Mexia, Tex., has written an article concerning Col. Leonard Williams, in which he outlines the great contribution Colonel Williams made to the State of Texas during the period of its revolution and while it was a Republic. Colonel Williams is buried in Hill County near Mount Calm, Tex., and has relatives residing in that county. The article by Mr. Winningham follows:

A FORGOTTEN HERO—COL. LEONARD WILLIAMS, 1800-1856

(By George W. Winningham)

Historian Ray Walter has said that Col. Leonard Williams is a forgotten pioneer Texas hero. Texas historians have neglected to give the prominent place to him which his services during our Texas revolution, Republic of Texas, and the early years of statehood merited. His grave was neglected 102 years before a marker was erected in 1958. He is buried in the Pitts Cemetery 2 miles inside Limestone County, south of the Hill County town of Mount Calm.

From 1819 or 1820 when the Williams brothers, Leonard and William, appeared in Texas, in the Nacogdoches area, with their half-breed Cherokee wives, Leonard was prominently identified with the ebb and flow of the political events which resulted in Texas independence and annexation to the United States by treaty.

Soon after their arrival in Spanish Texas, the Williams brothers were captured by

Comanche Indians and were held in captivity for 2 years. They were forced to do slave labor for the Comanches. They were frequently beaten by the squaws. In spite of long hours of grueling labor and cruel beatings at the hands of the squaws, Leonard mastered the Comanche dialect and talked their way to freedom. The 2 years in captivity was a sort of schooling which prepared the colonel for the role he was to play in the history of Texas under the leadership of Sam Houston.

After his return from captivity in 1822, Colonel Williams engaged in trading with Indian tribes, but history loses sight of him until 1835. He fought with Ben Milam at Bexar when General Cos, General Santa Anna's brother-in-law, was forced to surrender. In this battle, Williams lost an eye from gunshot wound.

Beyond a doubt his most important service to Texas was rendered during the Texas revolution. The Cherokees under Chief Bowls were restless and to counteract influence of Mexican agents, Sam Houston sent Colonel Williams as his agent to form a peace treaty with Chief Bowls and his restless Cherokee warriors. His Cherokee wife gave him a standing with the Indians as a blood brother and he was successful in preventing the Cherokees from entering the war on the side of the Mexicans or staging independent Indian raids on white settlements. By keeping the Cherokees peaceful, he contributed much to the success of the Texas revolution. It would have been impossible for Houston to have fought an Indian war and with the poor equipment and poorly trained army to have won a victory over Santa Anna.

The colonel could speak seven or eight Indian dialects and this enabled him, as Houston's Indian commissioner, to make a number of peace treaties with various Indian tribes. It is said the Indians never broke a treaty they made with Williams. Knowing their language and their wild ways, they opened their villages to him far and near on trading expeditions and missions of mercy to ransom white captives. He was on a trading expedition when he saw and tried to ransom Cynthia Ann Parker. There is no record of the number of white captives he ransomed from Indian captivity, but the number is impressive. His most important ransom case was the two children who were captured inside the city limits of Austin, Tex. He and an Indian companion remained on the trail of the Comanche raiding party 2 years before they located the children, ransomed and returned them to their relatives.

The colonel was loyal to his Indian friends. On one occasion he rode a long distance to apprehend and hang several white outlaws who had been robbing and murdering a friendly tribe of Indians.

In 1842, Houston appointed four commissioners, Colonel Williams among the number, to deal or "treat" with Indians on the frontier. The colonel played an important role in the council at Tehuacana Creek when a peace treaty was signed with a number of Indian tribes which ended a war against the whites and again Robertson County and adjacent area was opened to settlement.

The colonel was Indian agent at Torrey's Trading Post below Waco when Texas was annexed to the United States by treaty. He turned the agency over to Federal authorities.

The colonel finally retired to the land set aside for his services to Texas, and resided on it near the present town of Mount Calm until his death in 1856. He died of an old scalp wound inflicted by an Indian warrior. He is buried in Pitts Cemetery in Limestone County about 2 miles from Mount Calm where a number of his relatives still live.

