

furor over Western arms for Israel have raised new fears in the West about the shift of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Socialist regime to the East.

No longer is there any question that in his duel with West Germany Mr. Nasser was an easy victor or that, once set in motion, the Ulbricht visit was softened in some ways to ease Bonn's pain. The East German President received full protocol honors, but he was given no forum for speechmaking to the masses or for holding news conferences. He even had to absent himself from a signing ceremony for East Germany's \$100 million credit agreement with the United Arab Republic.

Rather surprisingly, President Nasser chose a dinner in Mr. Ulbricht's honor to declare his desire for maintaining ties with West Germany and to reaffirm his support for Bonn's demands for German reunification.

As a result, it is assumed that Bonn's cutting off of aid to Cairo will in the end mean only a delay of some months in the aid promised for Cairo's new development projects.

Nonetheless, the mere fact of the visit was a shattering blow for Bonn and for Western cold war strategy. "We are in a new era now," said one West German diplomat.

The trip to Cairo enabled Mr. Ulbricht, the most Stalinist of East European leaders, to break out of diplomatic isolation and to begin winning the acceptance in the neutral world that Moscow has long sought for its "country cousin" in East Berlin.

The problem for Western relations with Mr. Nasser is that Mr. Ulbricht's visits does not stand alone.

No sooner had Mr. Ulbricht sailed from Port Said than Cairo announced expanded diplomatic ties with North Vietnam and President Nasser's plans to visit Moscow this summer. (And, if Communist sources are right, a visit to East Germany is on the way.)

The new Soviet leaders, Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin and Leonid I. Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, are to come here late this year in what is turning into an almost steady parade of Communist leaders to Cairo. Current visitors include Premier Fidel Castro's traveling Minister of Industry, Maj. Ernesto Che Guevara, and the Yugoslav Premier, Aleksandar Rankovic.

This week it is the Premier of Czechoslovakia, Josef Lenart, and then Premier Chou En-lai of Communist China.

"It's astonishing," said one Western diplomat, "but hardly a day goes by when there isn't some high-level Communist delegation in town."

In part, this reflects a preference among officials Mr. Nasser's Socialist state for dealing with totalitarian governments and controlled economies of the East rather than with the competitive economies and often uncoordinated policies of the West.

It is also a reflection of Mr. Nasser's increasing dependence on Communist aid. In the last year he has had pledges of \$625 million in new Communist credits, while his two largest Western aid contributors, the United States and West Germany, are retrenching.

Another jolt to the West was President Nasser's indication in an interview last week that he was rethinking his whole policy of nonalignment, and his clear expressions of disappointment with President Johnson.

Most Western diplomats still believe that Mr. Nasser would prefer to remain as independent as possible from Moscow but that he is finding less and less maneuvering room. They note that he denounced communism a few days ago to the National Assembly, but that he still depends on Communists to give life to his campaign to build up the Arab Socialist Union, his mass party.

If the United States should replace West

Germany as an arms supplier for Israel, it would give the Russians a new opportunity for cementing ties with Mr. Nasser by offering him counterbalancing arms.

Some Egyptians say that Washington and its allies, except for France, are pushing Cairo toward the East. Some Western observers have been asking in response whether in the present circumstances the Western powers can have any significant influence in Cairo.

THE COMMUTER CRISIS—II

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that yesterday the Legislature of the State of New York passed a measure to authorize the expenditure of \$5 million for aid to the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad. This amount was set aside as part of a plan agreed upon by Governors Rockefeller of New York, and Dempsey of Connecticut whereby the States of New York and Connecticut offered to allocate \$5 million each and to request \$10 million Federal aid under the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. It is hoped that additional funds will also be made available by the States affected by the commuter operations of the New Haven Railroad to meet the critical situation with respect to operational costs in accord with a comprehensive plan as to expenditures as called for in S. 1234, and that the Federal Government will also provide needed financial assistance for a limited period. With such joint participation, I think we can look forward to an easing of the current commuter crisis on the New Haven.

In the meantime, the State of New York has taken the first step to show good faith and a readiness to implement the plan. That door now having been opened, we have a right to feel encouraged that if the trustees will help; and if the Interstate Commerce Commission and the other Government agencies concerned will demonstrate their understanding; and if Congress will be ready to lend a hand, there is a real prospect that a constructive step may be taken to place certain commuter railroads of the country, starting with the New Haven, on a rational basis which will enable them to be continued without sacrifices on the part of thousands of commuters who use these rail services daily.

I observe in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is presiding. They and other Senators have given considerable aid in this regard through their efforts and their advocacy of this cause during hearings by the Committee on Commerce, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

OUTRAGE AT SELMA, ALA.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to speak to the Senate about a situation existing in our United States that should disturb and shock every citizen. This week's uncalled for clash at Selma, Ala., must, if nothing else, alert the Nation and Congress to the lawlessness that can

prevail when selected groups of citizens are denied their constitutional rights.

It is only proper for groups of people to gather together in peaceful demonstrations, in order to obtain recognition as human beings with equal rights. And for what rights are the citizens asking? The right to be registered as voters. Certainly this is a reasonable request—one that hardly called for Sunday's misuse of police power.

Just yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States acted to erase arbitrary and discriminatory regulations used by some States to keep Negroes off the voter-registration lists. Justice Black, in his written opinion, pointed out that we cannot "leave the voting fate of a citizen to the passing whim or impulse of an individual registrar."

Obviously, the mere necessity for the highest court in the land to decide on issues of this sort indicates the existence of grave difficulties.

On Saturday, a group of Prince George's County, Md., citizens marched up Chillum Road, to protest existing road conditions. After reaching their destination, this group of peaceful demonstrators gathered in friendly conviviality for doughnuts and coffee. That was a far cry from the situation that existed in Selma on Sunday.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to seriously consider and enact the necessary legislation to correct the voter-registration problems that exist in parts of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD today's outraged editorials on this subject from the Washington Post and the Sun, of Baltimore.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.), Post, Mar. 9, 1965]

OUTRAGE AT SELMA

The news from Selma, Ala., where police beat and mauled and gassed unarmed, helpless and unoffending citizens will shock and alarm the whole Nation. It is simply inconceivable that in this day and age, the police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could resort, instead, to violent attacks upon them.

Decent citizens will weep for the wronged and persecuted demonstrators, for the decent citizens of Alabama who must recoil in horror from the spectacle of sadism, for the good name of the Nation before the world. This brutality is the inevitable result of the intolerance fostered by an infamous State government that is without conscience or morals.

The situation calls for more than mere reproach and anguish, but it is not easy to say what can be done to prevent the repetition of this scandalous misuse of police power. Congress, as a beginning, must promptly pass legislation that will put into Federal hands the registration of voters that the Alabama authorities will continue to obstruct as long as they have any discretion. At least, such legislation will put beyond contest the rights that the Negro citizens have been trying to gain by demonstration.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 9, 1965]

VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA

Probably the easiest way for Alabama officials to avoid the sorry spectacle of State po-

March 9, 1965

4440

lice forcibly turning back a line of marching Negroes would be to make sure that Negroes can register and vote in accordance with their constitutional rights. So long as they are blocked from the exercise of this right by the delaying and obstructing tactics of local officialdom, the Negroes will have a just grievance and will have the support of citizens in other States—and doubtless of many citizens in Alabama as well.

It seems reasonable to believe, too, that officials might have avoided physical clashes, such as the one that occurred Sunday at Selma, by permitting peaceful marches. This is a well established way of demonstrating in behalf of a cause. The march in Washington two summers ago in support of civil rights legislation was an example of the effectiveness of orderly behavior on the part of marchers and authorities. There is much to be said for diverting energy from possible violence to peaceful marching and talking.

But there was little of the reasonable in view in the clash at Selma. By and large, there can be no doubt that Negroes in the South are making progress in securing their rights as citizens. The Reverend Martin Luther King stresses his belief that non-violence is the key to their eventual success. Violence on the part of State officials and the police helps to demonstrate the strength of Dr. King's case.

APPOINTMENT OF KENNETH BELIEU AS UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my delight at the appointment of Kenneth Belieu as Under Secretary of the Navy.

He is the all-too-rare and exceptional kind of man who is a leader, a doer. He brings to his present responsibility wide experience in our Government. He has kept his head and his perspective in combat in our Armed Forces abroad and in the sometimes acrimonious jungle of Washington bureaucracy.

His is a fine appointment, and I congratulate the President and our administration on it.

REGRETTED DEPARTURE OF PAUL FAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I must express my regret that Paul Fay, former Under Secretary of the Navy, has left Washington. In the years that Paul Fay filled this post, he did so with verve, distinction, imagination, and honor. His departure is a loss to all of us in Government. I, for one, hope that he will come back to Government, preferably here in Washington.

Speaking more personally, as a friend and admirer of Mr. Fay's, I add my hope that his return to Government life may be soon. In the meantime, "Red" Fay and his lovely wife Anita, are much missed by his friends and former colleagues in and out of Government here in Washington.

CANADIAN'S VIEW ON WHY WE ARE LOSING IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a constituent of mine in Pawtucket, R.I., has drawn my attention to an article entitled "A Canadian's View on Why We Are Los-

ing," published in the Providence Sunday Journal of February 14, 1965.

The article discusses the background of the situation in Vietnam, written from the viewpoint of a non-American or a non-Vietnamese. The Canadian in question was for some time a member of the International Control Commission and was in both North and South Vietnam. I found the article to be of considerable interest and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, because I believe it may prove of interest to other Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CANADIAN'S VIEW ON WHY WE ARE LOSING (By Hugh Campbell)

(NOTE.—The following article by a retired squadron leader of the Royal Canadian Air Force and a member from 1961-63 of the three-nation international control commission set up to police the Geneva agreement in Indochina is excerpted from Maclean's, Canadian national magazine, by arrangement with the author. He admits it is "frankly controversial * * * but I believe the more thoughtful readers will recognize it for what it is—the constructive criticism of a concerned friend.")

The United States has entered its 3d year of war in Vietnam. Any day now we can expect another pronouncement from the American high command in Saigon to the effect that, while the situation is serious, it is not hopeless; and that the war can and will be won. After nearly 2 years in Vietnam, I've heard a good many such assurances. But since, as a Canadian delegate on the three-nation international control commission, I had a unique opportunity to observe the war from both sides of the firing line, I think the Americans are talking through their well padded brass hats. The war, as it's now being waged, cannot be won by our side—because the Americans, for all their brave talk about developing new antiguerrilla techniques, are still using obsolete methods to fight a new kind of invisible enemy.

TESTING CAMOUFLAGE

Exactly how invisible this enemy—the Communist Vietcong—can become was forcibly demonstrated to me one day on a dusty gravel road leading through the jungle in North Vietnam. It was a routine inspection patrol for the control commission and, for no apparent reason, the Communist officer in the lead jeep suddenly suggested a halt.

We piled out of our jeeps and stretched our legs, apparently in the middle of nowhere. Just as inexplicably, he then suggested we resume the patrol. As the convoy started off, he beeped his horn and, somewhere near by, a whistle shrilled.

Instantly, both sides of the road were lined with troops, grinning infantrymen whose faded khaki uniforms contrasted sharply with the dark jungle background. They'd been there all the while, standing not a dozen yards from the convoy. But because of the foliage that covered their backs from helmet to canvas sneakers, they'd been invisible to three experienced military officers.

There was nothing threatening about this mock ambush. The Communist troops were simply practicing camouflage, and used the international control commission as an unwitting umpire.

Although their camouflage was excellent, it was the mobility of the troops that impressed me most. They were many miles from any known base, and they carried on their backs everything necessary for living and fighting. They didn't need roads, jeeps, helicopters or mobile kitchens. They were

jungle fighters, as elusive as poison gas and twice as deadly—the kind of guerrillas who wore down the French masters of Indochina, and finished them off at Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

AIDED TO DEATH

The Pentagon, naturally, has been determined not to repeat France's mistakes. In the last 3 years they've poured in aid and advisers at the rate of more than a million dollars a day. So generous, so overwhelming has been this avalanche of assistance, that it's aided South Vietnam almost to death.

In 1962, there were only a few hundred U.S. military advisers in the country—and they were making noticeable headway against the Vietcong. The advisers were scattered in tiny detachments around the country. They were tough, highly trained men, and they were revered by the Vietnamese.

But the Pentagon apparently reasoned that 20,000 advisers could win the war 20 times as fast. They started airlifting them into Saigon by the thousands (in defiance, incidentally, of the Geneva truce agreement).

With them came wives, children, PX supermarkets, soft drink machines, air conditioning, officers' clubs, station wagons, insurance salesmen, schoolteachers, public relations men—all the equipage of a progressive suburb, without which the American military seems unable to function abroad.

DESK SOLDIERS' WAR

Suddenly, it became a desk soldiers' war, with the fatuities of Saigon's brass hats canceling the efforts of the men in the field. A gap appeared between the South Vietnamese and their American protectors, and the gap has been widening ever since.

There's also a gap between the Pentagon's concept of mobility and that of the guerrillas. Putting troops on wheels or in helicopters has proven unrealistic in a jungle war. Disguised as peasants, the Vietcong simply watch the machines charge futilely by—perhaps into a mine trap or ambush—or, if they're detected, simply melt into the jungle.

Pursuit on foot is fruitless; the South Vietnamese troops, carrying enough American-made equipment to fight the Battle of the Bulge, would be ineffective even if they were as hardy as their enemy. But of course they aren't, since they're now accustomed to riding to work.

But all the mistakes haven't been committed by the military. There are a host of nonmilitary agencies fighting Saigon's war, from the spooks of the CIA to the flocks of the U.S. Information Agency. They frequently operate at cross purposes and, in general, it may be said that they do not enhance America's image abroad.

Take, for instance, the unimportant but revealing case of the American pro football player who arrived in Saigon under State Department auspices to set up an athletic program for the Vietnamese. "Gonna teach these gooks football," he announced to all within earshot. Several days later, he announced a change in policy. The gooks he'd decided, were too small for football—so he was going to teach them soccer, a game he'd never played himself.

Or take the American service wife in Saigon. For boorishness, offensiveness, and condescension toward her "inferiors," she often takes the fur-lined mug. The generous allowances, PX privileges, villa, chauffeur, and servants are all new to her—and with rare exceptions, it shows. Some of the Americans' kids are no better. The spectacle of a bunch of crewcutted, gumchewing teenagers lordling it over the natives in the streets of Saigon is a lesson in how not to conduct foreign relations.

SPIES IN THE NIGHT

Or, finally, take the matter of Saigon's justly famous night life, which consists of

scores of saloons, each equipped with a bevy of the prettiest little bar girls in southeast Asia. The patrons are mostly American; and one South Vietnamese woman, who owns a string of such establishments, told me she estimates that half her girls are actively pro-Vietcong, while the rest maintain a profitable neutrality by spying impartially for both sides.

Multiply this example by a hundred, and you have an effective intelligence network—and an explanation for the failure of so many well planned, secret sorties against the Vietcong.

The result of all this ugly American behavior has been exactly what you'd expect: The South Vietnamese is starting to wonder if his Communist enemies might not be preferable to his American friends.

Once he publicly mourned the loss of American lives. Now, the nearly 300 Americans killed in Vietnam seem meaningless compared with his own terrible losses—more than 160,000 dead.

Once he believed that his government, good or bad, would be free of foreign interference. Now he's convinced that his government—whatever assortment of generals happens to be in power at the moment—is a puppet of the Pentagon. And every time a big American car zips by him on the streets of Saigon; every time he enters a restaurant he can no longer afford; every time he returns to his shabby dwelling (the Americans have grabbed all the best accommodation) he sees himself moving closer to second-class citizenship. For all their strategic failings, the Americans are fighting a just war. But they're going to lose it unless they make drastic changes—for at present, the American is his own worst enemy in Vietnam. By his obtuse policies and actions he has squandered the good will of his allies. Without it, he can't win. Without it, there is nothing left to win.

VIOLENCE IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I feel certain that every Senator must share my feeling that the situation in Selma, Ala., over the past weekend was a shocking display of violence which never should have occurred.

I am sure that all of us, North and South, Democrats and Republicans alike, deplore the horrid spectacle of American law enforcement officers clubbing citizens who were attempting to mount a nonviolent protest against discrimination at the polls.

It appears that the U.S. Government has enforcement jurisdiction only in the event of noncompliance with an order issued by the Federal courts. I am therefore urging the Attorney General to maintain the closest possible surveillance over the situation and to be prepared to take swift action, if necessary.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the

Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended.

AMENDMENT NO. 52

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment to H.R. 2998, the pending business, and ask that it be read and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator want to call up his amendment now?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 8 strike out "fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the sum of \$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "four fiscal years 1966 through 1969, the sum of \$55,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is an amusing commentary on the procedure of the Senate that, were I to call for a vote on my amendment at the moment, it would pass by a vote of either 4 to 1 or 3 to 2. I am not aware of how one of the Senators present in the Chamber would vote. But I shall not call for a vote at this time. Perhaps the majority whip would be alert enough to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to restore the period and the amount—namely, 4 years and \$55 million—carried in the bill sent to Congress by the President, as it was originally introduced in both Houses.

Earlier today, the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], advanced his reasons for having cut the recommendation of the President in half in terms of the period of time, cutting it from 4 years to 2 years, and more than half in terms of authorization, cutting it from \$55 million for 4 years to \$20 million for 2 years.

My amendment would support the position of the President. It would also support the well-known and long-stated position of the Vice President of the United States, former Senator HUMPHREY, to whose earnest efforts, in large part, is due the creation of this Agency and such support as it has been able to get from Congress since the Agency was established in 1961. I refer the Senate to the individual views submitted by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and me, which appear at the end of the committee report on the pending bill for a fuller statement of the views that I am about to express.

I expect to speak again at perhaps greater length tomorrow. But I want the RECORD to carry overnight a brief reply to the position taken by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that Senators having an opportunity to read the RECORD tomorrow morning will understand the clash of views represented by the amendment which I have offered.

The senior Senator from Oregon and I support the request of the President for

a 4-year authorization of \$55 million for the work of the Agency. We were not alone in a vote to restore the 4-year authorization. We were defeated by a vote of 11 to 6, with 2 members not voting.

A little later a vote was called on an authorization for 3 years and \$40 million. This latter amount was the amount which the House authorized, reducing by 1 year the recommendation made by the President, which recommendation had been endorsed by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It was announced to the press that the vote on the 3-year extension was 9 against and 7 for. That vote was, of course, technically accurate, but I am confident that Senators who will remain anonymous so far as my talk this evening is concerned will confirm what I say in that one Senator was voted for only a 2-year authorization by proxy and would have voted for at least 3 years had he been on the floor. Another Senator who was not voted I am sure will confirm that he too supported a 3-year authorization. Two other Senators did not vote at all. I have not undertaken to find out how they stood. Assuming they were indifferent to the bill, the 3-year authorization would have received a favorable vote of 9 to 8, with 2 Senators not voting, which is different from the official vote. But technically, it was 9 to 7 against.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the count the Senator has just made is an accurate count, and I rise to support him, as I have done many times in the past in this Chamber and ask him only a few questions on two phases of this matter.

Is it not true that some of those Members who are now voting for a 2-year program, including the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], of whom I speak most respectfully, have been heard to say on occasions in the past, in connection with personnel matters involved in manning our various foreign relations agencies, that one of our problems is to get high grade personnel? Many of the programs appear to be so temporary in nature that people do not like to commit themselves to work for a disarmament agency or an AID agency if they cannot be given some assurance of more than 2 years of tenure.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. That point was made very forcefully by Director William Foster of the Agency who stated, in supporting the President's program:

Within the Agency itself it will be easier to get and keep key staff experts if the Agency has a longer organization—

And then made a number of quite persuasive arguments into which I will go more fully tomorrow, as to why the 4-year authorization would be of great assistance to the Agency in carrying out the mandate given to it by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am at a complete loss to understand the position taken by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in his drive to reduce this to a 2-year program. I am

sorry he had so many proxies available to him before we could make certain as to whether the Senators giving the proxies fully appreciated the merits of the bill. The chairman certainly had the right to use the proxies. He was instructed to use them. I make no criticism of his using proxies. I am simply at a loss to understand why the chairman wants a 2-year program rather than a 4-year program.