The many heroic deeds of this man in the interest of Texas will never be known. His deeds were considered by Sam Houston as well worth preserving as a part of our his-

tory. When Williams was on his deathbed, Sam Houston sent two men to his home near Mount Calm to write the history of his life, but the colonel was too ill to be of any help. His life is glorified with service to Texas but most of the history of his life died with him. Suffice it to say that he performed heroic services for Texas which placed him in a class with his friends Sam Houston, Ben Milam, and other great heroes of Texas. The difference lies in the fact that history was not as kind in preserving his deeds of valor as it has been in preserving the deeds of other great Texans. He is one of the forgotten heroes of Texas history.

The New Spirit of Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great developments of our times is the new spirit of social action centered in our religious institutions. Exemplifying this spirit were three sermons delivered this past weekend in Washington, as reported in the Washington Post of April 5, 1965.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1965]

CALLING RIGHTS DRIVE "RED" SEEN AS TRICK

The Reverend James P. Archibald said yesterday that charges of Communist control over the civil rights movement represent "an old trick of those who have opposed social change."

In a sermon at St. Paul Methodist Church in Chevy Chase, Mr. Archibald said the leaders of the civil rights drive are persons of "high principles and sound moral integrity. "Whenever there is an attempt to break a social pattern, there are beatnik groups and offcolor societies that move in to join the festivities," he said. "But let's not be deceived * * * this is an old trick * * * of putting a bad but familiar label on your opponent."

CUTS IN WELFARE CRITICIZED

The Reverend David G. Colwell of First Congregational United Church of Christ said yesterday that holding down the costs of welfare and retraining programs here "is not good economics, and is surely not good Christian service."

Mr. Colwell criticized "certain Members of the Senate" for not providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the District although all 50 States receive this Federal aid.

"The result is that an unemployed father is faced with a cruel dilemma," Mr. Colwell said in his church newsletter. "Either he permits his children to go hungry * * * or he must leave home."

INDIAN THEOLOGIAN CALLS FOR UNITY

An Indian theologian sounded a call for Christian unity yesterday in a guest sermon at the Falls Church Episcopal Church.

The Reverend Isaiah Jesudason, 1 of 13 ecumenical fellows from around the world visiting this area as guests of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington, said there is now the "promise of a Christian faith which will be truly universal."

Mr. Jesudason, a member of the interdenominational church of South India and lecturer at a Kerala seminary, said Christians of all races and cultures must join together in seeking world peace.

we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified, will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

The Urban Population of the United States Cannot Expect To Have a Great Society Borne on the Bowed Backs of American Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has this week received the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. As we begin our study of this vital legislation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a fine editorial analysis of the farm situation which was published in the Washington Post earlier this week.

In addition to its well-reasoned approach, I feel this editorial is of particular significance because it reflects the views of a large metropolitan newspaper which has for many years ably presented the problems of urban areas to its readers. An equally important service has now been performed in educating its urban readers to the problems facing rural America and in effectively emphasizing the overwhelming interdependency of these two segments of our society.

As Americans we have not only an indirect but a direct stake in the entire social and economic condition of our Nation. The truth is that there can be no lasting prosperity in the city without prosperity on the farm. We must therefore seek a broader realization that a sound and successful farm program serves not merely the interest of region or group, but the national interest.

In this spirit I wish to enter into the Record at this point the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 7, 1965:

JOHNSON ON AGRICULTURE

The President's letter to Congress on farm legislation admirably states the objectives of national agricultural policy and appropriately acknowledges the obligation of the American people to pay the costs of producing their food.

No one can quarrel with the President's statement of purposes when he puts our goal at an abundance of food and fiber at stable prices, a workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to Government, an opportunity for the efficient farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations, equal opportunity for rural people and effective use of farm resources abroad.

The city folk of the Nation needed to be reminded that they are spending a smaller part of the family income than ever before for a better diet than they ever have had before. And they needed to be told that farmers are getting 5 percent less for their products than they got 15 years ago and that many of them are earning less than the statutory minimum wage. The urban population of the United States cannot expect to have a Great Society borne on the bowed backs of American farmers. The predicament of agriculture is a reproach to a nation in which every other economic group is enjoying the greatest prosperity in history.

The changes in the farm program set forth in the President's letter are very complicated and difficult to analyze. In principle, there is a great deal to be said for the idea of deriving a larger percentage of the farmers' income from the marketplace and a smaller percentage of it from Government payments. There was a time when the two-price system involved, with its discrepancy in the domestic and export price levels, would have been objected to as an export subsidy. But there has been so much interference with the natural world price levels of farm exports already that the situation is not profoundly altered by the resort to the certificate plan proposed.

The wheat plan vests the Secretary of Agriculture with great discretion in the allocation of certificates among growers. The distribution on the basis of the respective shares of producers in the wheat market was not ideal but it limited the Government to some standard. Distribution on the basis of what is fair and equitable leaves almost unlimited discretion to the Secretary in fixing the shares of the individual farmer. No doubt it is desirable to have some standard other than that heretofore provided, but the new proposals involve a very sweeping delegation of authority.

The President's proposals make plain the enormous and complicated problems of dealing with agricultural surpluses. Difficult and complicated as they are, it is certain that they are not anywhere near as difficult as the problem of agricultural deficits. President Johnson's suggestions of this week make much more hopeful reading than the recommendations which Premier Brezhnev made last week for solving the agricultural shortages in the Soviet Union.

New York Journal-American's Subway Protection Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the New York Journal-American, one of the outstanding evening newspapers in the United States, has been in the forefront of the effort to curb the horrendous crime running rampant through the New York City subway system.

The Journal-American has suggested a program for action which would be aimed at providing safety for the millions of New York subway riders. This program includes the use of highly trained and skilled police dogs in the subway system as a major deterrent to the armed thug, the rapist, the mugger, and the young tough.

Our experience here in Washington and particularly on the Hill with these marvelous police dogs is evidence of the high regard in which they are held in many areas of the country.

Urban areas of Philadelphia as well have had great success in the use of these police dogs.

One of the highlights in the recent Police Show in Madison Square Garden was the effectiveness with which these dogs can be trained to attack criminals and thugs and subdue them at the command of the master.

The Journal-American is to be praised for its leadership in this field. Not only has it reported the news of crime and its devastating aftermath, but it has led the campaign to do something about this crime. With these dogs in our parks and subways New York will not be permitted to become "6 o'clock town" with people afraid to venture out at night.

Disfigured African Boy Finds Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, although Project Hope primarily is interested in educating doctors and nurses of developing nations in modern medical techniques, Hope, in the process, performs miraculous surgeries and treatments.

One such example is described in a recent article in the Miami, Fla., Herald. The news story tells the tale of a young Guinean whose face was maimed and distorted to such an extent that he could not close his eyes.

Mr. Speaker, following plastic surgery aboard the white hospital ship *SS Hope*, the African youth—Mommadu Dialo—was able to shut his eyes. The scars removed in the operation removed his ugliness and permitted him to live a normal life.

Through Hope's teaching-training program Guinean doctors obtain the skill to perform similar operations and treatments. Thus, Hope helps others help themselves.

The entire story is told in the following Miami Herald article:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 18, 1965]

DISFIGURED AFRICAN BOY FINDS HOPE

(By Jean Wardlow)

Every day for 2 months the African boy came and waited.

He sat quietly on the U.S. medical mercy ship *Hope*, there in Conakry, Guinea.

His head was covered with a towel. He'd let no one see his face—a face full of scars

and ugliness; eyes that had never closed in 20 years because of disfiguration.

For 2 months Mommadu Dialo came and sat * * * and waited for the plastic surgeon—a Miamian—he was told would be there soon.

It had happened a long time ago—when he was 3 days old.

The night breeze which waved tall grasses of his village was cool. The lumbering and dancier-footed animals with high, curling horns already had sought their shelters. Only a hyena's cry protested the darkness.

The fire of the village burned bright.