This brings me to the next topic and a question in connection with it. In the world of this hour, when none of us can be sure how long peace will prevail, and where it does not prevail in so many places, does the Senator agree that this country should leave no doubt in the minds of the world at large that we believe mankind must work toward an eventual disarmament program? And if that is going to be accomplished, a period of 2 years in and of itself rebuts the program; the President was quite right when he was a Member of this Chamber and the Vice President was quite right when they worked for an open-ended measure in the matter of disarmament as being a matter that is going to confront us for many years to come.

We cannot have disarmament without enforceability, making sure that countries involved will be protected.

Therefore, the proposal of the majority of the committee puts us in a position that cannot possibly be understood around the world when we talk in the Senate about the only vehicle we have for a continued study and consideration of ways and means of eventual curbs and a world system of total disarmament so that the scourge of war can be ended forever.

Does the Senator agree with me that this 2-year proposal is inconsistent when we consider what our ideals are, what our promises have been, and what our obligations are?

Mr. CLARK. I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Oregon and am heartened by his eloquent expression of his views, which I completely share. I feel that to reduce the period of life of the agency from 4 years to 2 years would be taken across the world as another indication of the belligerence of the foreign policy of the Congress of the United States—a reputation which I regret this body carries not only overseas but also in the executive branch, where our belligerency creates a timidity in all our foreign policy aspects which I deplore. To my mind there was an utterly inadequate consideration after a markup session at which never as many as one-third of the Senators on the committee were present, and if any one of them had suggested the absence of a quorum we would have had to disband. That the strong recommendation of the President, backed by the Vice President, in my opinion convincingly justified by the director of the agency, should be cut down in this way is, let me say, with some understatement, most unfortunate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. One of the things that worries me is that we are merely giving fodder for the gristmills of the Russians and the Chinese to further their line of propaganda, because they will twist this action into a representation that we are engaging, even in the matter of a disarmament program, in American hypocrisy.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Oregon. I am happy to know that the great Republican Philadelphia newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, which has not always supported my position, agrees wholeheartedly with the views just expressed by the Senator from Oregon and me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on March 8th, entitled "Uses of Disarmament Agency" may be printed in the RECORD.

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

USES OF DISARMAMENT AGENCY

It seems to us that Senator CLARK has a valid point in his dissent from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's shredding of the bill to extend the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The administration has asked Congress to give another 4 full years to the agency and a \$55 million budget. The House compromised and voted 3 years and \$40 million. Now the Senate committee has hacked it further: 2 years and \$20 million.

Senator CLARK's objection is that at this particular time, with world tensions rising sharply and almost any unthinkable disaster becoming quite thinkable, indeed, it would be salutary for this Nation to signify that it is thinking past, around and over present problems to days when the world's true need, peace, can again be advanced.

The agency itself, of course, was instrumental in setting the climate and the actual talks which led to the partial atomic-testing ban treaty of 1963, as well as the "hot-line" connection between Washington and Moscow.

The symbolic usefulness of the agency in the present situation might be fully as important as its practical usefulness in the past. It should not be, however, mere window-dressing, or a false front. Americans generally are not warmongers by any stretch of the imagination. We take on such burdens in defense of freedom as we are required to do, onerous as they often are. But the great desire of this Nation remains peace with honor and justice. To eliminate or to trim down to utter futility the country's peace-planning instrument—which is constantly engaged in research and feasibility studies—would be tantamount to declaring that there is no hope of peace.

This, it seems to us, is not a true reflection of the Nation's wishes or position. If the Senate cannot now see its way clear to accept the entire program asked by the administration, it should at least return to the House compromise version.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY, of New York took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to return to the question raised by the Senator from Oregon a moment or so ago, when he asked, "Why did the Foreign Relations Committee undertake to chop down the President of the United States in his strong recommendations?"

The answers appear in the majority

report and was stressed by the small number of Senators who attended the markup sessions. The majority did not like the fact that the Agency had undertaken to enter into a series of contracts which, in my opinion, did no more than carry out the mandate given to the Agency by Congress.

Senators will recall that the statute creating the Agency stated in its preamble of congressional intent that the ultimate goal of the United States was, as stated by the Senator from Oregon a moment ago, a world free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments, in which the role of force would be subordinated to the role of law and in which international adjustment in a changing world would be achieved peacefully.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the specific wording of the statute:

This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technological information upon which realistic arms control and disarmament policy must be based.

Thus, pursuant to that congressional mandate, the Agency prefers—and I believe correctly—not to build up a vast hoard of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, but to hold down its employment to a relatively small number, and then to contract with outstanding individuals, scholars, knowledgeable corporations, and individuals engaged in the defense program who therefore have knowledge of the problems which would confront us if we were to go into a disarmament agreement. The Agency spends 70 percent of its money on this kind of contract and 30 percent of its money in conducting negotiations at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

That is what the majority of the committee does not like, because the agency was getting what I believe are erudite, able, intelligent studies on the very subjects Congress told them to investigate.

A majority of the committee—and I hope that I shall be careful not to misquote some of the informal language used in the mark-up session—believes that disarmament is the idealistic and quite impractical dream of a few starry-eyed idealists.

I do not agree. Tomorrow, at some length, I expect to discuss each of these contracts to which exception has been taken, hopefully to establish my point of view that everyone of them was justified, helpful, and desirable. But, even if I am wrong, even if more money was spent than should have been spent, even if the committee majority feels that the contracts should not have been entered into, why punish the agency by cutting down the period of authorization? Why punish the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States by cutting down the period of the authorization? If the committee majority does not like the contracts, let it call in the Director, or the contractors, and let us have some real congressional oversight with respect to the operation of the Agency. But, to cut in half the period of the authorization and the money is

EVENTS IN SELMA, ALA.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of ineffable sadness that I have read of the tragic events that have taken place in Selma, Ala., during the last few days. It is difficult, of course, and perhaps even dangerous to form judgments on the basis of secondary sources of information. However, in this instance the visual and photographic evidence as provided in newsreel films, television tapes, and news photos seems clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt. There has been an unnecessary and excessive resort to the use of violence on the part of the police officials of the State of Alabama in restraining a march of Negro citizens from Selma to Montgomery. When I further read that crowds of white citizens lined the highway where this terrible and bloody scene was played out and literally whooped and shouted in their enthusiasm, I felt a sinking feeling at the realization that this had taken place in America. It is not simply that our image abroad has once again been tarnished, and that we have given additional ammunition to our Communist enemies who seize every opportunity, real or fancied, to denigrate us as hypocritical in our attachment to the ideals of liberty, justice, and equality. Even more damaging than this defacement of our external image are the internal consequences of these unnecessary acts of savagery and violence on the part of the Alabama officials. Their conduct has only served to exacerbate an already seriously aggravated situation. Perhaps the only saving grace in this entire tragic sequence of events is the realization that has come to many that further action must be taken to guarantee the right to register and vote to every qualified American citizen. The kind of legal obfuscation that is going on in places like Selma, Ala., is a travesty on the whole concept of equal voting rights. The events of the last few days should have made it abundantly clear that for the good of the American order—yes, for the good of the soul of America we cannot any longer permit State officials under the color of discriminatory laws to deny supposedly freeborn American citizens their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and pray that we will have an end to the untoward instances of violence that have taken place not only in Alabama, but in many other parts of the country as well in the developing course of the struggle for civil rights. I would also hope that this Congress would promptly address itself to the job of making every effort to insure a proper implementation of constitutional guarantees as they pertain to the precious right to cast a vote in a free election.

No. 44—6

SELMA, ALA.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and degrading events in Selma, Ala., this week have incensed every right thinking American who abhors violence, brutality, and intimidation. When law enforcement officials anywhere in this country find it necessary to turn on a peaceable group of unarmed citizens, it can only lead to the eventual destruction of our American way of life.

I do not believe we can remain silent in the face of such outrageous denials of basic human rights and decency. If such savagery as administered to the Negroes in Alabama by the Alabama State police is permitted to continue and perpetrated without protest or punishment, then the day is not far off when this country, its Constitution, and its laws will mean nothing.

These Americans, so brutally attacked in Selma, sought only their constitutional right to register and vote. They did not resist arrest. They were, however, gassed, clubbed, and beaten at random in their efforts to pursue equality. While I do not condone lawlessness or defiance of law and order, I am equally appalled at any violent or unmerciful attack upon Americans who attempt only to march peacefully in their quest for civil rights.

It is my hope that the President will assume direct authority, and take such measures as he might consider necessary to suppress any similar occurrence of this kind in Alabama or in any other State.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

TIGHTER CONTROLS OVER DRUG ABUSES

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, narcotics addiction is a sickness growing in our cities. It feeds upon poverty and congestion. It strikes our young people in the most vulnerable formative years. It seeks out the troubled and disturbed.

Because this illness corrupts the society as well as the body, we have long treated it as primarily a criminal problem. It has been a criminal problem, but only because we allowed it to become so.

We must continue to treat the trafficker in illicit drugs as the criminal he is. We must remove his incentive and so stiffen the penalties that we drive him from this contemptible market.

However, in very recent times our laws have begun to reflect a surer understanding of the addict—to strike at prime causes rather than symptoms. In many areas, at last, we are no longer punishing victims, but treating patients. We are recognizing the monstrous problems of drug addiction for what it is—a contagious illness that is rapidly approaching an epidemic.

No one knows the exact extent of drug addiction in the United States. But we do know that it has been increasing at an alarming rate.

At the end of the Second World War, there was almost no addiction in this country, but now there are an estimated 100,000 addicts. Some well-informed people believe that there may be nearly twice that number.

In one typical 10-year period following the war, arrests for narcotic addiction in our major cities rose by as much as 900 percent. In one city alone, it rose by 2,000 percent over that period.

This is a problem of the very gravest concern for residents of New York City and environs. Drug addiction feeds upon the problems of cities: congestion, poverty, and frustration. And as our Nation's largest city, New York has by all odds the largest addict population—somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 troubled souls, more than half the Nation's total addict population.

In recent years the circle of this infection has begun to spread into the suburban and residential communities around the city. Now it is a problem of immediate concern to law enforcement officers and doctors in Westchester and Putnam Counties. Even sadder, it is a problem of personal concern to school teachers and parents.

March 9, 1965

The bill before the House today is an important step in helping our communities to counter and contain this contagion.

The so-called "goof ball" and the "pep pill" are serious health threats in themselves, but for our young people they can, and often do, have more tragic consequences. These marginal drugs are harmful enough in themselves, but when they reach the troubled and immature—the deprived and vulnerable—in our high schools and on our streets, they can also be the first step in a journey into hopelessness and despair. They can be the catalyst to a life of tortured addiction and the crime and degradation that this entails.

This bill, by identifying these drugs and providing some controls over their use, is the opening gun in a campaign in which the people of my district have a very special interest.

Last November I called for Federal legislation to prohibit nonmedical purchases of danger drugs such as barbiturates and pep pills. I will be pleased to return to the people of Westchester and Putnam Counties and tell them this became one of the first laws passed by the Congress this session.

But I look for further reforms that will provide stiffer penalties for nonaddict pushers, remove the element of profit from this vile, illegal commerce in drugs, and meet the crisis of crime that results from addiction.

I look also for realistic enlargement of the list of drugs for which Federal treatment is available, compulsory testing to catch drug abuse among our young people before it becomes the horror of addiction, expanded use of the concept of civil commitment for addicts, enlargement of treatment facilities and post-institutional care to prevent the return of former addicts to the life of despair—the miserable cycle of destruction that typifies their lives.

These direct measures may help to bring this frightful contagion under control and limit its spread.

The costs of addiction are enormous. Recently, Life editor, James Mills estimated that the addict without private sources of funds must steal an average of \$1,000 in goods each week from the public to support a \$20- to \$30-a-day habit. When you add in the lost human potential, the cost of extra enforcement and the pathetic cost of the futile cycle of imprisonment and hospitalization that typifies the life of the average addict, you have gross cost that no nation can afford.

For the future, I look to the programs that will attack the breeding places of addiction and will strengthen the defenses of our people against such illness. The true hope for the long run is not cure of the addict or the punishment of the abuser, it is in preventing the causes. For there is no question that the root of addiction is poverty—poverty of the body and poverty of the spirit. America has no room for this archaic evil anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2 and to lend their weight to a broad range of legislation that will

wipe away not only the illness, but the very cause itself.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, South Vietnam appealed to the United States for help to meet the serious threat posed by Communist subversion and acts of terror. A series of assassinations and raids on government centers had brought the country's morale to a critical point. Responding to the appeal, President Kennedy agreed to provide greatly increased military and economic aid. Since then, we have become more and more deeply involved in South Vietnam.

To prevent a Communist takeover, the United States is now spending over \$2 million a day and it is keeping more than 25,000 American military advisers stationed there. Last month, U.S. planes took part in raids against targets in North Vietnam. These strikes were made because there was mounting evidence of direct participation by Hanoi in the struggle in the south.

The struggle is sometimes referred to as a civil war. But let us consider the true facts. Thousands of trained men have come from the north, along with a stream of equipment and ammunition. This has been the mainspring of the Communist insurgency in the south.

Although there is discontent and local recruiting by the Vietcong, the whole Communist campaign would not be possible without the support coming from Hanoi. It is a clear case of aggression, of which there is ample proof in the recent State Department white paper on "Aggression From the North."

President Johnson has said that our purpose in Vietnam is "to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside the country." This is our pledge to the people of South Vietnam—a pledge that demands of us courage, patience, and a firm belief in the principles of freedom. I, for one, am confident that we can meet the challenge and win this struggle against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD this inspiring call to accept the challenge of citizenship which won the Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Missouri for my constituent, Robert L. Castle of St. Joseph, Mo. Robert will now compete with winners from throughout the United States for the scholarships awarded as prizes by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I believe that Robert's thought-

ful expression of the meaning of American citizenship will find affirmative response in each of us:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964-65

"The first requisite of a good citizen * * * is that he shall be able and willing to pull his own weight"—so said Theodore Roosevelt. From this statement we must conclude that in our country there exists the challenge of citizenship. A challenge based upon standards which we set and as a hopeful example, follow.

In 1846 an Irish potato crop failed that same year a new oppressive government rose to dominate Germany. The stage was set in the years following for the largest migration of humans the world had ever seen, 11 million Irish, Germans, Polish, Slavic, and Scandinavians going to a land they had never seen, but a land which was to them an oasis in a desert of starvation and political turmoil. It wouldn't be easy to pull up stakes and disregard what ones family had labored for and cherished for generations, but we must remember when starvation for liberty overcomes the fear of the unknown road ahead it is only expected that the choice will be the road to freedom.

Let us look at these people and their willingness to accept the challenge of citizenship. Imagine the expressions on these immigrants' faces as their ships steamed into New York harbor and they gazed upon the majestic Statue of Liberty, and read the words inscribed on her bronze pedestal:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

The wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These millions were the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free. They were the homeless, the tempest-tost, the wretched refuse of shores polluted by the stagnant waters of autocracy and famine.

Now before them lay a new life, and a golden door which would let them, the multitudes of nations pass through.

Those immigrants of long ago came able and willing to do their parts in strengthening the ideals of citizenship. They realized, far better than we do today, that to maintain the vision of freedom they brought with them they would have to work unceasingly to preserve it.

The challenge of citizenship is a full-time job, one which must not be neglected. It must be exercised by being informed; remember many people don't have the privilege of knowing the truth about the outside world. Exercise your citizenship by being active in your political party and by voting; remembers many people are given only one candidate and one party which they may support. Exercise your citizenship by having faith in your government; remember many people in our world have lost faith in their government because it has abused them and their rights. Exercise your citizenship by voicing your opinion on important issues; remember many of the world's people are forced to keep their opinions to themselves. But above all our challenge of citizenship should be exercised by our being familiar with our Government and its operation; millions of the world's population are told only one thing about their government—it's the parties' business, not the peoples.

Our challenge of citizenship is being fulfilled by those who care whether or not our Nation can survive this time of change and recurring clashes between Eastern and Western doctrines.

Citizenship is like a play, in that the producer is the taxpayer, the director is our Government, and the cast is you.

Citizenship is patriotism, a boundless loyalty, a sworn allegiance, but more than all

March 9, 1965

The Petaluma River, Sonoma Creek, Napa River all were damaged and will require the attention of our Public Works Committee as we consider the omnibus public works bill.

In Marin County, the Novato Creek and other streams did their share of damage but the Corte Madera Creek damage appears to be the most extensive. Inasmuch as the College of Marin has extensive expansion programs underway, it becomes increasingly urgent to step-up the construction of the project. Again an editorial by the Independent Journal succinctly expresses the sentiments of the people of Marin County.

"[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal, Feb. 22, 1965]

"TIME IS NOW FOR WORK ON FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT"

"Marin County got off relatively unscathed in last December's devastating floods that hit the northern counties.

"But we can't afford to keep pushing our luck indefinitely.

"The Corte Madera flood control project is a must. The Marin County Board of Supervisors have asked for immediate construction of the downstream portion of Corte Madera Creek, from the Granton Park area in Kentfield to the bay.

"While the December floods are still fresh in mind, this is a good time to give the Corte Madera flood control project a big push.

"We are aware that residents in the upstream area, from San Anselmo to Fairfax, are concerned about preserving some of the esthetic beauty of the natural creek setting. They don't want a solid mass of concrete cutting through the center of town.

"But this should not be allowed to interfere with immediate construction of the downstream half of the creek, where much of the damage occurs in flood years.

"In the lower portion, the need to protect lives and property will have to take precedence over aesthetic considerations.

"The extent of the flood problem in the lower half of Corte Madera Creek is pointed up in a report prepared by the College of Marin.

"The college is directly concerned because a portion of the creek runs through the campus, and the college area is hardest hit by flood waters. During severe flooding, as much as two-thirds of the campus area is under water. You probably recall pictures of students water-skiing on the inundated athletic field.

"Damage caused by flooding of the Corte Madera Creek amounts to an average of more than a quarter million dollars yearly, the college report points out. And the bulk of that damage occurs in the downstream half of the creek, including the college area.

"Most of the cost of the \$6.8 million project will come from Federal funds, and some from the State. The local share will amount to only about \$26,000 annually for maintenance, operation and repair, a small price to pay for the tremendous benefits that will be forthcoming.

"The flood plan, as worked out by the Army Corps of Engineers, calls for an earth-banked channel from the bay to a point just downstream of College Avenue, then a concrete lined channel through the college area and upstream.

"Upstream communities like Ross, San Anselmo, and Fairfax may be able to afford thinking in terms of balancing flood control with aesthetic beauty.

"But the downstream areas, particularly College of Marin and Kentfield, need immediate flood protection, even at the possible sacrifice of some esthetics."

I might add here that we have done much work with the staff of this committee to assist them in seeing that most of the problems that have currently been brought to our attention will be included in the final report, but it should be pointed out further

that with the overall devastation of the area, it is possible for new problems to crop up in the future, and we would appreciate the committee keeping the record open for a reasonable time should later requests be brought to our attention.

In closing, may I commend the armed services—Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, for their wonderful help which they gave so willingly and without reservation. The American Red Cross, Salvation Army, church organizations and a multitude of volunteer groups gave unselfishly of their aid. There are so many who put their "shoulders to the wheel" and worked side by side from the board of supervisors, city, civil defense and county officials, farmers, townspeople, to the Federal agencies giving disaster assistance. However, I cannot adequately express my appreciation to the chairman and members of this committee for visiting the area personally to view the extent of the damage. I am sure you will all agree that one has to see it, to believe the total devastation of the region. This you have done and the people of my congressional district shall remain forever grateful.

War in Vietnam—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include part XI of a report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for The Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on his recent trip to Vietnam.

Part XI, which appeared in this newspaper on March 3, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, XI—SKY RAIDERS BLAST VIETCONG HIDEOUT

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, tells of riding in a single-engined Sky Raider during an Air Force attack on a Vietcong hide-out.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

BIEN HOA AIRBASE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"It was," said Air Force Capt. Charles C. Vasiliadi of Huntington, Long Island upon return to 34th Tactical Group headquarters, "a very fine job. Twenty-nine hooches and there's plenty of those Vietcong dead over there now."