Soon Mommadu's cry would join the hyena's. His mother would drop him into the fire. By the time they got him out, Mommadu's face was twisted wreckage.

Mommadu was never a part of his people after that. He was something apart—ugly, laughable, pitiful. It depended upon who looked at him.

That's why Mommadu waited every day for 2 months for Dr. Thomas Baker, who recently completed his fourth volunteer stint with the *SS Hope*, a floating hospital which brings not only medical help, but trains local doctors, nurses, and technicians in countries that need them.

"Mommadu's was the most dramatic case I've ever seen on these trips," Dr. Baker said. "The before and after pictures are amazing. But not only his appearance changed. It made a difference in his whole personality."

Skin grafts gave Mommadu eyelids. Further surgery changed the ugliness. He had been blind in one eye and Mommadu is due for a cornea transplant soon.

But it was only one case of the many hundreds which come aboard the *Hope* every week, the doctor said.

The ship, a former Navy vessel, is staffed by volunteer doctors and nurses. The doctors even pay their own transportation to and from the *Hope* for short stints.

Its financed by contributions to the People-to-People Health Foundation and industry's donations of drugs and equipment, and has been winning friends for America by treating the world's sick.

The *Hope* ("health opportunity for people everywhere") goes only to countries it's invited (80 are awaiting it) and has treated for 10-month stints since 1960 in Indonesia and South Vietnam; Peru; Ecuador, and, now, in Africa.

Dr. Baker, who lives at 5200 SW. 59th Avenue, and his associate, Dr. Howard Gordon, whose home is at 4408 Toledo, have split volunteer shifts of 6 weeks each to serve aboard the ship.

Two days after Dr. Baker returned home, Dr. Gordon was on his way. Their enthusiasm for the project has spilled over to other associates in the Florida and Dade County Medical associations who also have volunteered for the *Hope*, and to local clubs and organizations where they give slide- and movies-assisted talks on the hospital ship.

A local south Florida Hope Committee, which will help raise funds and needed articles for the ship in this area—similar to those in other cities—is being formed. Mrs. Gordon is temporary chairman.

There are less than 100 doctors in the entire country of Guinea, with less than 4 million people, Dr. Baker said. There is only one dentist and no obstetricians. Babies are delivered by midwives "who have a high social standing in the community," he said.

There are two hospitals, one of them built by the Russians 5 years ago. The other was built by the French.

"It's a country just achieving independence," Dr. Baker said, "and they're afraid of everybody. The Russians, the Red Chinese and the Americans are all vying politically, economically and medically to influence this potentially wealthy country.

"When we first went in, doors were closed everywhere. This is gradually thawing. Now the people are accepting us. They know what we're trying to do.

"And the Reds are beginning to see—and be afraid of—how much the people think of what we're doing," he added.

Peace Corps members acted as translators for the many dialects and several languages used in the country, Dr. Baker said. And the *Hope's* medical staff took two things for granted: malaria, "everyone has had it" and superstition.

"You accept both facts and went on with your work," the doctor said.

"All the women wear strings tied about their waists, some knotted, some with beads. They believe they must wear these for fertility.

"And witch doctors still practice."

"We had no trouble with them," Dr. Baker said. "They sent us their tough cases."

Costs of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to call the House's attention to a fine letter from a constituent, Mrs. Robert C. Hunt, of Chattanooga, Tenn., who explains the sacrifices which she and her husband make to give their children the advantages of an advanced education. Mrs. Hunt cites the pressing need among low- and middle-income families for tax relief in order to meet their obligations to their children. In view of the fact that productive individuals such as the Hunts pay taxes to support educational opportunities for all children, I believe they should receive every possible encouragement to also seek greater opportunity for their own.

There is a need for positive action by Congress in the field of assistance to individuals seeking higher education. In the near future, I shall introduce legislation to provide realistic tax credits for those parents incurring the expense of sending sons and daughters through college.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. Robert Hunt's letter of March 16, 1965, addressed to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Stanley S. Surrey, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN, TENN.,

March 16, 1965.

Assistant Secretary STANLEY S. SURREY,
U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Chattanooga, Tenn., Times, on Monday, March 8, you are quoted as saying "that proposals to grant tax credits for college tuition payments would give benefits to those who have no real need for help." They go on further to say that you are "the ranking Government expert on taxes and his statements often reflect the pattern of administrative thinking in that field."

I would like to know just how many children you have and if you have had the burden of sending them to college as well as keeping the rest of the family going and paying the taxes we have to pay. It is possible that there might be a few who would receive benefit "that have no real need for it," but from my information, even that is not likely, for the wealthy set up trust funds for their children to offset this. It is a very wise thing for them to do and it is too bad the rest of us are unable to do it. There is by

far and away many, many others of us, we middle-class group, who want to send our children to college and will work our heads off to that end, rather than to have to borrow money to do it or beg from the Government.

Yes, I know there are many scholarships offered but those are for only those young people with exceptionally high grades. We happen to have three children who have normal intelligence, have to work very hard for their grades and would not qualify for a scholarship. My husband is an outstanding attorney in Chattanooga but does have great integrity and will not overcharge any of his clients. So—when the time came for our oldest child to go to college, I went to work in order to supplement the income to make it possible. Then, 2 years later, our second child was in college. I think you can figure out what a terrific strain that would be on any middle-income family. This same one is now at Wheaton College working toward a masters in Christian education—she worked for a while in order to supplement and had to pay nearly \$250 income tax out of the little amount she made. We now have a third coming along whom we very much want to send to college. What is the answer do you think? Should we all look to the Federal Government to decide who should go and to send our children to the college they deem to be the right one?

Wouldn't it be better for the many families in our category to get some relief on income tax for doing the job ourselves? Once we educate our children are they not in a position to make more income and in turn pay more income tax to the Government? Is the Federal Government trying to take every bit of initiative away from the people? I wonder. How could granting tax credits to those who would rather do it themselves "actually slow up progress in education" as you say? It would give families a chance to send their children to college without Government assistance and a drain on the Treasury.

I hope this does not sound bitter. But I am writing in disgust for after sending two to college and one to go, my husband and I have not been able to put away or save anything toward our old age, which we should have been able to do. Oh, yes. We have social security, but when that time comes we will then be in the President's own terms the "Poverty group" and in the meantime paying taxes to send other children to college when we received no relief on sending our own. Is that fair form to you, sir?

I would like very much to hear from you in answer to this.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT C. HUNT.

The President Opens the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting herewith the lead editorial in the New York Times for today, April 8, on the President's address last evening at Johns Hopkins University.

I was tremendously heartened by the President's proposal to bring about "unconditional discussions" on the Vietnam situation, and I am hopeful that from this serious peace offensive, we may soon reach our goal of world peace.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
April 8, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT OPENS THE DOOR

President Johnson last night projected an American policy on Vietnam in which the country can take pride. He indicated that the United States now may begin to apply as much determination and ingenuity to seeking peace as it has to waging war. He has wisely broken his long silence on American purposes. And, much as this newspaper and many Members of Congress have urged, he has restored the olive branch that balances the arrows in the eagle's claws.

The President's proposal to seek a Vietnam settlement through "unconditional discussions" with "the governments" concerned opens the door to peace explorations in a wide variety of forums with Hanoi, Moscow, even Peiping, although not with the Vietcong directly. He has broken new ground as well, in explicitly offering to North Vietnam American aided regional development, food-for-peace programs and—implying the possibility of increased recognition—"peaceful association with others."

In urging Secretary General Thant to initiate a plan immediately for increased development in southeast Asia to aid in the establishment of peace rather than merely to follow its restoration, he has given wings to long-pending, imaginative proposals by men such as Ambassador Chester Bowles and Canada's Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

The size of the proposed American contribution—\$1 billion is half the estimated cost of the initial five-dam program of Mekong Valley development—is less important than the willingness to participate for the first time in a jointly financed aid program with the Soviet Union.