Even in my benumbed state after going along on a Sky Raider (A1E) fighter-bomber mission and my amazement at finding myself all in one piece, I managed to ask, "What's a hooch?"

The captain explained that it wasn't whisky cellars that were being destroyed at the Vietcong village 55 miles southwest of Saigon, but native huts of the Communists.

DESTRUCTION

I can personally testify that all of the huts I saw riddled by bombs, napalm and cannon fire, were indeed in the process of destruction, but I will confess that I didn't find time to count them, even though the chase plane in which I was permitted to ride, made five passes over the area, two at 20 feet off the ground.

I guess I was just too busy recovering from the approximately 4 g.'s (pull of gravity) when our plane pulled out of its 5,000-foot dive on the first three passes, and too preoccupied with my morbid curiosity as to whether Vietcong fire might abruptly end my

correspondent's career on the last two skim-throughs.

Actually, as our pilot, Lt. Col. Garth L. Reynolds, deputy commander for operations of the 34th Group, assured me over the intercom, flying low is the safest way to do it because the plane roars over the area too close and too fast for the enemy to take effective aim.

UNSETTLING

But an awareness that there still might be some Vietcong hiding in foxholes or nearby trees was somewhat unsettling. However, perhaps my greatest shock had come moments earlier when on the fourth pass on nearing the ground I heard a loud burst of cannon fire and wondered whether my number was up.

Actually, the noise came from our own 22-millimeter cannons, two protruding from each wing, as the colonel strafed the ground for the Vietcong, who had earlier, I was told, opened fire on our craft. I had missed this fire, but the colonel said some of the bullets came over our canopy, entitling him to return the fire.

Because this is a civil war, the South Vietnamese insist that on any bombing raids each Sky Raider have one of their countrymen along on each plane.

SHOOT BACK

The chase plane was not so equipped, but the rules of the games permit such planes to shoot back if first fired upon.

The bombing and strafing took only a few minutes of an afternoon I shall not soon forget.

For a half hour, Captain Vasiliadi briefed three other American pilots upon their mission of interdiction, or wiping out of an enemy village. Soon after they equipped me with a parachute, Mae West life preserver and even a .38 caliber revolver just in case.

By 1:35 p.m., the five single-engine Sky Raiders were warming up and not long after "Beaver 83," as the mission was called, was airborne.

MARK TARGET

At 2 p.m., a small air controller plane joined the group. Its responsibility is to lead the way to the target and mark it.

At 2:15 p.m., the air controller laid down two smoke grenades on the ground, perhaps 1,000 feet apart, indicating the direction of the bomb run.

Less than a minute later, the No. 1 plane, piloted by Captain Vasiliadi, peeled off for the kill. He was followed in quick succession by Sky Raiders piloted by Capt. William J. Richardson of Gilbert, Mass., Capt. Richard H. Head of Lexington, N.H., and Capt. Richard H. Head of Des Moines, Iowa. Our plane peeled off closely behind.

SMOKE VISIBLE

The ground rose up swiftly as our plane streaked toward the Vietcong village. Before it leveled and our plane pulled sharply up, I could see that the first batch of 500 pound general purpose bombs, two with VT fuses that made them burst with shrapnel just above the ground, had done their deadly work and thick, dark smoke was billowing upward.

The dive-bombing was repeated until some 9,000 pounds of bombs, including seven 500-pound general purpose ones, four 270-pound fragmentation ones, four 125-pound fragmentary clusters and six 20-pound fragmentation bombs, had been dropped.

Then the planes headed back to the base with no casualties and not the slightest nick on any of the Sky Raiders.

SUPREMACY

Although our forces do have complete air supremacy in South Vietnam, a Skyraider mission is always not quite that easy. Sometimes the ground fire is deadlier, as I learned that afternoon at the officers' club. I talked with Lt. Kemp P. "Buddy" Roedema of Gar-

March 9, 1965

A1054

field, N.J., whose Skyraider had been so badly damaged by Vietcong ground fire that he had to bail out over enemy territory.

While bullets whined around him, he ran for cover and hid under a log. The Vietcong searched diligently for him and came within 20 feet, but couldn't find him.

Meanwhile, armed U.S. helicopters winged their way to the area and hovered in the area of the downed craft. For a while, Roedema dared not stir despite the nearness of the whirlbirds, for fear of getting shot if he made a break for it.

RESCUE CRAFT

One of the choppers left and the other was about to pull out, too, when Roedema made his break. Apparently out of respect for the cannon and rocket power of the helicopter, the Reds retired and the lieutenant made it safely to the rescue plane.

For those who think that we are not winning and cannot win this war, there is a great object lesson in the way our mission was pulled off. The estimates of the killed enemy were not available, but it is reasonable to assume that more than 100 of the Vietcong were killed in their mooches and foxholes, while not a single casualty was inflicted on our side.

OPERATIONS

As Colonel Reynolds had told me in an earlier briefing, the Vietcong enemy losses from the 34th Tactical Group operations in December had been in excess of 2,600 and the indications were that the January toll will be even higher.

Compare this with only 59 airmen from our side killed since the war began, and the lesson becomes obvious. It is not unreasonable to assume that this tremendous disparity in losses may eventually jolt Ho Chi Minh and the North Vietnamese guerrilla war leaders into calling off their war.

The Challenge of Citizenship**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that an able and articulate young constituent of mine, Mr. Peter De Rose, has been selected as New York State's winner in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy contest. Mr. De Rose won this honor with his fine essay "The Challenge of Citizenship," which I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Peter De Rose, Bronx, N.Y.)

According to popular repute, the role of the 20th century citizen is insignificant, as small as a drop of water in the ocean, which seeking to find its fellow drop loses itself in the wide sea. According to this source, the citizen of today has no control over the problems arising from the atomic bomb or automation; his own personal ideas and reflections are tossed aside when matters such as Berlin and birth control are discussed; and, according to this same popular opinion, he is never consulted when policies concerning communism, the Congo, and Cuba are at stake. To some extent, this belief does contain a certain degree of truth. But I do not completely agree with all of its implications. In short, I do not believe

that the role of the 20th century citizen has been weakened so much as to render it ineffective. I know there are those who will disagree with me, those who will object that because the population of America and of the world has spiraled so rapidly the views of one are inconsequential to the government of the masses. I am cognizant of this objection, but I refute it, and I challenge those who undermine the worth of the individual to prove their citizenship.

I am a sovereign citizen of the United States. I am the source of the authority of the Government. I have upon my shoulders the preservation of this great boon of freedom and opportunity for which others in the past have paid so dearly. It is my responsibility to inform myself; I owe it to myself and to my county to formulate my own conclusions on vital national issues as carefully as if I were actually sitting in the President's chair. It is my responsibility to learn to think clearly, to collect and evaluate evidence, to learn to distinguish between propaganda and truth. It is my responsibility to read and scrutinize the news, to understand the nature of the news, to extract and prescind the facts from the editorial bias that often distorts its objectivity, and to make due allowances for my own self-interests and prejudices. But knowledge is not enough; I must be able to express myself, to share my information with others publicly and privately; to that end I was given the right to vote, to privately manifest my own wishes to the public. I must be conscious, too, that I ought not to hold fast to my opinions as though they were political dogmas, that I should not hesitate to change my mind when stronger arguments supersede them, that I should not be embarrassed when introduced to new ideas. I must be tolerant of opposing viewpoints, to have an independent conclusion by the best light I have but with a certain respect for the person whose viewpoint I do not share. I must be loath to impugn motives or to engage in personality attacks; I must recognize that difference of opinion in a democracy is wholesome. Finally, if this is truly to be one nation under God, I must seek and listen for divine guidance, to join with others in the infinite fellowship of a small group for discussion and prayer and find that great increase of power and strength in such fellowship, to live totally and to live every moment.

Again, I repeat: I am a sovereign citizen of the United States. I am the source of the authority of the Government. I do not agree with those who underestimate the awesome power of the individual and, in turn, neglect their own personal responsibilities on the grounds of a false assumption—and a foolish assumption at that—who, by their own apathy, ignorance, and confusion conclude that the role of the 20th century citizen is insignificant, and I challenge them to prove their citizenship.

American Tourism**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, the term "American Tourism" can no longer be classified as a minor segment of our Nation's economy. Recent problems and statistics have now placed American tourism in the realm of big business with all the incentive and motivation that

apply to the multibillion-dollar industry of today.

One of the major problems facing our Nation in this era of rapid transportation is that the United States, through its tourists, spend more money in foreign countries than foreign visitors spend in the United States. Recent figures indicate that over 2 million Americans traveled abroad last year and spent \$3 billion in foreign markets. In contrast, foreign visitors to the U.S. number approximately 900,000 and they spent about \$1½ billion. Obviously, these figures place Americans in an unfavorable position of losing approximately \$1½ billion each year.

The Government and people of the United States are well aware of this pressing problem. Americans have been motivated to become more familiar with their own country and to visit the historic and scenic areas of our land.

According to the Automobile Association of America, approximately 8 million Americans visited the State of New Hampshire in 1964. Each year, the number of visitors to New Hampshire has increased by one-half million. Thus, New Hampshire is doing its part in attracting visitors to the Granite State who otherwise might travel abroad.

I believe we must now work even harder to balance the monetary imbalance that still exists.

New Hampshire is a prime example of an excellent reason why tourists find comfort and enjoyment in American travel.

From the White Mountains to the seacoast and from the Monadnock to Coos, millions of American citizens have enjoyed their vacations in New Hampshire. For those who seek beauty, the White Mountain Region, with the formidable Mount Washington and the majestic Mount Chocorua, is a foremost vacationland, famous for its scenic beauty and its many natural and manmade attractions. For those who seek relaxation and enjoyment, Lake Winnepesaukee and Hampton Beach offer the ultimate of fresh water sailing and swimming or salt water surfing and comfort. For those who seek sporting, good roads and an abundant choice of wildlife combine to offer the best in hunting and the finest in salt and fresh water fishing. New Hampshire has pioneered many modern ski devices and today offers more than 60 major ski lifts, many of them brandnew and many operating for summer sightseers. In the sport of horseracing, Rothingham Park features harness racing and is the home of the richest race in the world—the New Hampshire Sweepstakes.

The history and tradition of the unique New Hampshire countryside are being preserved for the future. The famous Strawberry Banke Colonial restoration project in Portsmouth will be completed within the next few years, and will serve students and educators with the history of the old Portsmouth of Revolutionary times.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a presentation in capsule form, of what New Hampshire has offered in the attempt to alleviate America's problem of gold outflow.

March 9, 1965

A1045

Mr. Bromley began his long tenure in the summer of 1917, in fact, just 3 months after the Wyoming Highway Department was created by the State legislature.

Checking old records, it is interesting to note that between April of 1917 and November of 1918 the department expended \$49,598.33 and this included such things as salaries, autos and expenses, surveying equipment, camping equipment and the necessary expenditures for office furniture required for a new department.

It was also found in 1917 that none of the counties had ever made surveys or plans for highway construction and, in fact, some did not even possess right-of-way records.

During the construction season of 1917 surveys were done on 330 miles of Federal aid projects and 72 miles of State aid projects.

Mr. Bromley worked in the summer of 1917 and joined the department full time in 1918 as a roadman at Lusk after having completed 3 years study in civil engineering at the University of Utah.

From this beginning Mr. Bromley rose through the ranks, having served in numerous assignments and at virtually every location throughout the State of Wyoming. In his 45 years of service to the people of Wyoming, the last 21 have been served as superintendent and chief engineer.

Also during this time, the department has risen to a State highway system comprising nearly 5,500 miles and an employee force of 1,500 and an annual expenditure of nearly \$50 million per year.

Since the placement of the first oil surfacing in 1925, the department has presently \$361 million invested in highways and structures and an additional \$132 million of highway construction and progress. In highway administration and management circles, J. R. Bromley and the Wyoming Highway Department have jointly acquired a record of accomplishment which is envied throughout the land.

Mr. Bromley has served as vice president for the Rocky Mountain region for American Association of State Highway Officials and also as vice president and president of the Western Association of State Highway Officials. He is a registered land surveyor and professional engineer in the State of Wyoming.

I join other officials of the State and his many friends who are legion throughout Wyoming in wishing Mr. Bromley every happiness upon his retirement from a career of dedicated public service to the interest of every citizen of America who will have occasion to use Wyoming's great highways and roads in the generations to come.

War in Vietnam—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

include the 10th part of a series by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., covering his trip to Vietnam.

Part X, which was printed in the Courier-Express on March 2, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, X—OLEAN MAN RISKS LIFE AS CIVILIAN

(NOTE.—Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, writes about a western New Yorker who is risking his life every day to promote South Vietnamese agriculture.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—“So sorry I didn't see you when you were in Danang,” said Francis J. “Bud” Savage, formerly of Olean, N.Y. “But you see the situation where I was at Quang Tri is No. 10, an expression that means very, very bad.

“In fact,” he explained, “it was so No. 10 that I am not being permitted to return because of the danger. I guess maybe they're right. When you have been shot at three times and ambushed once by the Vietcong, perhaps it's best not to press your luck by staying.”

Bud Savage, whose mother lives at 311½ South Second Street, Olean, is one of the representatives of the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM) of the Agency for International Development (AID). He's a part of USOM's counterinsurgency team that directly supports the South Vietnamese war efforts in the rural areas. USOM seeks to provide a new life for hamlet dwellers and refugees from the Vietcong Communists by helping them construct schools, health stations, rural water supply facilities and hamlet defenses.

AGRICULTURAL AID

The USOM crew is equipped to provide seed, fertilizer, and rat poison, help establish a hog-raising industry and grow better corn and sweet potatoes. And for good measure, they equip villages and hamlets with two-way alarm radios and provide radio receivers for key residents among the South Vietnamese.

In the area where Savage has been working, the Vietcong had made sharp inroads, as my own trip near his hamlet had attested a few days ago. I had visited Thanh Quit with a U.S. Army major only a few hours after the Vietcong had been on a rampage and destroyed the hamlet's barbed wire and bamboo fortifications.

“You were only about 6 miles north of where I was stationed,” Savage declared. “The whole area is becoming reinfested with Vietcong and it will take strong measures to push them back again. Aside from those shootings and ambush, I underwent two substantial mortar attacks. And to add to my troubles, I experienced two typhoons and a flood. And yet I like my work and intend to go back to another assignment in a different area.”

OVERSEAS FOR 15 YEARS

The Olean man has served his Government overseas for 15 years since World War II. In his earlier foreign service work he was stationed at such places as Reykjavik, Iceland; Marseilles, France; Athens and Salonika, Greece, Trinidad, and Tripoli.

Once he joined the Foreign Aid program and worked in Mongadisclo, Somalia, East Africa, before volunteering for the Vietnam USOM staff. He has been here 6 months and present plans are for him to continue here until at least October before reassignment.

“All my friends in the States think I'm nuts to do this,” he said, “but I frankly like it. Besides, I firmly believe that the United States just can't pull out of here. It's got to stick it out and win, and if I can be of some small help, I'm happy.”

BOOST IN FORCES' MORALE

Savage says that morale among U.S. and South Vietnamese forces got a big shot in the arm with the bombing of North Vietnam military installations.

“It brought the war home to those who are responsible for it, and it should help in turning the tables,” he declared.

Not long ago, Savage was one of the 70 to receive the South Vietnamese Medal of Merit for one of his USOM missions. The medal was presented in recognition of tireless and devoted work of these men during the critical days of the flood.

NEW ASSIGNMENT

My interview with Savage occurred on the day of his return to the Danang area, not far from the border of North Vietnam. His new assignment will be in the Tan Ky area, south from Danang, but some miles away from his old hot spot. The South China Sea is only about 12 miles away, but he'll be in hill country where the going may be almost as rough as the post he vacated.

“Probably about No. 8 there,” he grinned. “Maybe I can help make it No. 1.”

World Peace Through Rule of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Cecil J. Olmstead on behalf of Rule of Law Committee:

“MAKING PERMANENT THE RULE OF LAW AMENDMENT IN THE PRIVATE INVESTMENT PROTECTION PROVISIONS OF THE U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT (SEC. 620(e)(2))”—STATEMENT OF CECIL J. OLMSTEAD ON BEHALF OF RULE OF LAW COMMITTEE

I

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Cecil J. Olmstead. I serve as assistant to the chairman of the board of Texaco, Inc. I am appearing today not only in that capacity but also as a representative of a group of companies who have formed a committee called the Rule of Law Committee. By way of background, I am a professor of international law at New York University School of Law and serve as president of the American Branch of the International Law Association. The Rule of Law Committee last year supported in the Senate the Rule of Law or “Sabbatino” amendment which was cosponsored by Senators SPARKMAN and HICKENLOOPER and adopted by a large bipartisan majority in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The amendment, the text of which appears on the last page of this statement, was ultimately adopted as section 620(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act with the understanding that it be further considered this year before being made permanent. I am here this year to urge with all the force at my command that the rule of law amendment be made permanent. The recent expropriations in Indonesia and in Syria serve to emphasize the urgency of the situation.

The membership of the Rule of Law Committee represents a significant part of American business abroad and includes:

Aluminum Co. of America; American & Foreign Power Co., Inc.; American Metal Climax, Inc.; Anaconda Co.; Bethlehem Steel; Chase Manhattan Bank; Ford Motor Co.;

Gulf Oil Corp.; International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.; Kennecott Copper Corp.; North American Sugar Industries; Republic Steel Corp.; Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc.; Standard Oil Co. of California; Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); Texaco, Inc.; United Fruit Co.; United States Steel Corp.; and Pan-American Life Insurance Co.

All these companies have a common interest in the protection of oversea investment. This common concern for the protection of oversea investment accounts for the fact that the members of the Rule of Law Committee were deeply disturbed by the Supreme Court decision of last March in the Sabbatino case. (*Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 376 U.S. 398 (1964)). The impact of that decision could have very adverse effects indeed upon the protection and encouragement of oversea investment, particularly in the less developed countries.

In the Sabbatino case, the Castro government of Cuba sued in New York to recover the sales proceeds of a shipment of sugar which it had confiscated in Cuba as part of its 1960 program to expropriate U.S. interests. The proceeds of the sale had come into possession of a U.S. sugar broker in New York and been put in receivership pending judicial determination of ownership. The lower courts gave judgment for the expropriated American owners of the sugar on the ground that the Cuban taking, although an "act of state," was in violation of international law and hence not entitled to the recognition ordinarily given in U.S. courts to the acts of a foreign state. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that there should be no inquiry in U.S. courts into the legality of the Cuban expropriation and therefore that the Cuban Government was entitled to the sales proceeds in New York of the expropriated sugar.

Thus, in its simplest terms the Supreme Court decision in the Sabbatino case stands for the proposition that if American property is expropriated abroad and thereafter brought within U.S. territory, courts in the United States are precluded from making any inquiry into the matter including whether that property was taken in violation of international law. The consequence of this proposition is that if the former American owners of property expropriated abroad seek to recover that property when it turns up within the United States, they are denied any kind of recourse to U.S. courts, both State and Federal, even in cases in which the expropriation is uncompensated or otherwise is in violation of international law. Specifically, this means that the fruits of such illegal expropriations could be marketed with impunity in the United States.

As one commentator has put it, the Court's decision was generally received with "dismay and consternation by those members of the legal profession concerned with the protection of foreign investment."

The reasons for this dismay and consternation may be itemized as follows:

1. The highest court in the United States adopted a position in the Sabbatino case which permitted the Castro government of Cuba to invoke the legal sanctions of U.S. domestic courts to enforce its claim to the proceeds of the sale of goods expropriated in Cuba from the American owners without payment of compensation and otherwise in violation of international law including admitted discrimination against our nationals.

2. At the same time an American litigant in a U.S. court was denied the protection which international law, if applied, would have afforded to his property interests.

3. The Supreme Court for the first time in its history declared that domestic courts, which traditionally have applied international law as a part of the law of the United States, are not obliged to apply that law where the application might result in a hold-

ing that the act of a foreign state taken within its own territory had been in violation of international law.

4. The Supreme Court refused to permit domestic courts in the United States either to make a determination on the merits or to inquire into the validity of confiscatory acts of a foreign state even where the courts had complete jurisdiction by every conventional test of jurisdiction.