The President's speech has, in short, at last begun the essential process of changing the context of a problem that, as usually stated, appears insoluble. In proposing a South Vietnam tied to no alliance and containing no foreign military base, the President has accepted the concept of ultimate American military withdrawal and of an independent South Vietnam that would be neutral and yet free to seek outside assistance if threatened.

Most important, the President's speech nowhere repeats Secretary Rusk's vague and wornout homily about negotiations being inconceivable until the Communists "leave their neighbors alone." It recognizes that negotiations are not only conceivable but necessary if that desirable purpose is ever to be achieved.

President Johnson has now provided a bold answer to the appeal made to him last week by the chiefs of 17 nonaligned states and earlier by many of our allies. It would be too optimistic to expect a favorable reply from the Communist countries, at least at first. But they are provided with plenty of food for thought.

Neither they nor anyone else can dispute the fact that a serious peace offer has been made. It is now clearly up to them to make a reasonable response.

The Federal Student Loan Program Is
a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant successes of our Fed-

eral Government in the field of education has been the student loan program.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article describing that success which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1965:

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM A SUCCESS

(By Terry Ferrer)

Six years ago, the Federal Government stepped into a new field of educational support: loans to college students.

The beginnings were modest in February of 1959. Some \$6 million was sliced up among 1,227 colleges to make some 7,000 loans available. Each college had to put up \$1 for every \$9 it received from Washington. Each student could borrow up to \$1,000 a year, with a loan ceiling of \$5,000, and was expected to begin repayment 1 year after graduation, when a 3-percent interest rate begins, and to end repayment after 10 years.

At the time, skeptics declared that the program, part of the National Defense Education Act, simply wouldn't work. "There wasn't enough money," they said. "Since the colleges had to administer and collect the loans, they would be running all over the country for years, trying, at prohibitive cost, to find delinquent loanholders," they said. "Students wouldn't borrow," they said, "because families didn't borrow for higher education. And if they did, they wouldn't pay their debts."

Like most prophets of doom, the skeptics were partly right and partly wrong. More money was forthcoming from Congress. In fact, as the U.S. Office of Education testimony before the House and Senate Education Subcommittees has shown in the last 2 weeks, the \$6 million has now ballooned into \$443 million, loaned over the 6 years to 640,000 borrowers at 1,618 colleges.

Obviously, the students did borrow, in unprecedented numbers and amounts. In fact, the National Defense Education Act student loan program virtually changed the American family's thinking on borrowing for higher education and convinced both students and their parents that buying college on time payments was as logical as installment buying of a television set or a car.

By way of contrast, 10 years ago, only 83,000 students borrowed the total of a mere \$13.5 million from their colleges. This academic year alone, the Federal Government is giving \$145 million to colleges for student loans.

Have the students been repaying their debts? Yes and no. Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education in the Office of Education, said last week that \$2.8 million has come in in "accelerated payments"—meaning that some students had paid their debts sooner than they needed to.

But more than offsetting this bonanza is \$3 million past due. However, Mr. Muirhead said in a telephone interview, "of this \$3 million, almost \$2 million is overdue by only one payment. Some \$1.1 million is overdue by two or more payments. Remember that a bank does not write off a bad debt until after six payments are missed."

Asked to compare the college delinquent payment rate with the 1.9 percent general public rate currently cited by the American Banking Association, Mr. Muirhead said: "There are about 275,000 borrowers now in collection status. About 8,000 are overdue by 1 payment. This gives us a rate of almost 3 percent."

But, Mr. Muirhead continued, of deep concern to the colleges involved is the cost of administering and collecting the Federal loans—as the skeptics predicted. According to a survey of 395 representative colleges in the loan program, Mr. Muirhead said, the average cost of processing and collecting a typical loan of \$2,000 borrowed over 4 years is \$135.42 per student. The study, conducted by the National Association of College and

University Business Officers, estimated the total administrative costs to the colleges in the current fiscal year at between \$5.6 and \$6.6 million, a sizable sum.

Nearly 90 percent of the institutions surveyed felt that they should be reimbursed by the Government for this expense, in whole or in part.