5. Unnecessarily and without weighing the practical consequences of their words, the Supreme Court majority appeared to endorse the attack made by Castro's lawyer on the international law standard of "prompt, adequate and effective" compensation.

6. The Supreme Court adopted a more extreme application of the act of State doctrine than any other country whose courts have passed upon this problem and in doing so set a precedent which, if not modified, may unfortunately be adopted by other countries all over the world.

The practical threat to U.S. foreign investment posed by the majority opinion in the Sabbatino case was threefold:

(a) U.S. owners of foreign investment would be denied the protection against expropriation of being able to attach their former property if it were seized in violation of international law and later came within the jurisdiction of American courts.

(b) The willingness of courts in other countries to permit U.S. investors to attach their expropriated property if it was imported into those countries was undermined.

(c) The Communist and Nationalist enemies of U.S. foreign investment were given encouragement by the suggestion that the international law standard of "prompt, adequate and effective" compensation for expropriations could not be enforced by American courts in the absence of a treaty. In Chile, the unsuccessful presidential candidate Allende in advocating expropriation of the U.S. copper companies commented that the Sabbatino ruling meant that he would not have to compensate the American companies if he took them over.

II

The Supreme Court's opinion in Sabbatino, however, made it clear that the problems created could be corrected by legislation. In its opinion the Supreme Court had stated that its decision was not required by any provision of the U.S. Constitution or by any rule of customary international law. Instead, it is clear that the Court's decision was based upon the belief that in this particular area of international law the Supreme Court should defer to the political branches of the Government who are expressly charged with the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. It should be emphasized that the Supreme Court's expressed deference was not to the executive branch alone but rather to both the executive branch and the legislative branch—and properly so. At the time of its decision, however, the Court had only the State Department's expression of preference before it and acted without the benefit of any expression of congressional policy. It is therefore clear from the text of the Sabbatino opinion that the Supreme Court recognizes that the Congress is perfectly free to participate in the formulation of U.S. policy in this area under its traditional constitutional powers, among others, the power to regulate foreign commerce and to define offenses against the law of nations. In actual litigation in which the rule of law amendment has been sought to be applied, the Justice Department has stated that it found "no constitutional prohibition" to the amendment's application.

The purpose of last year's rule of law amendment was to modify the Supreme Court decision only in part and to strike a reasonable balance between the interests

of private parties in the protection of their oversea investment under international law and the interests of the Government in the conduct of foreign relations. This was accomplished chiefly by a simple reversal of presumptions. Under the law as it stood immediately after the Supreme Court's decision in the Sabbatino case, every court in the United States was then required to presume that any inquiry by it into the validity under international law of the act of a foreign state respecting matters within its own territory would be a matter of embarrassment to State Department in the conduct of foreign policy and therefore no such inquiry should be initiated unless the State Department by affirmative act indicated that it had no objection to such a judicial inquiry. The rule of law amendment reverses this presumption so that the courts now are to presume that they may make a determination on the merits in every case in which it is asserted that international law has been violated unless the President, or his designee, advises the court that such a determination would be a source of embarrassment in the conduct of foreign policy. In addition, the amendment permits application of the "prompt, adequate and effective compensation" rule as already set out in section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act without the requirement that this be agreed to by treaty.

Under the amendment, the litigant is granted his day in court on the basis of a statutory presumption of nonembarrassment, unless the President intervenes to rebut that presumption. Thus the litigant may be denied a consideration of his case on the merits only after the President, or the State Department on his behalf, has actually weighed the public interest of the Government in avoiding embarrassment against the private interests of the litigant in having his property dealt with under the rule of the law and has affirmatively found that in the particular case the public interest must override the private interest.

Another consequence of the statutory reversal of presumptions is that international law with respect to expropriations will be applied in U.S. courts as a matter of course, as it is applied in all other cases where it is relevant, unless the President intervenes. In the absence of such intervention the amendment assures that international law will be applied and that the private litigant will be accorded his day in court. It is for these reasons that we speak of it as the "rule of law" amendment.

III

It will be recalled that the conference committee last year accepted the principle of the amendment but made it applicable only to cases commenced prior to January 1, 1966. The conference report makes it clear that the only reason for the time limitation was to permit the Congress to hold hearings on the question before taking the decision that the rule of law amendment be made permanent legislation. I am here to urge with all the strength I can bring to bear the amendment be made permanent. Specifically, we urge that the third proviso in section 620(e)(2) of the act be deleted. You will see this proviso bracketed in the text of the amendment appearing at the end of my statement.

It should be noted that the position urged by companies that make up the Rule of Law Committee enjoys wide support among bar associations, trade organizations, and members of the academic community who have no commercial connection whatsoever. The proposal for the principle embodied in the rule of law amendment was originally put forward in 1959 by the International Law Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and was later adopted as a matter of policy by that asso-

with some derogatory labels such as radical, socialistic, un-American, subversive, and so on. Persons with such an attitude really betray the fact that they do not trust truth to win out in the free-for-all of public discussion. Perhaps they fear that their intellectual stance cannot be defended in open debate, and that opposing viewpoints must be destroyed by smearing the persons who express such views.

If America is to remain strong and preserve its democracy for future generations, we must guard vigilantly our freedom of speech—which, today, often means the freedom to express unpopular opinions.

Must Ask Question To Get the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
 OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal included on Wednesday, March 3, 1965, the editorial, "Must Ask Question To Get the Answer," posed the problem of using fighting men from several Asiatic nations on the firing line in Vietnam instead of a major buildup of American troops. This suggestion by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] makes enough sense to deserve an analysis and an answer by those in command of our Departments of State and Defense. It recognizes the need for stopping the flow of Communist troops into South Vietnam but also recognizes the fact that those nations with a vital interest in preserving freedom in southeast Asia have the responsibility to help shoulder the load rather than to sit on the sidelines indefinitely.

Representative FORD has here made a constructive suggestion which neither emphasizes the view of "get out and negotiate" nor the commitment of greater numbers of boys to the struggle in Vietnam. It deserves most serious consideration by the administration. With unanimous consent I submit the editorial for the RECORD:

MUST ASK QUESTION TO GET THE ANSWER

It wouldn't be surprising if the plan put forward by U.S. Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Grand Rapids, for winning the war in Vietnam without a major buildup of American troops were greeted by gloomy predictions that it wouldn't work.

The House Republican leader proposes that fighting men from several Asiatic nations be put on the firing line against the Communist Vietcong.

It wouldn't be a United Nations operation, but instead would call for the formation of a brandnew Asian-American task force.

In an interview with this newspaper, FORD listed South Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia as countries he feels could contribute substantial numbers of troops to the joint force assigned to the defense of freedom in South Vietnam.

"Those countries have just as big an interest as we do in keeping southeast Asia free," he said. "Maybe more so, since they are geographically closer to the war."

FORD views as unrealistic the ideas of two opposing schools of thought in Washington. One wants a negotiated settlement in Viet-

nam and withdrawal of all U.S. ground forces. The other favors sending as many as a million U.S. troops, if necessary, to hold South Vietnam against the Communist infiltrators from the north.

FORD said he cannot visualize sending a million Americans and asserted that "any substantial increase should come from our Asian allies."

On the other hand, he expressed belief "it would be catastrophic to withdraw now, either militarily or by some negotiated settlement that would be unworkable."

FORD said it should eventually be possible to withdraw U.S. ground forces unit by unit as pro-Western Asians move in to replace them, with America's contribution limited to air and sea power.

Of America's immediate objectives in the war, he said:

"First, we must stop the flow of Communist troops and armaments into South Vietnam.

"Second, Hanoi and Peking must learn that they are wasting their time trying to overrun South Vietnam.

"Once those aims are achieved, then may we can talk about a negotiated peace."

Its obviously going to take a lot of doing to achieve these two goals, but we believe FORD's plan makes a lot of sense.

Of course, a big question is involved—whether the other Asian countries would cooperate in a joint effort in behalf of a cause that is an important, or more so, to them is as it is to the United States or whether they are determined to stay on the sidelines and let America continue to carry the whole burden.

The answer to the question cannot be obtained by taking the position that FORD's proposal wouldn't work and that there is no use in pursuing the course he has outlined.

The best way to get the answer is to ask the question in terms that make it unmistakably clear that the United States doesn't intend to continue indefinitely to carry on its own shoulders a load which others having a vital stake in preserving freedom in southeast Asia have a moral responsibility to share.

A Bill To Grant an Additional Tax Exemption for a Taxpayer Supporting a Dependent Who Has Attained Age 65 or Is Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to grant an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind.

Despite the recent tax cut, the burdens of taxation still lie heavily on those supporting elderly persons or blind persons. The expenses these supporting taxpayers must incur are severe, and they receive no tax break—apart from the medical expense deduction. I think it is time that we recognized the weight of this burden, and the need to lessen it.

A taxpayer supporting elderly or blind

persons cannot now get the double deduction that the elderly or blind person can get for his or her income tax. As it is often the supporting taxpayer who is the only one paying the tax, things ought to be equalized by giving him the additional tax exemption. This would ease the heavy burden of caring for elderly and blind persons.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a Voice of Democracy contest for high school students across the Nation. The winner for the State of Montana this year is Miss Mary Margaret Blom of Havre, Mont. I would like to commend Miss Blom and, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert her essay:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Mary Margaret Blom)

During this past year, Americans have had more opportunity to voice their opinions, state their views, argue with opponents, and grow firmer in their political convictions than at any other time in communications history. Voters and politicians discuss, analyze, argue, present, and continually try to convince one another. Everybody has an idea about how our Government should be run. And yet, in spite of all the squabbling, this country grows and prospers, supplies good jobs to more people, has the best paid teachers in the best equipped schools in the world, feeds tens of thousands all over the earth, gives more to charity, spends more on education and research, takes better care of its old, sick, and orphans, and supports more generously more symphony orchestras, more artists and writers, and more good publications. And in what other nation on earth would you find the counterpart of Little League baseball?

So despite all the varied and oftspoken cures prescribed by American social doctors, America is today the greatest, most productive Nation on earth.

What is the reason that the United States has been able to progress and out-produce the rest of world? America is a democracy. America is based economically on free enterprise. These two reasons explain the position that the United States of America holds in this hemisphere and indeed in the world today.

American democracy is threefold—political, which is freedom of expression and vote; economic, which is freedom of investment and enterprise; and social, which is freedom of association and opportunity. Each of these forms of democracy has become vital to the American way of life. Each American holds his rights dear. And most Americans realize how important the duties that correspond to these privileges are. This growing realization among Americans—that citizenship implies active participation—is the reason, I believe, that more Americans are registering to vote, joining the Peace Corps, attending criminal trials, earnestly supporting political parties that express their views, and in general, showing increasing interest in the image and the reality of the American way of life—an American way of life that

A1042

every year expands itself by admitting into its privileged membership, thousands of foreign-born appreciators—people who in their dire need and love of freedom strive even to the point of risk of life to become recognized citizens of liberty's bulwark—the country that we are learning not to take for granted.

This then is the challenge of citizenship of this year and indeed of this decade: to continue, now that we have begun—to continue in our advancement, our progress, our prosperity. We are coming to grips with the challenge, but the struggle is far from won. We must continue our efforts, our loyalties, our hopes. And this way, America can reach new peaks, can ride to new crests on the tide of democratic principles. We must spread them abroad, and further them at home. We must build, and create and encourage. We must give to the youth of our land a whetted appetite, a hunger for justice and the American way.

Continued voter interest and even more of it must be the key phrase to insure that in the future of our America, right is might, not the opposite.

Grocery Store Bills Rise, but Not Because of Food Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, March 7, issue of the New York Times carried an article entitled "Grocery Store Bills Rise, but Not Because of Food Costs." Unfortunately, this fine article was carried on the pages of the financial section and may have been missed by the housewives of the Nation. It is information that every grocery shopper should have, and it is a pleasure to incorporate the article into these remarks.

Mr. H. J. Maidenberg has presented a factual statement and the information indicates clearly that, despite the changing tastes of the American consumer, and while all other consumer prices have been going up and up, proportionately less is spent on food today by the housewife than was spent years ago.

Food is still the best bargain on the merchant's shelf.

The article follows:

GROCERYSTORE BILLS RISE, BUT NOT BECAUSE OF FOOD COSTS—NON-EDIBLES OUTDISTANCE GROWTH OF THE POPULATION

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

If you thought you spent a bit too much at the supermarket yesterday, you probably did—but not for food.

Chances are the shopping bag contained hair sprays, first-aid kits, bubble-bath soap, paper towels, patient medicines, and many other items formerly bought in drug stores.

As for food, much of the bill covered purchases of meat, soft drinks, frozen vegetables, beer, and prepared or semiprepared goods such as cake mixes, and other convenience foods that were rarely on shopping lists a dozen or so years ago.

In terms of percentage, food sales are not keeping pace with the rise in population, but nonfood sales in groceries are growing much faster than the population.

Like as not the shopping list showed few, if any, of the little snacks or candies bought on impulse just before the checkout counter was reached.

All in all, surveys by the Government and the food industry note that despite the changing tastes of the American consumer, he spends proportionally less on food today than he did years ago.

SALES FIGURES REPORTED

The Government has estimated that food sales this year will total \$82 billion, or \$2 billion above 1964. This increase of about 3 percent, however, is the same as the rate of population growth.

According to the Grocery Manufacturers' Association, the consumer spent 19 percent of his disposable income on food in 1964. This compared with 26 percent about 15 years ago. During this time, the 1,500 items he had to choose from on the grocer's shelves has grown to 8,000.

The Food Field Reporter, a trade paper and statistical organization, said that total grocery sales rose 2.8 percent in 1963, to \$53,920 million. In the same period, the latest for which figures are available, nonfood items in these shops and markets jumped 12.5 percent to \$4,327,550,000.

Is it concern over waistlines that is keeping expenditures for food down in relation to disposable income?

The answer is elusive.

The largest gain in sales in 1963 was in dietetic soft drinks, up 52.3 percent from the year before; and the largest decline of any grocery line was in metered-calorie products, down 30.1 percent.

One theory that food executives dismiss is about the less arduous work Americans do nowadays. They point out that people spend more time at home than they did years ago, and consequently are closer to the refrigerator.

Increased incomes are also translated into a rising demand for meat as well as beer and snacks, such as potato chips. Market research men are particularly interested in the increased consumption of beer by teenagers.

This has helped move beer sales from fifth to fourth position in volume leadership. Only fresh beef, cured pork products and fresh vegetables top beer in grocery stores.

As for keeping busy, food men are one in declaring that housewives, especially those in the suburbs, are more active than ever. As one executive noted:

"Kids are rarely left alone today, whether in the city or suburbs. They are driven from pillar to post by parents obsessed with 'attainment.' This means less time to prepare meals and hence the fantastic growth of convenience foods."

OTHER FACTORS

The extra housework required of housewives in the suburban home and the growing number of married women who work also contribute to the sharp sales rise of cake mixes, boil-in-the-bag foods, frozen dinners and other convenience items.

Commenting on taste, one executive of a large food concern said that vast improvements in the manufacture of convenience foods had overcome initial resistance to many of these products.

"Take instant potatoes, for example," he said. "They don't taste like mashed potatoes, they're better tasting."

One reason given for the slow rise in grocery sales of food products is the strength of specialty stores, particularly in the city.

While the city is often called an impersonal place, shoppers there are far more personal in their tastes and less bound by conformity than those in the suburbs.

The specialty stores usually carry grocery staples, but depend heavily on "ethnic foods" and gourmet items. Their sales show a steady rise from year to year, and in 1963 totaled \$5.57 billion.

Part of the success, or at least the ability to withstand competition from supermarkets, stems from the pockets of ethnic groups that remain in the cities. This factor has had a profound effect on food store management.

"Ethnic or specialty foods are so important," one chain store executive declared, "that they have set headquarters buying back. One large national chain that did its buying with a computer failed to allow for special preferences in various neighborhoods and wound up selling its Eastern stores."

The specialty stores also perform services that the large chains find impossible. For instance, many grant credit or permit customers to buy items on sale by the box and then allow the buyer to draw from this carton over a period of time.

ONE FAMILY'S PATTERN

Recently, one family on the West Side bought several cases of canned vegetables at a sale, which were put aside by the grocer. The housewife then picked up several cans each day and it saved space in her home.

Large supermarkets, on the other hand, depend on low prices and variety to draw customers. This has led to the stocking of many nonfood items, which have higher profit margins than most edibles.

The drug stores, now losing their toiletries customers to supermarkets, have in many instances installed food departments serving ice cream and confectionery items. Loft's Candy Co. has been particularly active in placing their agencies in drug stores.

Probably the biggest gainer in the drug store-supermarket competition for the consumer dollar is the packaging industry. Last year, an estimated \$23 billion was spent on packaging materials for food and drug items. That more toothpaste is sold in supermarkets than drug stores is immaterial to this industry.

PILLSBURY'S FORMAT

Another beneficiary is the grocery manufacturer. A case in point is the Pillsbury Co.

Some 20 years ago, Pillsbury was mainly concerned with producing flour. It then began making cake mixes, processed potatoes, frozen foods and other convenience foods.

One result has been a 93-percent rise in profit on a 40-percent increase in sales in the last 7 years.

About the only loser in the food industry has been the farmer. The Department of Agriculture has reported that the retail cost of all food consumed or exported in 1953 totaled \$1,008 million. Of this, the farmer received \$445 million, or 44 percent.

In 1963, this same food basket cost \$1,078 million and the farm value was \$394 million, or 37 percent.

War in Vietnam—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Luciano C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., visited Vietnam recently and has been writing a series of articles for his newspaper on his observations there.

Part IX, which appeared in the Courier-Express on March 1, 1965, follows:

FLARE PLANES HELP TO SPOT VIETCONG

(NOTE.—Vietcong guerrillas are night-fighters, so Vietnamese forces and their American advisers have countered with planes

ing flares. Here Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, rides a flare-carrying C-123.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

PHUOC HOA, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It is mid-night, and the big C-123 Air Force cargo plane is slowly circling over this area miles north of Saigon and at an altitude of about 4,000 feet.

A moon that is nearly full casts a ghostly light on the plain below, and the eerie effect is heightened by a crescent-shaped grass fire blazing in this vicinity.

"The fires could be the work of farmers who use this method to prepare the soil for planting, or they could have been lit by the Vietcong Commies to provide a smoke cover for their activities."

U.S. PILOTS

The comment was from the plane's Air Force pilot, Maj. M. R. Richardson, a native of Bay St. Louis, Miss., with whom we were chatting over the plane's intercom system.

Beside him sat his copilot, Capt. James M. Dillard, a Negro from West Virginia, and behind them in the navigator's chair was a young Vietnamese Air Force man, who was in constant touch by radio with South Vietnamese forces below.

"Looks very much like you're not going to see our fireworks tonight," drawled Dillard. "Guess you should have taken the Smoky Blue run. They dropped plenty of flares there just a little while ago at Soc Trang in the delta country south of Saigon. But it appears that Smoky Red just isn't going to get the word."

FLARE NICKNAMES

Earlier we had learned that Smoky Red and Smoky Blue were the nicknames for the aircraft parachute flare operations that are available nightly to the South Vietnamese ground forces if they need illumination to thwart the Vietcong.

Smoky Red is the first to become airborne every night at dusk. At about 7 we had boarded the C-123 and took off with a crew of 8, also including the flight mechanic, a "loadmaster" in charge of the 180 flares aboard, and 3 "kickers" trained in dropping the million-candlepower oversize roman candles with maximum efficiency.

CALL TO PHUOC HOA

For more than an hour the Smoky Red plane had described an arc around Saigon, waiting a call. At 8:15 p.m. it came and the plane took off for Phuoc Hoa.

This automatically set in operation Smoky Blue, another similarly equipped C-124 plane, which circled Saigon until it got its call for Soc Trang. This was the signal for Smoky Green to become airborne, and if it had become necessary a Smoky Brown was on tap.

It took only about 15 minutes for Smoky Red to arrive at its destination. The time was utilized by the loadmaster and the kickers to shuck some of their flares from metal containers. Four were then placed on a flair chute, their "safety pins" (tiny screws which make the flare inoperable until pulled) removed and timers adjusted.

IGNITE AT 1,500 FEET

The loadmaster, S. Sgt. Harley W. Nelson of Minneapolis, Minn., told me that the timers had been set for the flares to go off 1,500 feet above the ground, after being dropped at about 3,000 feet.

Anticipating quite a show, I watched the busy crew which was ready to kick off the first 2 flares upon arrival at the directed spot.

Five, ten, fifteen minutes went by and nothing happened. One of the kickers sat on the rear cargo door, elevated just enough to let the flares be dropped. His feet were on the 4 readied flares, while 10 more were lined up behind, ready for the chute.

NO DROP

But the call did not come. Nelson said it sometimes happens that the flare plane will

get a call for the target, but for some reason the ground forces failed to notify the plane after it arrived that the flares should be dropped.

"Sometimes the Vietnamese navigator just can't contact the ground forces," he explained, "and he is not supposed to give the go-ahead until he does."

A check with Major Richardson, however, produced the information that nothing was amiss, that contact had been established with the ground but they didn't want the flares dropped at that time.

"Sometimes," he said, "the flares might help the Vietcong and hurt our forces. The very fact that the Vietcong can hear us circling above them may have had a restraining influence in their planned dirty work for the night."

TEAMWORK

It is now 12:30 a.m. and Smoky Red, running low on fuel, has been ordered to return to Tan Son Nhut Airport at Saigon. As the plane turns south, I can hear the Mississippian bantering goodnaturedly with his Negro copilot.

Major Richardson had told us earlier: "He's one of the finest guys I have ever known. We get along just great."

I am not destined to see the flares dropped tonight, but the example of teamwork of a Mississippian and a Negro and their crew working valiantly to protect the interest of the freedom-loving South Vietnamese is, in its very special way, highly illuminating.

Girl, 14, Saves Drowning Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an act of heroism on the part of a 14-year-old girl in my home city of Laconia, N.H., on Wednesday last.

Barbara Michaud, 14, of Gilford, N.H., a ninth-grade student of Laconia Memorial Junior High School, jumped into 15 feet of frigid water, in a swift current in the Winnepesaukee River to save 10-year-old Anthony Glidden, of Laconia, who had fallen through the ice and drifted into open water. This Friday the Laconia Police Department is sponsoring a "Heroine Day" in honor of Barbara's courage and heroism.

It is indeed heartwarming to be able to relate such acts of heroism in view of the increasing publicity given to our mounting crime rate and juvenile delinquency. Barbara's selflessness should remind us all of the uprightness and courage of the great majority of America's youthful population. Perhaps if we looked to the motivations of the many young people like Barbara we could learn better how to cope with juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the further attention of my distinguished colleagues, an article by Mr. Earl O. Anderson of Laconia, which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of Thursday, March 4, and part of an editorial which appeared in the Laconia Evening Citizen of the same date.

[From the Laconia Evening Citizen, Mar. 4, 1965]

EDITORIAL COMMENTS—WHAT GOES THROUGH YOUR MIND BEFORE YOU JUMP INTO ICY WATER TO SAVE A STRANGER FROM DROWNING?

Plucky Barbara Michaud, 14, of Gilford, did not stop to consider the consequences to herself yesterday, and as a result, a 10-year-old Lakeport boy, Tony Glidden, is very much alive today.

In an era when people many years older than Barbara have adopted an attitude of not becoming involved as fellow humans are fatally beaten almost in their dooryards, the Gilford girl's deed of valor stands out as a shining star.

Gilford neighbors who know the Michaud family and Barbara as a competent babysitter felt that she had what it takes. Now they are positive.

[From the Manchester Union-Leader, Mar. 4, 1965]

GIRL, 14, SAVES DROWNING BOY

(By Earl O. Anderson)

LACONIA.—Quick thinking of a 14-year-old Gilford girl, coupled with prompt action, was credited with saving a 10-year-old Lakeport boy from drowning here late yesterday afternoon.

Anthony "Tony" Glidden, oldest of eight children of Mr. and Mrs. William Glidden, 7 Hill Street, had gone down twice before Barbara Michaud reached him, in the middle of the Winnepesaukee River, just above the Lakeport Dam.

The water was an estimated 15 feet deep and near freezing temperature, firemen said.

The girl grabbed Tony by the collar of his jacket and the back of the head and brought him ashore, and had started artificial respiration when the firemen arrived.

Barbara, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Michaud, Cherry Valley Road, Gilford, said later that she was attracted by Tony's cries for help, and then saw him go under, as she was walking across Elm Street Bridge, en route to Our Lady of the Lakes Church.

"I cried 'O my God,' and started running toward him as fast as I could," the plucky girl said later.

"It was perhaps 50 yards, and as I got to the bank of the river I tossed down my schoolbooks and tore off my coat and plunged in.

"I saw Tony go down a second time just before I reached him.

"I just did what I had to, that's all."

Firemen who responded with resuscitation equipment and a boat used the inhalator on Tony for a few minutes, and he was administered oxygen in the Robichaud ambulance during his ride to the Laconia Hospital.

He was attended by Dr. Harry E. Trapp, who said the boy appeared a little blue from the cold, but responded well to treatment. He was released later last evening. Barbara did not appear to have suffered any ill effects from her unexpected swim in the icy water.

The physician was high in his praise of Barbara's action, and said there was no question but that she had saved Tony's life.

Tony's father, as he thanked Barbara, said, "Thank you so much. I wish that you were my own daughter. I am going to try and see that you get a medal for this, even if I have to write President Johnson, and it takes every cent I have. For if it hadn't been for you, we wouldn't have had Tony tonight."

SWIMMER SINCE 6

Barbara said she had been able to swim since about 6, and was taught by her father, a disabled World War II veteran, who has shown all the Michaud children how to swim.

A1044

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

She is a former Girl Scout, a 9th grade student at Memorial Junior High School, and the second youngest of five children.

Tony told, when asked later, that he was headed to the Lakeport library when he saw a bright object on the ice near the shore. He walked out on the ice to pick up the object, when the ice broke and he fell into the water.

Firemen said the boy was about 10 feet out in open water in the swift current when he was rescued.

The scene was near the control station for Lakeport Dam.

Firemen answering the accident call were telephoned by a woman who saw Tony in the water at the same time Barbara spotted the boy, were Capt. W. Donald McAllister, Howard Marden, and Charles Stuart.

Southeastern Ohio Applauds Appalachian Development Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, passage of the Appalachian regional development program by Congress has been greeted with widespread approval and enthusiasm in my 10th Congressional District of Ohio.

I have received a floodtide of letters and communications from representatives of practically every segment of our population in southeast Ohio. They have come from community leaders, educators, conservancy districts, farm groups and from individuals who want to leave for their sons and daughters greater opportunities than they themselves inherited from the last generation.

As coauthor of this vital legislation, I am, of course, glad that it does have the active, vigorous support of the people whom I represent in Congress. More importantly, I am proud that they are willing to roll up their sleeves and go to work now, without delay, to help translate into reality the bright promise of the Appalachian program. My people realize that this is not a "handout," that its benefits can be earned only through self-reliance and initiative at the local and State levels of government.

This point was best summed up, perhaps, by the Logan Daily News, which is one of the most forward-looking newspapers in southeast Ohio. In a front page editorial on March 4, the Daily News said that the Appalachian program assures that "our chances for real and permanent progress in the building of modern highways, access roads, flood control dams, parks and recreation facilities are certainly brighter than ever before. Though a stubborn few will always say otherwise, this is not a partisan matter. The problems of Appalachia are real, and those who deny them show only the kind of selfish partisanship that has crippled this area for so many years."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I insert the full text of this espe-

cially perceptive editorial, which is entitled "Appalachia Program Will Test the Quality of Local Leadership."

The editorial follows:

APPALACHIA PROGRAM WILL TEST THE QUALITY OF LOCAL LEADERSHIP

Final approval of the Appalachia Region Development Act by Congress signals an important beginning for the hill country of southeast Ohio, and especially Hocking County.

Years of patient effort have gone into the bootstrap development of this community, which has made important strides forward in the past decade. Logan's name is a byword all over Ohio because of the pioneering work done here to rebuild a faltering economy.

Now a massive Federal program has been activated to bolster our community efforts. Our chances for real and permanent progress in the building of modern highways, access roads, flood control dams, parks and recreational facilities are certainly brighter than ever before.

Now comes the real test of local leadership and the staying power of our effort. Neither Federal nor State support will mean anything unless we can spark the needed action right here in our own community.

Only our own citizens can produce the answers to local problems. What is needed now is concerted effort, general agreement that improvements are needed and possible, and willingness to sacrifice time, effort, talent, and money to get things done.

Though a stubborn few will always say otherwise, this is not a partisan matter. The problems of Appalachia are real, and those who deny them show only the kind of selfish partisanship that has crippled this area for so many years.

The problems we now seek to solve are not found on Logan's Main Street. They are on our back roads, in the crumbling mine towns all around us, on the hills that one visiting reporter called "dusty and desolate" with some cause. Life magazine calls southeast Ohio "Nowheresville" and, for most of the world, that is just what we have been.

All the resources of Federal and State Governments are now pledged in support of any constructive move we make to better our own community.

The cards are dealt, and the stakes are high. Do we play out our hand, or do we fold, rejecting once more the dream of greatness that has always been inherent in every segment of the American society?

I also include an assessment of the Appalachian program by Dr. Vernon Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens and one of the truly outstanding educators and civic leaders in all of Ohio. Dr. Alden's statement was contained in an article published March 4 by the Pomeroy Sentinel under the headline "Alden Sees Benefits Coming to Southeast Ohio From Appalachian Act: Should Open Major Markets Through Road Development."

The article follows:

ALDEN SEES BENEFITS COMING TO SOUTHEASTERN OHIO FROM APPALACHIA ACT—SHOULD OPEN MAJOR MARKETS THROUGH ROAD DEVELOPMENT

ATHENS, OHIO.—Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University, Wednesday praised passage of the Appalachia Region Development Act which he hopes will provide long overdue capital improvements considered basic to economic activity.

Alden has been a leader in the drive to develop the economy of southeastern Ohio and serve as head of President Johnson's Domestic Job Corps.

Alden said the act's broad scale develop-

mental approach area to the major thriving economy.

He noted that the act covers development areas involving State action; access to all parts of the region; water resources including flood control; upgrade of the use of natural resources and development of human resources.

Alden noted that the Federal Government realizes the limitations of the bill and its experimental nature. In a region populated by more than 15 million persons, there is a limit to how far \$1.1 billion can be stretched, he said.

Recognizing this, designers of the Appalachia program planned to compensate on areas showing the greatest potential for future growth.

Since the lack of major highways has restricted the economic growth of southeastern Ohio, the act will help elevate this critical lack of access to the market areas.

This act will build a developmental east-west major highway and adequate access to it and to the present interstate system.

Alden also praised the water control and conservation provisions of the measure "Construction of flood control projects on the major rivers and streams and the further development of water impoundment structures and related tourism and recreational facilities now will be possible in a short period of time instead enduring many damaging years through waiting for the normal processes to be effective," he said.

He added that Appalachia funds would make adequate sewage treatment facilities a reality for many southeastern Ohio communities which are restricted by lack of such basic health needs.

Referring to the need for good planning for health facilities and health training programs in his region, Alden said, "The Appalachia Act will give impetus to the development of multicounty regional health centers, and it is my opinion that parallel to the development of these centers and the servicing of all health facilities is the development of paramedic training programs to meet staff and service needs."

He said other phases of the act, such as erosion control of hill country, improving timber resources and providing vocational education, "will add greatly to the economic base of the area and to the welfare of its people."

The 28 Ohio counties included in the Appalachia program are: Clermont, Brown, Adams, Highland, Ross, Pike, Scioto, Lawrence, Jackson, Vinton, Hocking, Perry, Gallia, Meigs, Athens, Morgan, Muskingum, Coshocton, Holmes, Tuscarawas, Guernsey, Noble, Washington, Monroe, Belmont, Harrison, Jefferson, and Carroll.

Wyoming Will Miss Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the State of Wyoming, as well as those nationally, have lost a most dedicated, knowledgeable, and outstanding leader in the field of highway construction and management through the retirement of Mr. J. R. Bromley, superintendent and chief engineer of the Wyoming State Highway Department.

March 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1039

history and philosophy. In addition, an arts unit would assist nonprofit theater groups, needy symphony orchestras, aspiring writers, painters, composers and others seeking artistic expression.

This morning's Rockefeller Panel report on the performing arts discusses similar schemes, and the group does have the courage to point to some of the dangers in Federal support of the arts. The panel believes, however, that "machinery" might be evolved to surmount the dangers. We doubt it, at least as far as the legislation now before Congress is concerned.

As Federal planners see it, the idea is to compensate for a culture lag into which the United States has supposedly fallen especially in the recent years of heavy concentration on science. Since the Federal Government is largely responsible for the scientific emphasis—it supports the bulk of the Nation's entire research and development effort—Washington is said to have a duty to come to the aid of the arts and humanities.

The stress on science may well be excessive; certainly much of the Government programming is wasteful, diffuse, and uncoordinated. There is little evidence, however, that esthetic pursuits have suffered proportionately; on the contrary, the Nation is in the midst of a cultural explosion of sorts. And by no means all of its offshoots are things of value.

In the universities, for example, a tremendous amount of useless work is being done in the humanities; all too often scholarship has become the sheerest pedantry. The trend is reflected in the reigning publisher-perish doctrine whereby professors must pay more attention to getting their words, however meaningless, into print than to teaching. It is also reflected in the current student mania for graduate work, no matter how trivial, in many cases just to stay in school.

As for the arts, it is hard to estimate how much had writing, painting, composing, and theater is being produced along with a respectable amount of excellence. The Rockefeller report devotes a substantial part of its bulk to the sad state of the arts.

For our part, we recognize that literary and artistic judgments are bound to be subjective and hence dangerous to advance as generalities. Yet any halfway reasonable standard, such as comparison with past works of greatness, will show that much of what appears on Broadway is inferior and much of what finds its way off Broadway is not only disgusting but intellectually fraudulent. The same defects are found in other arts.

It is all but axiomatic that Federal subsidization would intensify the tendencies toward mediocrity and phoniness. Why? One excellent reason is that otherwise the Government would have to set its own standards.

An extreme case of government standards was the Soviet trash produced as Socialist realism under Stalin, but even if our Government established what many experts might consider good standards it would still stand rightly accused of cultural dictatorship. Without standards, however, it would be providing a fresh field for the incompetents and the frauds.

That is the trap the private foundations long since plunged into. In their generous efforts to help science, art, and the universities, they have assisted many a deserving individual; unfortunately they have also, willy-nilly, fostered an abundance of mindless research and talentless artistic enterprise.

Another reason subsidization would be worse as a Federal than as a private project is that the Government is the epitome of the bureaucracy and politicking that exist in all organizations. Its officious interferences and political directions in the scientific field already worry a lot of educators; it would be the same for the arts and humanities. Thus some who dare to question the national founda-

tion proposal scent in it a culture pork-barrel, with favors granted in places they were thought to do the most political good.

The basic misconception, of course, is that Federal money and concern can create a high cultural level, whereas the actual influence is likely to be negative when not baneful. The Renaissance did not burst on the world simply because there were princes to patronize; it emerged from a complex of profound reasons, and the princes had the judgment to perceive value while their individualistic and quarrelsome natures assured diversity.

If, despite some of the excellent work being done today, ours is not destined to be an age of artistic greatness, the Government cannot remedy it, for the springs of cultural vitality lie beyond the reach of any organization. Unless it be autocratic, the Government can at most become the sponsor of what exists. It would seem we have enough indifferent art without needing another patron for it.

Wallace Crosses The Rubicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a well-reasoned editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1965, which, in commenting on the brutal actions of Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and of his State troopers, points up the need for Federal legislation to insure that every citizen of our country be given the opportunity to vote.

I ask that a bill to accomplish this be brought to the floor for action as soon as possible so that all the citizens of Alabama and of all our States can have a voice in selecting those whose responsibility it is to govern and to represent them.

The editorial follows:

WALLACE CROSSES THE RUBICON

The river was the Alabama and Governor Wallace was nowhere near. But it was in fact his Rubicon, and he crossed it. By the stupid brutality used to break up a peaceful march from Selma to the State capital, the voter registration practices of Alabama were indicted before the American people as they could have been in no other way, and the eventual end of those practices was assured.

Had there been even a modicum of good sense and good will in the Governor's office, the march on Montgomery could have been organized to insure a minimum of disruption of traffic—about which Mr. Wallace pretended to be so concerned. But had there been that much sense in Montgomery, the march from Selma need never have taken place.

What Governor Wallace did, by turning loose his State troopers on the marchers, was to provide an outlet for the frustrations of his more paleolithic followers. Many white Alabamans cheered the attack. And those cheers, no less than the club-swinging charge of the troopers, will convince the conscience of America that the law of Alabama, as administered by Governor Wallace, is not the law of the land, but club law, used against the disfranchised because they insist upon their constitutional right to enfranchisement.

The result—just as the troubles in Birmingham brought about the Civil Rights Act of 1964—is almost certain to bring about

the Civil Rights Act of 1965. Such an act would give statutory backing to the general provisions of the 15th amendment; that is, it would give teeth to the requirement that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

It is an unhappy thing that a Federal law should be necessary for this purpose; it is always unfortunate when citizens have to turn to Washington for rights or privileges denied them by their native State. But Governor Wallace's resort to raw and wholly unnecessary violence demonstrates that there is no other course open. He has won the skirmish at the Pettus Bridge, but he has lost his war.

Win The War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 9 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat points up the harsh alternatives we face in Vietnam. The only sensible course of action, as the editorial concludes, is to win. Here is the text:

[From the St. Louis, (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Feb. 9, 1965]

WIN THE WAR

The President acted with firmness and justice in the strikes against enemy targets in Communist North Vietnam. Official Washington now asks what the next step is to be. It seems entirely obvious—win the war.

There are three alternatives.

One is to win the war.

Another is to pull out, which, of course, means overwhelming political and moral defeat for us and victory for the Communists.

The third is a negotiated settlement, as in Laos, which is exactly the same as alternative two, except it takes a little longer. The effect is identical.

The commitment of the United States has ever been to freedom. Where those oppressed by tyranny have asked our aid, we have given it when we could, although notably not in the case of the Hungarian freedom fighters.

A decade ago, after the French had lost the war and Vietnam was partitioned, the South Vietnam Government under President Diem asked our aid to fill the vacuum caused by withdrawal of the French. This we did.

It is irrelevant to argue now that this was the wrong decision. We do not think it was, but even if it were, we crossed that bridge a decade ago. Now, thousands of lives and millions of dollars later, we are upon the final horns of the dilemma.

In the intervening decade we have tried to limit the conflict in South Vietnam, using persuasion and softness. This has simply emboldened the aggressor Communist, for they mistook—and not surprisingly—our peaceable protestations as weakness.

The Communists had before them President Kennedy's incredible weakness in Laos which led to a tripartite government, which is now a Communist takeover. They also took due note of President Kennedy's terrible weakness in dealing with the implanting of Communist missile bases in Cuba and his unwillingness to do more than make feeble protestations about this—90 miles away from home.

March 9, 1965

A1040

The Communists have always nurtured the idea that America is a paper tiger and, while we would fall feebly at weak targets, we no longer have the courage and resolution to fight for freedom. They say it is just a question of how quickly the Reds can nibble away southeast Asia and the rest of the world.

After President Truman's commendable decision to stand firm in Korea in 1950, his later refusal to allow General MacArthur to win the war gave them their cue.

Small wonder that the Communists have been pushing wars, until this week, virtually with impunity. Only a few strong stands, like Quemoy, Matsu, and Lebanon, are solitary beacons to light an otherwise dreary picture.

American stature has been crumbling throughout the world. Now no dictator is so lowly and so puny that he does not dare to pull the tail feathers of the American eagle.

Those two-bit tyrants—Nasser, Ben Bella, Sukarno, Nkrumah, and their like—have been bombing our Embassies, violating our ambassadorial and counselor staffs, defiling our flag and taunting us to do something about it. Sometimes we send mild protests. Mainly, we don't even bother with that meaningless gesture.