Mr. Muirhead said that both the House and Senate education subcommittees are considering such reimbursement, perhaps on a matching basis. Further, he said, there is a possibility that the Government can help with payments which have been deferred because the borrowers were either in the armed services or the Peace Corps or they had gone on to graduate school. Such deferments totaled \$3.7 million in the year ending last October.

Also under consideration, Mr. Muirhead said, are requiring the student to have a cosigner (not now necessary), cutting down the 10-year repayment period, requiring a minimum yearly repayment, and encouraging voluntary collection agencies set up by the colleges themselves. Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House subcommittee, feels that a possible answer is to have a Federal agency collect the loans after the colleges make them.

But Mr. Muirhead indicated that the Office of Education is considering "systematic application" of the voluntary cooperative programs, whereby associations of colleges and universities use a commercial bank or create a nonprofit agency to make collections. The commercial-bank approach is now being used by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and the Associated Colleges of Illinois, both served by the American National Bank and Trust Co.

The 24 colleges of the State University of New York have a cooperative service center for collections, and the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York is considering such a program. State colleges in Connecticut and Maryland are using the joint approach, and it is under consideration in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio.

The voluntary approach seems preferable to collection by a Federal agency. But some tightening of repayment by the Federal Government and aid to the colleges for administrative costs do seem desirable.

Nevertheless, the Federal student-loan program has more than justified its original concept as a way of helping needy students through college. The need to strengthen and refine the program's operation should not detract from its overall resounding success.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared tobacco bill for President.

Senate worked on school aid bill.

House passed medicare bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7231-7262, 7341

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1744-1752; S.J. Res. 69; and S. Con. Res. 32. *Pages 7237-7238, 7341*

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 339, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr., with amendments (S. Rept. 150);

S. 1570, to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (S. Rept. 151);

S. 702, providing for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Indians (S. Rept. 152);

S. 795, to permit assessing of Indian trusts and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project, Washington, through a draining and diking district (S. Rept. 153);

S. 1135, to extend to June 1, 1967, the period during which the President may transmit reorganization plans to Congress, with amendments (S. Rept. 154); and

Report of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," together with individual views (S. Rept. 155). *Pages 7237, 7341*

Tobacco: Senate adopted conference report on H.R. 5721, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. *Pages 7288-7289*

Authority To Meet: Special Committee on Aging and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet on Friday, April 9, while Senate is in session. *Page 7341*

School Aid: Senate worked on H.R. 2362, to strengthen and improve the quality of the Nation's elementary and secondary school facilities, rejecting the following amendments:

By 39 yeas to 49 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment providing that applications for grants under title III (supplementary educational centers and services) must have been approved by the State educational agency concerned; by 38 yeas to 56 nays

(motion to reconsider tabled), Prouty amendment providing a substitute formula for fund apportionment ratio under title III of the bill; by 32 yeas to 59 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Pearson amendment to provide for more gradual reduction of payments in impacted areas as a result of termination of certain activities of the Defense Department; and by 38 yeas to 53 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment to title II (financial assistance to local school agencies for education of children of low-income families), to provide a substitute for the aid-giving formula in the bill by adding funds based on the States "effort index" reflecting the amount spent by each State in relation to its ability to pay.

Pending at adjournment was Ervin amendment to require Commissioner of Education to give 30 days' notice in Federal Register of any proposed payment under this bill and to permit individual taxpayer suits to challenge constitutionality of such payment. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment and by unanimous consent it was agreed that on Friday, April 9, after Senate convenes at 10 a.m. further debate on the Ervin amendment shall be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided. *Pages 7262-7277, 7280-7341*

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today.

Pages 7277, 7287, 7291, 7305

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today.

Page 7287

Program for Friday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 9:15 p.m. until 10 a.m. Friday, April 9, when after 10 minutes' further debate it will vote by yeas and nays on the pending Ervin amendment, to be followed by further consideration of the bill. S. 1564, voting rights bill, will be reported by Committee on the Judiciary. *Page 7341*

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee continued its hearings on H.R. 7091, second supplemental appro-