So long as we stand pusillanimously idle in Cuba and Vietnam, the outrages against this Nation will increase. They will continue to increase so long as we are too weak and effete to fight for what is right, for what is just and for what is honest.

The Johnson administration has apparently concluded that Cuba is down the drain. We wish it weren't so, and certainly strong measures could be exerted 90 miles from home with far greater ease than 7,000 miles away.

But at least it may be said in Cuba that Castro is the de facto government. Bad as it is, we can rationalize that no one has asked our intervention—because we have suppressed even the government in exile which might have called for help, and we have allowed the Monroe Doctrine to die.

In Vietnam it has been a different story. We were invited in by the legal Government. We have the moral responsibility of more than 1 million people whom we transported in the final days of the migration from North Vietnam to South Vietnam so they could live in a land of freedom.

If we abandon these and the South Vietnam Government to the mercies of the Communists, what will our few remaining allies in southeast Asia and other parts of the world—like the Governments of the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, and others—think?

Would they not do better, from their own point of view, to line up with the Reds as the sure, eventual winner now, on the best terms they can, rather than be conquered later because our Government is not interested any longer in helping those who would fight and live for freedom? Then we shall stand alone.

Certainly the risks are very great in South Vietnam. Unquestionably, if we push through to victory—as former Vice President Nixon and many of the military leaders have urged—we will lose some men, some planes, and perhaps some ships.

We can win, however, because the Communists are at the end of a long supply line and have great difficulty supplying a war from their own industrial plants and bases over secondary railroad lines and inferior jungle roads, compared to our control of the sea and air lanes.

We can win by attacking Communist supply lines, depots and staging areas, thus cutting off the Vietcong from their supplies and then mopping up the remnants.

If we pull out, or if we agree to a negotiated settlement—with which we suspect some of the President's advisers have been flirt-

ing—we risk enormous damage to the cause of freedom and to the position of the United States in southeast Asia and throughout the world. Who, then, will ever trust us or ally with us?

We end where we began—it may be expensive to win the war, but the risks in winning it are far less than those in losing it.

Frank G. Raichle Named to Panel for U.S. District Court Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our community is justifiably proud of Frank G. Raichle's appointment by Chief Justice Earl Warren to serve on a committee which will formulate rules of evidence for Federal district courts.

I have known Mr. Raichle for many years as a friend and a prominent attorney. He is able, and well deserves this recognition of his ability.

I compliment Justice Warren upon his selection and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an item which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 8, 1965, relating to this appointment:

RAICHLÉ NAMED TO PANEL FOR U.S. DISTRICT COURT STUDY—COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY JUSTICE WARREN WILL FORMULATE UNIFORM RULES OF EVIDENCE

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Frank G. Raichle, Buffalo trial lawyer, today was named by Chief Justice Earl Warren to a committee to formulate uniform rules of evidence for U.S. district courts.

Mr. Raichle is a fellow and member of the Board of Regents of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Justice Warren named Albert E. Jenner Jr., Chicago trial attorney and former president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, as chairman of the committee made up of Federal judges, legal scholars, and leading trial lawyers.

The rules to be studied govern the admissibility of evidence and the competency of witnesses in civil and criminal trials.

MAY SERVE AS A MODEL

"The task assigned to the committee is of the greatest importance in improving the administration of justice in the United States courts," said Justice Warren.

"Moreover, as has happened with respect to the Federal rules of civil and criminal procedure, the work of the evidence committee may well serve as a model for the States to follow."

There has been recognition for some time of the need for simplicity, clarity, and uniformity of application of rules of evidence in trying civil and criminal cases in the Federal courts.

FORMIDABLE TASK

At present, Federal courts follow the rules of evidence laid down by the State in which the court sits. The States have certain variations which can provide complications when Federal cases are appealed.

The task of formulating uniform rules of evidence has been considered the second phase of the modernization of the courts initiated by the Supreme Court in 1938 when

it promulgated the Federal rules of civil procedure.

At that time, the adoption of modern and uniform rules of evidence was considered so formidable a task that it was postponed by the advisory committee appointed by the Supreme Court.

In appointing the committee, Justice Warren acted under a resolution of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

REPORTS MUST BE MADE

The uniform rules of evidence, when formulated by the advisory committee, will be reported first to the judicial conference, then to the Supreme Court, and ultimately to the Congress before they can be put into effect.

Freedom To Express Unpopular Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred Cloud, associate editor of the editorial division of the board of education of the Methodist Church, has recently been honored by the Freedoms Foundation for his work.

The foundation awarded Mr. Cloud the honor certificate award for his editorial, appearing in Christian Action, July 1964, entitled "Freedom To Express Unpopular Opinions."

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent editorial. Its content is applicable to our entire society and it serves as a timely reminder to all of one of the most precious guarantees of our Constitution.

I commend Mr. Cloud's editorial to my colleagues for consideration and with unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Action, July 1964]

FREEDOM TO EXPRESS UNPOPULAR OPINIONS (By Fred Cloud)

Man is a being who thinks and who communicates his thoughts through speech, oral or written. Much of his freedom as a human being is dependent upon his right to express his thoughts freely. Dictators, whether of the left or of the right, know this; consequently, one of their chief tactics in their attempt to retain absolute power is to suppress freedom of speech.

One of America's glories, written into the very heart of her Constitution, is freedom of speech. This heritage of ours grew out of long centuries of struggle in Europe before the founding of the Colonies in the New World. The French philosopher Voltaire expressed it best, perhaps, when he said: "I may disagree with you completely, but I will fight to the death for your right to say what you think."

There are two glaring perils to freedom of speech in America today, it seems to us. The first is that of abuse of the freedom by the promulgation of lascivious, obscene, and hate-inspiring literature. We have laws, however, which can—and, in time, usually do—protect the public while protecting the freedom of writers and publishers.

The second peril is harder to cope with, more insidious because it cannot readily be contended with, in the courts or elsewhere. It is the peril of a closed mind that will not allow unpopular opinions to be expressed—or, if they are expressed, will brand them

March 9, 1965

like throwing the baby out with the bath water.

Mr. MORSE. I do not agree with the committee majority, either, in regard to its characterization of the studies as being too idealistic and starry eyed. In this dark hour, if there is anything that is needed in this Republic, it is that we give some attention to our ideals, that we recognize what our ideals are. I am growing a little weary of the substitution of expediency for ideals in the Senate. We had better start giving some consideration to our ideals, because unless we put them to work we shall not leave any heritage to the next generation of American boys and girls.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Even if the criticism were fair—and it is not—if they were making studies based upon ideals, that would commend itself to me. But the Foreign Relations Committee should be the last body in the Senate to be expressing any criticism of having studies prepared by experts, of bringing in the best minds, of bringing in persons who know what they are doing, for that has been the policy of the Foreign Relations Committee itself, so long as I have been a member of it—and I know that was its policy before that time.

We maintain a small staff on the Foreign Relations Committee. There are some who believe that it should be a large committee staff. I do not happen to believe that. I believe that our policy has been a rather good policy. The staff we have is composed of excellent, dedicated young men and women who serve us far beyond the line of duty, time and time again. But our policy as a committee has been to sit as legislative jurors and evaluate studies or findings which are made for us, and the recommendations which are submitted to us. We are qualified to do that.

Able as the disarmament group is, in my judgment, the disarmament group would be wasting a great deal of money if it tried—on the basis of its own background—to conduct many of the studies which are being conducted for them by experts.

I could cite many examples as a result of my service on the Foreign Relations Committee—at a time when the Senator from Pennsylvania was not a member.

I invite attention to the Alliance for Progress series of studies, because the Senate appropriated to my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs a substantial amount of money. What did we decide to do? I made the motion and the then Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, seconded it and supported it. I took the position in the subcommittee that we were not qualified to make a study of all the problems that had arisen between the United States and our Latin American neighbors—and at that time they were strained relations. I therefore proposed that we should enter into contracts. I discussed this problem at some length with our able staff members, and they were very much of the same opinion.

I presented the reasons why we should do it, and the then Senator from Massa-

chusetts, John F. Kennedy, expanded upon those reasons and seconded my motion. That is where the studies came from which form the basis of the Alliance for Progress program. Senator John F. Kennedy took them to the White House with him when he became President. He used them, as he was prone to say on various occasions, as the foundation, the well from which he drew the principles of the Alliance for Progress program.

That is the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not know why we are walking out on our own practice by criticizing of the Disarmament Agency for doing the same thing.

The Senator is right. Some umbrage was taken, and some views were formed that some of the studies which were made probably were not very good.

The Senator and I know enough about research to know that we do not always ring the bell on research projects.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him, how much research, how much development that did not pay off and that was a mistake to start, has gone into the Defense Department and the space agency during the last 6 or 7 years without incurring any harsh word from Members of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. It is tremendous in quantity.

Let us not forget that I always try to find some salvage in something that may be a failure. At least it has some negative results, and in research sometimes negative results are as valuable as positive results.

I would not attempt to take the position that everything that the Commission has done has paid out well. That does not mean that we should stop trying.

We cannot have a program in this field of disarmament without having some studies that some may think involve a waste of money.

I wish to say, in my support of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that the value of the program far outweighs the criticisms, and the symbolism of the program is so vital, in my judgment, to the perpetuation of the cause of peace in the world. I am at a loss to understand how the majority of the committee can want only a 1-year program instead of a 2-year program. I would take 4 years, I happen to think that it should be an indefinite authorization.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator stressed the word "symbolism," because in many ways the pending bill is a relatively small and unimportant bill. The agency can get along on a 2-year authorization and a \$10 million a year authorization, but why, after we put many billions of dollars into the business of preparing the weapons of war and going to the Moon and Mars and Venus, should we be so niggardly with respect to an authorization as small as \$55 million for 4 years, which is less than we spend in a single day in the arms program? That is something I fail to understand.

Mr. President, tomorrow I expect to speak very fully on this subject before the vote.

VISIT TO THE FLOOR BY LORD CHALFONT, MINISTER OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we are honored today by the visit of the new Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain. Lord Chalfont, formerly Mr. Alun Gwynne Jones, was made a life peer and a member of the Privy Council on his appointment in October 1964 as Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in Harold Wilson's government. In this capacity, Lord Chalfont is the Minister responsible for disarmament.

It will interest many Senators, when they read the Record tomorrow, to note that Lord Chalfont was commissioned in the Regular Army, and served through World War II in Burma and India, where I also had the privilege of serving, in the Air Corps of the U.S. Army.

Thereafter, Lord Chalfont served in Malaya, where he won the Military Cross, and in Cyprus.

I should think that this would give him an intimate and personal idea of the desirability of disarmament, or at least drastic arms control.

I ask unanimous consent that a fuller biography of Lord Chalfont may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

Lord Chalfont, formerly Mr. Alun Gwynne Jones, was made a life peer and a member of the Privy Council on his appointment in October 1964 as Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in Harold Wilson's government. In this capacity, Lord Chalfont is the Minister responsible for disarmament.

Alun Arthur Gwynne Jones was born on December 5, 1919, in South Wales. He was educated at West Monmouth School, and in 1939 was commissioned in the Regular Army. During the Second World War, he served with the South Wales Borderers in Burma and India. After the war he fought in Malaya, where he won the Military Cross and in Cyprus. This was followed by regimental, staff and intelligence appointments in the Middle East, Paris, and Rhine Army. He graduated at the Army Staff College at Camberley and the Joint Services Staff College at Latimer and in 1959 became a staff officer in the manpower planning department of the War Office, where he was awarded the Order of the British Empire and made a brevet lieutenant colonel.

In 1961 Gwynne Jones resigned his commission upon appointment as defense correspondent of the London Times. He quickly gained a reputation for being an intelligent and well-informed journalist whose articles were distinguished by their authority and by their lucidity in unraveling the complications of modern defense strategy. After spending the summer of 1963 in the United States at the invitation of the Department of State, he published "The Sword and the Spirit," an analysis of American military power. Gwynne Jones relinquished this post in October 1964 upon his appointment as Minister of State for Foreign Affairs. In the latter capacity, he visited with U.S. disarmament official in Washington in November 1964.

Lord Chalfont, who qualified as a military interpreter in Russia, has always taken a keen interest in defense and Soviet studies and in disarmament, and has been a fre-

quent broadcaster, lecturer, and writer on these subjects.

In 1948, Gwynne Jones married Mona Mitchell. Lady Chalfont is a doctor in the London County Council's Children's Department.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Minister of State that I do not know what the attendance in the House of Lords is like. Perhaps it is very much fuller than in the Senate. There are times, as the Senator from Oregon will agree, when we succeed in attracting to the floor more than 4 Senators out of 100 Senators. When that occurs—and it often does—and a visitor as distinguished as you, sir, is introduced to the Senate, we all rise and applaud. I suggest now, if it is agreeable to you, Sir, that you rise, and that we 4 Senators on the floor applaud; and I hope the applause will be loud enough to make you think 100 Senators are present. [Applause, Senators rising.]

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Victor D. Lippit, of Yale University. I addressed a meeting of Young Democrats at Yale recently, and I was planning to speak at a rally of Yale students in opposition to the American policy in Vietnam.

However, I was called back to Washington by the President to serve on the Presidential Panel in connection with the dock strike. I made a film to be used at the rally. Mr. Lippit was one of those who arranged for the film, I understand. I have received a letter from him, part of which I shall read, as follows:

I am enclosing a copy of the news release listing the names of the 152 members of the Yale faculty who have thus far signed a petition calling on the President and Congress of the United States to negotiate immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. The New Haven Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which circulated the petition, grew out of the Yale rally last month for which you were kind enough to make a filmed address.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
March 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of the news release listing the names of the 152 members of the Yale faculty who have thus far signed a petition calling on the President and Congress of the United States to negotiate immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. The New Haven Committee To End the War in Vietnam, which circulated the petition, grew out of the Yale rally last month for which you were kind enough to make a filmed address.

I have spoken to one faculty member, Prof. Robert Herbert in the history of art department, who says he knows of no larger faculty petition at Yale on a political issue in the last 10 years. I suspect one could go back much further than that without finding an issue that has stirred comparable concern. If possible, I wonder if you or Senator GRUENING, to whom I am sending a similar request, could read the petition into the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In any event, I thought you would want to know the strength of the feeling in favor of disengagement in Vietnam that has been manifested here.

Sincerely,

VICTOR LIPPIT.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the petition, to which Mr. Lippit refers, with names of the signers, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and fifty-two members of the faculty of Yale University have signed a petition calling on the President and Congress of the United States to negotiate immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. The petition, circulated by student and faculty members of the New Haven Committee To End the War in Vietnam and by other sympathetic faculty members, reads as follows:

"We the undersigned, members of the faculty of Yale University, in the belief that the continuation of the American military presence in Vietnam can have only unfortunate consequences for the people of that war-torn country and for the maintenance of world peace, urge the President and Congress of the United States to abandon the policy of escalation, to halt the attacks on North Vietnam, and to negotiate the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam."

Among the signers are:

Harry Benda, associate professor of south-east Asian history and associate chairman of the council on southeast Asia studies.

Joseph W. Bishop, Jr., professor of law.

John M. Blum, professor of history and chairman of the department of history.

Harold C. Conklin, professor of anthropology and chairman of the department of anthropology.

Robert A. Dahl, Sterling professor of political science.

Thomas Emerson, Lines professor of law.

Grant Gilmore, William K. Townsend professor of law.

Frederick Kessler, Sterling professor of law.

Robert E. Lane, professor of political science.

Richard W. B. Lewis, professor of English and American studies.

Sidney W. Mintz, professor of anthropology.

Rev. B. Davie Napier, Holmes professor of Old Testament criticism and interpretation.

George W. Pierson, Larned professor of history and director of the division of the humanities.

D. F. Poulson, professor and chairman of the department of biology and director of the biological laboratories.

George A. Schrader, Jr., professor and chairman of the department of philosophy.

Robert Triffin, Pelatiah Perit professor of political and social sciences.

Dr. Richard Weisnerman, associate professor of medicine and public health and director of ambulatory services, Grace-New Haven Hospital.

Paul Weiss, Sterling professor of philosophy.

C. Vann Woodward, Sterling professor of history.

Mary C. Wright, professor of Chinese history.

Others who signed include:

Robert P. Abelson, psychology.

Layman E. Allen, law.

Joel Allison, psychology.

James B. Appel, psychology.

Werner Baer, economics.

William A. Banner, philosophy.

C. Malcolm Batchelor, Spanish and Portuguese.

Bernard Bergen, sociology and public health.

Merton C. Bernstein, law.

Richard J. Bernstein, philosophy.

Boris Bittker, law.

F. L. Black, epidemiology-microbiology.

Sidney J. Blatt, psychology.

Harold Bloom, English.

E. J. Boell, biology.

J. Boorsch, French.

G. B. Bouck, biology.

Arthur S. Brill, molecular biology and biophysics.

R. Brumbaugh, philosophy.

Earl C. Butterfield, psychology.

Thomas H. Cain, English.

Norman S. Care, philosophy.

B. C. Carlton, biology.

David Carr, philosophy.

A. Elizabeth Chase, history of art.

Lawrence W. Chisolm, history.

Dorothy Ciarlo, psychology.

Michael Cole, psychology.

Robert Conant, music.

Robert M. Cook, sociology.

S. Counce, biology.

Warren Cowgill, linguistics.

David A. Crocker, philosophy.

A. Dwight Collier, English.

David J. Danelski, political science.

J. W. Dickoff, philosophy.

Manuel Duran, Spanish.

Eisuke Eguchi, biology.

Jacques Ehrmann, French.

Edmund Fantino, psychology.

Milton Fisk, philosophy.

Charles W. Forman, divinity school.

K. W. Forster, history of art.

Lawrence R. Freedman, internal medicine.

Joseph Gall, biology.

Frederick Gault, psychology.

Joseph Glick, psychology.

David Goldberg, psychology.

I. Ira Goldenberg, psychology.

Joseph Goldstein, law.

Leroy Gould, sociology.

Thomas M. Greene, English and comparative literature.

Jacques Guicharnaud, French.

Richard F. Gustafson, Slavic languages.

Gordon S. Haight, English.

Norwood Russell Hanson, philosophy.

Charley D. Hardwick, philosophy.

W. D. Hartman, biology.

Garry E. Haupt, English.

James Hazen, English.

Richard N. Henderson, anthropology.

B. P. Hendley, philosophy.

Robert L. Herbert, history of art.

Gen-Ichiro Hori, astronomy.

Dorothy M. Horstmann, epidemiology-pediatrics.

Kathleen H. Howe, public health.

George Huaco, sociology.

G. E. Hutchinson, biology.

Stanley Insler, Sanskrit.

Robert L. Jackson, Slavic languages.

Patricia James, philosophy.

Irving Janis, psychology.

Jon Johanning, philosophy.

Michael Kahn, psychology.

Kay Katz, law.

Kenneth Keniston, psychiatry.

John A. Kirchner, surgery.

Elizabeth D. Kirk, English.

E. E. Kriekhaus, psychology.

Peter Limper, philosophy.

F. G. Lounsbury, anthropology.

C. Lutz, French.

Staughton Lynd, history.

William A. McFeely, American studies.

Gilbert S. Markle, philosophy.

Jay Martin, American studies.

James A. Mau, sociology.

Donald Mead, economics.

David G. Miller, epidemiology-medicine.

Irving Miller, public health.

Norman Miller, psychology.

James Millikan, philosophy.

Alice S. Miskimin, English.

March 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4445

Harry A. Miskimin, Jr., economics and history.

J. C. Mokriski, history.
E. S. Morgan, history.
Richard M. Morse, history.
Pauli Murray, law.
Albert E. Myers, psychology.
June Nash, anthropology.
R. B. Nicklas, biology.
Alvin Novick, biology.
Edward M. Opton, epidemiology and public health.
Philip Orville, geology.
Norman Pollack, history.
Thomas Poulson, biology.
Antonio Regalado, Spanish.
Charles A. Reich, law.
William E. Reifsnnyder, forestry.
Clark W. Reynolds, economics.
D. Haigh Roop, Burmese.
Thomas Rothenberg, economics.
Roger B. Salomon, English.
Harold W. Scheffer, anthropology.
Peter Schran, economics.
T. K. Scott, Jr., philosophy.
Richard B. Sewall, English.
James P. Sewell, political science.
David E. Snyder, geography.
James D. Stafney, mathematics.
Paul Tedesco, sanskrit and comparative philology.

M. Elizabeth Tennant, public health.
E. F. Thompson, biology.
J. D. Thompson, philosophy.
W. Sibley Townner, Divinity school.
Roy Treadway, sociology.
J. P. Trinka, biology.
M. Tsukada, biology.
Eugene Vance, English and French.
Thomas A. Vogler, English.
Cynthia M. Wild, psychology.
Richard J. Wood, philosophy.
Shane J. Hunt, economics.

The New Haven Committee To End the War in Vietnam consists of more than 150 people from all walks of life in the New Haven community. Of the somewhat over 100 students involved, 20 are from the law school, 35 are undergraduates, and 50 are graduate students. A dozen faculty members from a variety of departments are presently active. About 40 people in the community who have no affiliation with Yale are also taking part in the work of the committee. They include housewives, teachers, civil rights workers, doctors, and a variety of white collar workers.

Following the administration's open escalation of the Vietnamese war in early February, the committee organized a protest rally at which some 700 people overflowed the Yale Law School auditorium. Two days later it organized a demonstration in which 250 people marched through downtown New Haven to protest America's participation in the Vietnamese war. It is one of many such protest groups which have appeared throughout the country. While signatures on the faculty petition are continuing to come in, the committee is busy preparing a new antiwar petition which will give an opportunity to register protest to the current policies in Vietnam to all members of the New Haven community who wish to do so.

NEW HAVEN COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

Mr. MORSE. The petition states:

We, the undersigned, members of the faculty of Yale University, in the belief that the continuation of the American military presence in Vietnam can have only unfortunate consequences for the people of that war-torn country and for the maintenance of world peace, wish the President and Congress of the United States to abandon the policy of escalation, to halt the attacks on North Vietnam, and to negotiate the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam.

Then follow the names of the faculty and the departments in which they teach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial, written by Mr. Knight, of the Knight newspapers, published in the Miami Herald of March 7, 1965. It is entitled "A Brainwash Can't Possibly Tidy Up Vietnam Mess."

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

A BRAINWASH CAN'T TIDY UP VIETNAM MESS—
THE HEAT'S ON

Now that President Johnson has decided to get tough in Vietnam, a good many "thought leaders" who didn't know which way to jump are cheering like mad for more blood and guts.

Conscientious Senators of Mr. Johnson's party who questioned our course in southeast Asia are being whipped into line by administration enforcers.

Even newspaper editors and Washington columnists have been given the "treatment" by the highest officials of Government.

Other makers of public opinion seek refuge in the fact that the die has been cast and we should, therefore, agree with Stephen Decatur's toast to our country, "right or wrong."

And so the brainwashing proceeds, just as it has ever since we first became involved in Vietnam more than 10 years ago.

A DREARY RECORD

President Eisenhower thought we were defending South Vietnam's liberty.

In a more pragmatic statement, President Kennedy said we must save South Vietnam to prevent a complete Communist takeover in southeast Asia.

Vice President Johnson, after visiting South Vietnam in 1961, spoke for President Kennedy when he opined that "while we shall make any sacrifice, risk any danger for the protection of liberty, nowhere in Asia was there a request that we send American troops."

This statement is reminiscent of Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous speech in which he gave assurance that no American boys would be sent to die on foreign soil.

Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, informed President Kennedy on October 2, 1963, that "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965."

Adm. Harry Felt, U.S. Pacific commander, told reporters in 1963 that "the war is taking a generally favorable course * * * the South Vietnamese are good fighters and they're killing four Communists for every man they lose."

The admiral later admitted that he had gone out on a limb and appeared "to be stuck with it."

More from McNamara and General Taylor in 1963: "By the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

Last June Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge asserted: "I don't see the need for more troops in Vietnam." Mr. Lodge is the authority named recently by President Johnson to conduct another survey to find out where we stand.

Several weeks ago, Secretary McNamara found the political situation in South Vietnam "grave but by no means hopeless." The next day the Government changed hands for the eighth time in 16 months.

The long and dreary record of pledges, promises, assurances, and reassurances by our Presidents, ambassadors, and military ex-

perts contains more words than could be published in a week's editions of the Herald.

Yet it all boils down to a melange of misinformation, misconceptions, paregoric, and propaganda.

BOMB AN IDEOLOGY?

Not enough people appear willing to examine the origins of the civil war in Vietnam, so often explored in this column since 1954.

It requires much less thinking to accept the view that our leaders must be right and their judgments not open to question.

The fact is that three Presidents, the State Department, and the military men have consistently misunderstood the nature of the struggle in southeast Asia.

You simply cannot bomb an ideology or strong nationalism into submission. True, a "victory" of sorts is possible over the Vietcong. Yet the destruction of North Vietnam's military installations and burning civilians with napalm flames will in no way bring a lasting solution of the problem which is basically what it has been for more than a decade.

As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has said so aptly: "The fantasy of a world struggle, in which 'we or they' must win, does not square with the world of reality, a diverse place which has never been and is not likely to be controlled by any one ideology. The destiny of India, of Indonesia, of the Philippines, of Japan will not be decided in Vietnam, but in the hearts of their peoples; and neither there nor in Vietnam will military power be the crucial factor in the end. Nations can be contained, ideas cannot."

WE MUST FACE IT

President Johnson's stepped-up military action against North Vietnam may bring the Communist leaders to the negotiating table. Or, it may involve us in a major war.

This calculated risk has been taken in the belief that the Commies will talk, rather than fight. Yet no one can be sure.

We should not be so softheaded as to think that any agreements reached with the Communists will long be honored. Nor should we be so hardheaded as to believe that Asia can be "disciplined" by our military firepower.

This country made a frightful mistake when President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles began their backdoor intervention in 1954. The South Vietnam crisis has worsened with each passing year.

And, certainly, those of us who opposed this mad adventure at the time have no reason now to be swayed by emotional appeals to "rally 'round the flag" and give blind support to uncertain objectives.

Ultimately, the United States must find a way to withdraw from Vietnam with honor.

This is not the cowardly cry of appeasement, but the courage to face harsh and unpleasant reality.

Most wars have been avoidable. This is one that must not be catastrophically enlarged by compounding our past mistakes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the editorial refers to a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post Dispatch. From time to time, for more than a year, I have placed in the RECORD editorials from Knight newspapers and from the St. Louis Dispatch, and more recently also from the New York Times. In spite of the great drive that is being put on to stir up support for American warmaking in Vietnam, which I think is shocking and without justification in any respect whatever, and in spite of the attempt to propagandize the American people, there are still some newspapers in this country which insist upon being free, and an increasing number of fellow citizens are

March 9, 1965

determined to do all they can to stop the killing of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who will be killed in the months ahead, unless our country desists from this warmaking, and proceeds to move back inside the framework of international law.

That editorial by Mr. Knight is unanswerable. It offers further proof of my comment the other day that the white paper is but a swiss cheese, full of holes. Over the past year administration spokesmen themselves have cut into the white paper with their own irreconcilable and inconsistent remarks before the Foreign Relations Committee in regard to their now new-found rationalizations for warmaking in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Anchorage Daily Times of March 2, 1965, entitled "BARTLETT, GRUENING Ask Viet Negotiations."

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

BARTLETT, GRUENING ASK VIET NEGOTIATIONS

Both of Alaska's U.S. Senators are now on record as favoring negotiations for settlement of the troubled situation in Vietnam. Their views are expressed differently, but the general purpose appears to be the same.

"I welcome negotiations," says Senator E. L. BARTLETT, "not because I believe the United States should or could pull out from its commitment in South Vietnam, but because I believe this 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."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, one of the leading national spokesmen for those who favor an end to involvement of American troops in the Vietnam fighting, puts it this way:

"The U.S. intervention in the South Vietnamese civil war cannot and will not be won on the battlefield. Since March 10, 1964, I have been urging a negotiated settlement for the real neutralization of that troubled area of the world."

The two Alaskan Democrats hold that the U.S. position in any negotiations would be one of strength, BARTLETT refers to "our unquestioned superiority in the air and on the sea." GRUENING calls attention to "the strength of our 7th Fleet, which dominates that part of the world."

GRUENING sees further escalation of the fighting as "inviting the beginning of the last world war." BARTLETT's most recent statement makes no mention of a new world war, but the State's senior Senator says "Red China's strength on the ground and her geographical proximity make her inevitably a part of any equation for the stabilization of southeast Asia."

Of the two viewpoints expressed there probably is more support for the arguments advanced by BARTLETT than those put forward by GRUENING. BARTLETT finds failure with the "purpose, sense and direction" of our national commitment in Vietnam. Anyone attempting to assess the situation is bound to be overcome by doubts by the apparent inability to see a successful solution—or even a containment—of the turmoil in Vietnam.

There are powerful and apparently well-founded views, on the other hand, that the fighting in South Vietnam does not represent merely a civil war, as the situation is viewed by Senator GRUENING. At the same time, there seems to be much agreement with his fear that the Asian fires could well erupt into the holocaust of a world war.

We can't pretend to judge whether either or both of our Senators is recommending the proper course that our country, and the world, should be following. Obviously their views represent judgments based on assessments made from information available to them as Senators charged with assisting in the formation of the Nation's foreign policies.

Most of us probably share nagging thoughts that any negotiations with Communists at gunpoint reflect a weakness in national determination. And that feeling is accompanied by the smouldering fear that any agreement reached with Communists would last only so long as it suited the Communist purpose.

But while the assessments are being made, and our national course is charted, we're glad to see Alaska's Senators participating in the fateful debates. If nothing else, their statements help bring home to each of us in Alaska the grave national decisions involved in the course to be followed by the United States in the Asian crisis.

CIVIL RIGHTS CRISIS IN ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the views expressed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] earlier today in regard to the civil rights crisis in Alabama. Under the rules of the Senate a Senator should not make statements that reflect on another State. My remarks may be interpreted that way if one wishes so to interpret them. But I am also aware of the trust that I owe to speak out against the course of action that exists in any part of the Nation that, in my judgment, is not only jeopardizing the liberties, the freedoms, and the rights of Negroes but, because Negroes are placed in such jeopardy, automatically jeopardizing the freedom, the liberty, and the rights of all of us.

Last night I sat in my living room and viewed on my television screen the pictures of the brutality of Alabama police, acting under the orders of the Governor who is quoted to have said, in effect, that they should take whatever action was necessary to stop that march.

They did. But, Mr. President, when they did, they massacred liberty and freedom in Alabama. When they did, they disgraced a page of modern American history. When they did, they demonstrated to the world that we had better look to the protection of freedom here before we talk about killing American boys in the name of freedom elsewhere in the world.

Colored people have the right under the Constitution of the United States to march peacefully. We are now entering a phase of the civil rights controversy in which many white people would like to forget that freedom is being massacred not only in Alabama, but in other places in this Republic, too.

Within the last 10 days I made a statement in opposition to a proposed sitdown in violation of law in the Federal Building in Portland, Ore., on the part of students who sought to protest the war in South Vietnam.

In that statement I pointed out that it is one thing to petition and protest lawfully. It is another thing to petition and protest illegally. I pointed out that in that instance in my judgment, those students were following a mistaken

course of action, for they could not justify their course of action on the basis of so-called peaceful resistance. Even though we may not like the provisions of an existing law, we do not help the cause of government by law, as I pointed out, in effect, by violating it, even though we think the cause in which we are interested is a justifiable and admirable cause. I share the view of those students who sought to protest U.S. warmaking in South Vietnam. But I could not condone what was obviously their illegal course of action. When the U.S. district attorney, Mr. Lezak, appealed to them to obey the law and leave the Federal building, he was their best friend. But they had the right peacefully to march. They had the right peacefully to picket.

So I make the application in this particular incident to a situation that confronts the Negroes in connection with the civil rights crisis.

I shall be criticized for it, I suppose, but in many parts of the country there are white citizenry who would like to sweep civil rights enforcement under the rug. The Negroes will have to give consideration to peaceful resistance within the law, to peaceful petition within the law, to peaceful demonstration within the law, and therefore, in many parts of America the feet of Negroes must march and march and march and march until the tramp of those feet can be heard across this Nation, until the American people come to realize that human rights, civil rights, and legal rights, including the constitutional rights of Negroes, must be respected, even by Alabama bigots and racists. The tramp, tramp, tramp, of Negro feet on the highways and the byways and the streets of America will continue to increase in the months ahead—and should. It should, if such a course is necessary to educate the American people into an understanding that we have now entered a year in which no longer can the white man of the United States justify the denial to the Negro in any part of the United States of his equal rights under the law with every other citizen.

But to the Negroes, let me plead, as I have pleaded in connection with the Vietnamese demonstration in Portland: You have an obligation to carry on your demonstrations within the law. There is much you can do within the law that will perform what I think is an educational function that demonstrations must now render.

Many people would rather not have these demonstrations; but do not forget that freemen throughout the history of mankind have had to be willing to stand up and suffer, if necessary—even to be knocked down—in order to attain the precious rights of freedom for those who were to follow.

As I watched the television screen last night and saw Negro women beaten to the ground; when I observed the nature of the blows that were struck on the heads and the bodies of Negroes by white, bigoted, racist policemen, I shuddered to think that that could come to pass in any State of my country in the year 1965.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Aiken	Harris	Morton
Allott	Hart	Moss
Anderson	Hartke	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Murphy
Bass	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bayh	Hill	Nelson
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Pearson
Boggs	Inouye	Pell
Burdick	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Robertson
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Clark	Kuchel	Simpson
Cooper	Lausche	Smathers
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smith
Curtis	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Mansfield	Stennis
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Dominick	McClellan	Talmadge
Douglas	McGovern	Thurmond
Eastland	McNamara	Tower
Ellender	Metcalf	Tydings
Ervin	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Mondale	Yarborough
Fong	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Montoya	
Gruening	Morse	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—12

Brewster	Magnuson	Proity
Carlson	McGee	Russell
Gore	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SELMA, ALA.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, March 7 was a Sunday of shame in Selma, Ala. It was a shock felt in every home in America.

This was mob violence at its worst as mounted civilians masquerading as a sheriff's peace posse rode herd on fellow Americans—men, women, and children.

The uniforms of these miscellaneous mounted men were motley—their weapons were deadly as they charged into 600 praying Negroes with flying clubs and whips and ropes—flaying a subdued 600—subdued already with choking, blinding gas by bludgeoning State troopers.

Though reporters and cameras were kept at a distance, they managed to make an enduring record of the brutality that stained the Sabbath.

A stunned America could hardly believe the television story. The Monday newspapers confirmed the facts and multiplied the universal dismay at Sunday's disgrace.

Telegrams from horrified citizens—neighbors of mine—pour into me. They reveal the deepfelt dismay—the heart-felt resentment that helpless Americans anywhere in America could be subjected to such savagery.

There must be a remedy somewhere unless American law and order is a mockery. If the law is there, let it be enforced. If the law is not there—let us lawmakers be about our task.

We know that our dismay is shared by much of the people of Alabama. They know—as we know—that no American home anywhere can know peace and security while such savagery as Selma is abroad under the guise of civil government.

AMENDMENT OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 68, H.R. 2998, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 68 (H.R. 2998) a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization of appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "following", to strike out "and for the three fiscal years 1966 through 1968, the sum of \$40,000,000" and insert "and for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the sum of \$20,000,000".

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate as proposed to be amended by the Foreign Relations Committee would authorize an appropriation of \$20 million for the next 2 fiscal years for the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This Agency was established in 1961 with an authorization for the appropriation of \$10 million to remain available until expended and the transfer of funds already appropriated to the Department of State for its disarmament administration. In 1963, when these funds neared exhaustion, Congress authorized the appropriation of \$20 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The bill now before the Senate, if the committee amendment is accepted, continues the 1963 formula.

The administration requested a larger and longer range authorization—\$55 million for the next 4 fiscal years. The House has approved a \$40 million authorization for 3 years. The committee's recommendation of \$20 million for 2 years will not necessitate any cutback in the Agency's activities, since of the previous \$20 million authorized, only \$16,500,000 were actually appropriated—\$7,500,000 for fiscal year 1964 and \$9 million for fiscal year 1965.

The Disarmament Agency fills a need as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy and fills it very well, on the whole. Its progress has been slow but solid, except in one small area which I shall discuss subsequently. The U.S. proposals to the Geneva Conference are well thought out and offer a good basis for negotiations. The work of the Agency is in the national interests of the United States and deserves to be continued, and, with the committee's proposed funding, can be continued with greater emphasis.

The committee's examination of the Disarmament Agency's activities this year centered largely on the contract research program which will absorb 70 percent of the Agency's resources under its proposed budget. A great many of these studies are in the highly technical area of verification and inspection and related functions, and are, in my opinion, quite appropriate. Those in the historical and political fields, however, the committee found somewhat less persuasive. Since not even Mr. Foster nor Mr. Fisher, the Director and Deputy Director of the Disarmament Agency, have found the time to read all the finished studies, perhaps the committee will be excused for its limited scrutiny of the finished products. This scrutiny was nonetheless sufficient to persuade the committee that it wished to assure itself that the Agency

did not engage in peripheral or unrealistic projects.

For my own part, no matter how desirable the goal of complete and general disarmament is, I consider it to be such a remote possibility as to be almost a form of escapism, that studies on peace-keeping in a disarming and disarmed world could be postponed, if they have to be done at all, to a future date when this goal may be more realistic than it is today. Certainly to pay a panel of seven men \$87,000 for a series of seven essays on this subject seems a bit extravagant, especially when they arrive at such an often-stated, self-evident conclusion that "effective arrangements for maintaining international peace under conditions of extensive disarmament are probably not achievable for the foreseeable future."

There were other studies with equally general and trite conclusions. Still others, the necessity of which the committee questioned, such as a historical analysis of arms control and disarmament agreements 1919-39, are in process. The committee questioned not only the necessity and value of some of these studies—and Mr. Foster's written evaluations did not remove this doubt—but also whether they could not be undertaken by other Government agencies, rather than outside research firms. I have in mind economic impact studies that the Labor Department could well undertake, or the design of field test equipment, which should be of interest to the Defense Department.

At any rate these are some of the considerations which led the committee to limit the authorization to 2 years so that the Agency can reappraise its contract research program.

The other 30 percent of the funds requested by the Agency are for its in-house research, and for preparing for and conducting international negotiations on disarmament matters under the direction of the Secretary of State. No criticism was raised about these activities. In fact, the thorough preparations for the 18-nation disarmament conference at Geneva were highly commended by several committee members.

In conclusion, Mr. President, there was no question in the committee for the need to continue the type of activities carried on by the Disarmament Agency. Certainly we have to keep trying for agreement at Geneva; this requires adequate and meticulous preparations. These, in turn, demand a certain amount of technical and political research. It was only the magnitude of the future effort, in the light of some of these research contracts, that was the question before the committee.

Lest I appear overly critical, I want to remind the Senate that in 1961 and 1963, the administration requested an open-ended authorization for the Disarmament Agency and contemplated asking for appropriations and personnel on a much grander scale than it did this year. I think the Agency has matured considerably in the past 2 years and for this it is to be commended. In the selection of some of the topics to be researched, however, the committee thinks the

Agency has shown a certain lack of realism.

Mr. President, the bill as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations will permit the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency a modest growth in operations during the next 2 fiscal years. I hope the Senate will adopt the committee amendment and pass the bill as amended.

THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when I spoke in the Senate on February 17, questioning the wisdom of American policy in Africa and Asia, and suggesting that this country has become excessively involved in the internal affairs of the newly emergent countries of the ex-colonial world. I expected my speech would provoke vigorous reaction.

The rebuttal has naturally been focused upon the Achilles heel of our policy of interventionism—the worsening war in Vietnam. Many have risen to cry out: "We shall brook no dissent."

I have no intention to answer the pundits who assert that all Americans, including members of the U.S. Senate, should keep their mouths shut and march in step. I am too fiercely proud of my heritage as a free citizen and much too conscious of the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to fall silent when the question of an expanded war lies in the balance.

But since there has been speculation in the press that my speech of February 17 resulted from a misreading of signals from the White House, I think, in fairness to the President, that I should set the record straight. My position on Vietnam is one of strong personal conviction, as anyone who reviews the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past year and a half will readily discern. For example, I expressed my anxieties at some length, in colloquy in the Senate, with Senators FULBRIGHT and HUMPHREY, among others, on June 23, 1964.

I also expressed my mounting misgivings about our Vietnam policy in an interview published in the Washington Sunday Star and St. Louis Post-Dispatch on March 15, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of that interview may appear here in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 15, 1964]

ON THE RECORD: MORE FLEXIBLE FOREIGN POLICY?

Question. Senator CHURCH, the Republicans say that foreign policy will be the major issue in the coming presidential campaign. Do you accept that premise and, as a Democrat, how do you feel about it?

Answer. I think that foreign policy, in the times in which we live, will always be a major issue in a national election campaign.

As a Democrat, I welcome it. I think that the foreign policy record of President Kennedy and President Johnson is strong, and that this issue will be to our advantage.

Question. The most serious problem right now is probably Vietnam. Would you be willing to see a full-scale American debate on what course we should take in Vietnam?

Answer. Yes, if there are real alternatives to discuss. Should the President propose some change of course in South Vietnam, this would provide an occasion for extended debate. If, on the other hand, we continue to hold to our present policy, then I would not anticipate such a debate soon taking place.

Question. Do you think it was right for the United States to become so deeply committed to its present course in Vietnam, without a debate in Congress or among the general public?

Answer. I personally have always had grave misgivings over the original decision which took us into South Vietnam. If we had it to do again, I would strenuously object, and I know there are many others who would, also.

Unfortunately, neither President Kennedy nor President Johnson had that option available to them. We were in Vietnam when they took over.

SUCCESS IN VIETNAM?

Question. Is it your own view that we are succeeding, or failing, now, in Vietnam?

Answer. I don't know. I am not optimistic about the outlook. If Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, is regarded by most Vietnamese people, North and South, as the authentic architect of independence from the French, as the George Washington of Vietnam, so to speak, it will be hard for us. Wars against George Washingtons are not easily won.

Question. Do you think that the way out in Vietnam may be to carry the war north into North Vietnam, or even Red China?

Answer. That is certainly not the way out. As I look at the map, that is the way in.

I would hope that we don't make South Vietnam a launching pad for another Korean war. That war cost us heavily in American lives and fortune. We were able to end the fighting only by confining ourselves to the area south of the 38th parallel. This became the basis for the truce, but the Korean problem is still costing us half a billion a year.

One could question what has been gained, when one compares the enormous outpouring of American resources into this Korean peninsula with the real interests of the United States that have been served by our presence there.

Are we again to repeat this performance in South Vietnam, extending the war northward, inviting the Chinese down? I would have to be persuaded that the vital interests of the United States are in fact at stake, to warrant so dangerous and endless an adventure as this would be.

We need to look further ahead than our immediate frustrations in South Vietnam. If we were to make this our own war and occupy this territory with the American Army, which would be the likely next step if the war were broadened, then we must face up to the fact that we will have to seize and hold this remote region of the world with naked American power. Asiatic people would regard our holding it as a kind of American possession, however differently we viewed it.

Everything that has happened in the last 20 years demonstrates the folly of such a course.

SOUTHEAST ASIA SETTLEMENT

Question. Do you see merit in President de Gaulle's suggestion of a neutralist settlement in Southeast Asia?

Answer. If the whole of the archipelago could be neutralized, including North Vietnam, then I should think that this would be positively in the American interest, as well as in the general interest of all the peoples concerned.

I am not dismayed that General de Gaulle is apparently attempting to explore the possibilities for some such political settlement.

If he succeeds, it could well serve our interest and furnish us with a basis for an acceptable solution. If he fails, we are no worse off for his having tried.

Question. Do you think, then, that we should officially support General de Gaulle's search for a neutralist solution in Southeast Asia?

Answer. I think that President de Gaulle does not particularly want our support. Therefore, I see no advantage to be gained by giving him our official endorsement.

Question. There is another option we haven't discussed. Would this be a problem that the United Nations could deal with effectively?

Answer. It might be. But only if some possibility develops for neutralizing the whole of the archipelago. It is difficult for me to conceive how the United Nations could play a useful role here, if the only issue is what shall be done about South Vietnam.

PRESIDENT'S ROLE

Question. Do you think we can achieve the neutralization of South Vietnam so long as we are, or appear to be, losing the guerrilla warfare there?

Answer. It happened in Laos. It could possibly happen in Vietnam.

I concede that the prospects are dimmer if the war continues to go badly. There is much truth in General Clay's statement that nations can usually secure at the bargaining table only what they can hold in the field.

Question. Then you don't agree with the official position that to go to a neutralization formula at this point and withdraw American troops from South Vietnam would mean giving over South Vietnam to the Communists?

Answer. I am opposed to any bogus neutralization which is only a mask for a Communist takeover.

There are several neutral countries in that region that are not Communist. Laos and Cambodia are examples. In fact, I thought we had gotten over the habit of regarding neutralism as anti-American.

Where we are dealing with small countries on the fringes of China, if we insist on their taking sides in the cold war, they are very apt to feel compelled to take sides with China, and not with us. Neutralism becomes an umbrella which oftentimes can protect their independence.

NO GENEVA ACCORDS

Question. Then would you say the Geneva accords of 1962, on a neutral Laos are working?

Answer. I would say that it became obvious from the course of the fighting preceding that agreement that, without it, the whole of the country would soon have fallen under Communist control.

Question. Senator, do you find it either improper or awkward to have the U.S. Ambassador to Saigon, Henry Cabot Lodge, with a campaign being waged for the Republican presidential nomination in his behalf?

Answer. It may be awkward for him. I don't think it is awkward for the United States, as long as he attends to his duties as our Ambassador in Saigon.

Lodge is a man of great experience and ability. Mr. Kennedy's decision to send him to South Vietnam, and Mr. Johnson's decision to retain him there, seem to me to be in the best interests of the country.

I would just like to say one further word about this Vietnam problem.

President Kennedy was careful to make the distinction, some months ago, that the war in South Vietnam was their war, not ours. If their Government cannot maintain itself against the uprising, it won't be because we have failed to give it adequate advice, assistance, training, equipment, money, and materials. We will put enough armament and supplies into South Vietnam to fairly sink the peninsula before we are finished.

This enormous quantity of arms, food, and money had doubtlessly helped the Government, but our presence there may also be a handicap to the Government.

When one considers the general attitude of the Asian people toward Western nations, and how recently these countries have emerged from colonial control, it is hard to feature a war more difficult to win in that region of the world than one carried on under the auspices of a Western nation.

I first went into this part of the world as a young officer in the Second World War, and I stayed for a time in India. Out in the countryside of India, I never saw much distinction drawn between an American and an English uniform.

It is hard for me to believe that the people of Vietnam in the jungles and in the countryside draw the distinction we draw between American and French uniforms.

THE U.N. SESSIONS

Question. Senator, as head of the International Organizations Subcommittee, you must be concerned about what is going to happen in the next session of the United Nations.

Do you think, in view of French recognition of Communist China, it is wise policy for the United States to continue to oppose its admission to the United Nations?

Answer. I think it is necessary for us to continue to oppose the admission of Red China. I am doubtful that any change in our position, at this time, would prove beneficial to the United States. I suspect that China finds us a convenient enemy to have, and that, for internal purposes, she needs and wants an enemy.

Therefore, I am doubtful that any sudden change in our attitude would result in better behavior on the part of the Chinese Government.

Question. Do you think Red China will be admitted this year?

Answer. I am hopeful that Red China will not be admitted, despite the prospect that France may support her bid. However, we have to face the time when we may be outvoted on this issue. I only hope that, if it does happen, we will be mature enough to accept the decision of the member states on this question, and that we will continue, nevertheless, to remain a member of the United Nations, and to give it the support that its general record entitles it to have.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Question. What, then, should a responsible administration do to prepare this country and the people in this country for the prospect that you think is likely?

Answer. I think that we should begin to talk candidly about the realities in the world. To the extent that American policy is based upon myth, we deserve ourselves.

The fact is that there is a China, and that there is a Formosa. The fact is that Germany is divided into two parts. The power, the array of power, necessary to rejoin Germany, or to reinstate the Formosan government in Peiping, is simply not present. We are not prepared to supply it, nor should we, and neither are the other countries.

If we don't begin to recognize these facts, and take them into account as we formulate American policy, we are in danger of becoming a kind of Alice in Wonderland in world affairs, and other nations will begin to take policy away from us and make decisions which leave us behind.

This is what De Gaulle is now undertaking to do, with astonishing rashness, and with some prospect of success.

PRECEDENT IN LAOS

Question. It has been said that President Kennedy was much more personally involved in foreign policy than President Johnson. What would you say?

Answer. President Johnson is demonstrat-

ing, in his handling of the water-pipe crisis in Cuba and the dangerous Panamanian riots, that he is capable of acting with that combination of force and restraint which is the substance of statesmanship.

Nobody will walk over Lyndon Johnson. At the same time, he is going to be cool-headed in his decisions, if these examples typify the way he intends to conduct American foreign policy as President of the United States.

Question. And yet, in answer to a previous question, you said that General de Gaulle was developing policies which seem to leave us behind. By "us," you seem to mean the administration which conducts foreign policy.

Answer. I was referring there to the whole American attitude, which has obtained under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and which, in the main, is still accepted on both sides of the aisle in Congress.

What I am calling for is a reappraisal of fundamental propositions that long have frozen American policy into place, both in Europe and in the Pacific.

President de Gaulle may force this reappraisal upon us, but it is much too early to say what posture President Johnson will assume with respect to these fundamental matters. He has been in the White House too short a period of time.

Mr. CHURCH. I again registered by doubts about Vietnam in another interview given in September of 1964, published in Ramparts magazine, and later featured in the New York Times on December 27, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Ramparts interview, along with a reprint of the news story from the New York Times, may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Ramparts magazine, January-February 1965]

INTERVIEW SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

I think that if there is a basic fault with our Asian policy, it might well be our failure to confine it to the practical limits of our power. We conquered the Pacific in the Second World War. Afterwards, the Pacific was a very broad moat protecting the United States against hostile encroachment. Had we established, as our westernmost rampart, the island chain which rims the Asian continent, and had we made it clear that we were prepared to meet—with our own military force—any hostile penetration of the Pacific, we would have established a boundary line fully within our military power to maintain. The United States is essentially a naval and aerial power, and there is no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific. The elephant cannot drive the whale from the sea nor the eagle from the sky. But it is also true that neither the whale nor the eagle can drive the elephant from his jungle. I think our failure to establish such an island rampart, conforming to the character of our military power, has been a fundamental cause for some of the difficulties that now face us in Asia.

Senator Church, you would restrict American intervention to the defense of this string of islands, is that correct?

That might have been our posture, but it has not been.

If you are going to limit the line like that, how can you justify our presence in Korea, which is on the mainland?

I think that we were right, in the first instance, to intervene in Korea. An invasion by North Korea had occurred, and we undertook, in the name of the United Nations, to defend the independence of South Korea

against that invasion. Many other countries joined us, at least in a token way, to uphold the U.N. shield against an aggression of this kind. Our mistake was not in undertaking the defense of South Korea, but in having remained there afterward longer than required. Today, for example, there still are 55,000 American troops on the 38th parallel. From all appearances, they are permanently entrenched as though the 38th parallel had become an American boundary, and this, despite the fact that the South Korean Army has been equipped as a modern military force, nearly twice as large as the North Korean Army which faces it. There is no military necessity for so large a continued American presence along the 38th parallel, and I think that we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea.

There are some who argue that even though the North Korean forces are much smaller, there is the vast army of Red China just across the Yalu River. From that point of view, wouldn't it seem advisable to keep American troops in there?

If we were to accept that premise, then it would follow that American troops must remain permanently on the 38th parallel so long as Red China endures. I think that this is a faulty argument. It may lead China, North Korea, and other Asian countries to conclude that we are, in fact, interested in maintaining some kind of permanent foothold on the Asian mainland. Remember, we have a large and mobile military force on Okinawa, within easy striking distance of Korea, should another invasion ever occur. Moreover, we could, if necessary, leave a single regimental combat team, rather than two full divisions, on the line in Korea, which would be a sufficient "trigger force" to guarantee our renewed participation in the defense of South Korea, if the need were ever to arise again. But, no matter how one looks at it, there is no military requirement for keeping a whole American army there indefinitely, in view of the present strength and capacity of the South Korean Army to defend their boundary line.

If there is no military need for the 55,000 troops, is there a possibility that there is a political need?

The only political reason for maintaining so large an American army there would be to assist in buoying up the weak South Korean economy. But this is, in itself, an admission of the failure of American policy in Korean. Twelve years after the end of the war, South Korea is still a garrison state, incapable of self-support, and each year it is necessary for the United States to give South Korea close to half a billion dollars in rations. We can't continue indefinitely to finance the South Korean nation and yet, we seem unable to find an alternative to this dole.

Senator CHURCH, returning to the matter of the island string, what about our being in Formosa? Is this compatible with traditional American policy in Asia?

Of course, we are not in Formosa with a whole American Army as we are in Korea. I think we were correct in giving formal assurances to Formosa that we will defend her against Communist attack. Our commitment extends not only to the island of Formosa, but the Pescadores as well. I would view these islands as a part of the ocean rampart I previously mention, and well within the American military capacity to defend. Our 7th Fleet is, indeed, the shield for Formosa. My only criticism of American policy in Formosa is that we have helped to finance the maintenance of an army for Chiang Kai-shek, which is twice too big for the needs of the island's defenses and not a tenth big enough to retake the mainland. So the policy has been unduly costly for us, and at the same time, may well be giving China cause

to suspect that we are preparing Chiang Kai-shek to act as a spearhead for an invasion of the mainland. I do not regard this as our objective, but it may seem so to the government of Red China.

It might seem, from the two instances of South Korea and Formosa, that we are trying to preserve an American grip upon Asia. Do you think Asians so view the situation?

It disturbs me that we may well be creating such an impression even though this is not, in fact, our objective. We fully understand the importance of credibility when it comes to our military forces. We take great precautions to make certain that our nuclear deterrent is a credible one in order to avoid a nuclear war through enemy miscalculation. But we seem to give precious little attention to making our diplomatic objectives credible. I think we have, to some degree, committed this error both in South Korea and Formosa.

The dilemmas we seem to have vis-a-vis South Korea and Formosa appear to find their ultimate expression in the situation in South Vietnam. Wouldn't you agree, Senator?

Yes, I think that's so. And here again, it is a fact that we are in South Vietnam only because the Communists refuse to let the Saigon government alone. If they were to call off the insurrection against that government and leave South Vietnam and her neighbors alone, we'd be only too willing to withdraw our forces from that region of the world. Nevertheless, it may not seem this way to many Asians. I remember spending some months in India during the Second World War. I had the opportunity to talk to Indian intellectuals and revolutionaries. They made a sharp distinction between me, as an American, and my English friends. They understood that the United States had been the first colony to achieve its independence from George III. They had read our Declaration of Independence; they could quote passages from Thomas Paine, from Thomas Jefferson, and from Abraham Lincoln. But once I left their company and went out onto the great flat lands of India itself, and encountered ordinary Indian people, it was apparent from the way they treated all Americans, that they made no distinction between us and the British. We were all white men. To them, we all represented Western imperialism. I'm afraid that in South Vietnam today, there are a great many of the indigenous peoples who make little distinction between our American uniforms and the old French uniforms, and therefore, we are once again faced with the problem of making our position in Vietnam credible to the Asian people with whom we must deal.

Then that raises probably the most fundamental question of all. Should we have gone into South Vietnam in the first place?

Looking back upon it, I would say that Mr. Dulles was mistaken when he persuaded President Eisenhower that we ought to intervene in South Vietnam after the French defeat. After all, the French had fought for years with an army of some 400,000 men in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina, and that proud army was defeated by ragged guerrilla forces which could not be overcome. Nevertheless, we did make that decision and we now have to live with it.

Thus far, the Saigon Government has not been able to win the war. Do you think that the war can ever be won?

I really don't know. I think that we have to continue to honor our commitments to the Saigon Government to make sure that it has all of the weapons, the equipment, food, and financial assistance needed to carry on the war. We have given such help in massive quantity, and I think that we must continue to do so.

But in the end, the capacity of Saigon to win the war will depend on the cohesiveness of public support that can be achieved.

Some political stability will be essential. The people themselves must have the will to continue the fight. For nearly 20 years now, fighting has been going on in this unhappy region of the world. The people are weary of war. If the spirit to fight on is preserved, we can provide the material aid necessary, and the war eventually can be won. To do this, I think South Vietnam must be sealed off from supplies from the north, both over the jungle trails and from the sea. But in the last analysis, victory or defeat will depend upon the South Vietnamese people themselves. The thing we must remember is that there is no way for us to win their war for them. It is a guerrilla war, at root an indigenous revolution against the existing Government, the kind of war where it's exceedingly difficult to tell the enemy from the people. It can only be won by the people themselves.

When you say seal off supplies to the Vietcong from North Vietnam and from the sea, are you implying that the South Vietnamese have sufficient military capability to do this?

I think that it's possible for them to accomplish this militarily, particularly if we can bring about a joint military effort in Laos which will interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. It's possible, also, that we can find a role for the United Nations to play in maintaining the integrity of the boundaries in this area.

Isn't it true that a lot of the warfare is being waged by captured American arms, with the result that the insurrectionists are already rather self-sufficient?

Yes. It isn't well enough understood that the war in the south cannot be won in the north, even though it would be helpful to cutoff the supply lines which continue to give aid and comfort to the Vietcong. Basically, the Vietcong consists of South Vietnamese; the bulk of their weaponry is captured, and they have the capability of maintaining their attacks, independent of North Vietnam. Therefore, it's folly to think that, by extending the war northward, there is a way out for us. All one needs to do is to look at the map to see that this is the way in, not out, and that the war can be more easily won, not by taking on the whole North Vietnamese Army, but by confining it to the 25,000 hard-core Vietcong that are involved in the south. If they cannot be put down by the Saigon government, with all of the aid and assistance we are giving it, then our predicament will only be worsened by extending the war northward and increasing the enemy force many times.

Moreover, let us remember that, within the past 2 years, China invaded India. Also, it was Red China that came down from the north when she felt herself threatened by approaching American troops in Korea. Thus, there is little basis for us to assume that China might not respond in like fashion to Vietnam, if the war were to be extended northward. Then, we would have the whole of the Chinese Army to contend with as well, and we would be faced with a tragic trail of casualties in this region of the world, out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States.

Assuming that South Vietnam could be insulated and assuming further that we kept pouring in more and more supplies, what should be the policy of the United States if this effort failed nonetheless, and the war in South Vietnam could not be won?

I would hope that we could find the maturity to accept that fact. France did so, both here and in Algeria. Algeria, incidentally, meant a great deal more to the economy of France than Vietnam does to ours. Besides, Algeria was for many years considered a part of France, where more than a million Frenchmen lived. When, in the end, the French Government found that there was no way to put down the insurrection against it, that the will for independ-

ence in Algeria was irresistible, the statesmanship of De Gaulle made it possible for the French to recognize the inevitable and to make a peaceful settlement in Algeria. This involved a French withdrawal.

Now, South Vietnam has never been, nor do we want it to be, an American possession. It is alien to the United States in almost every way, and it is as remote from the United States as any country in the world. If, despite all of its material advantages, the Saigon government can't prevail, because it simply lacks the indigenous support of the people of the country, then I would hope that we would recognize that it is not our country and never has been. The war is there for them to win or to lose. If it is lost and there is no way left to win it, we should accept that fact.

And by that, do you mean that we should withdraw our support?

I think in that event, withdrawal would be forced upon us, for the Vietnamese themselves would form some kind of government which would invite us out. I hope it never comes to that, but we must be prepared for that possibility.

Wouldn't it be possible, even before that time, for the United States to make certain diplomatic moves to support the French proposals advocating neutrality for all of southeast Asia? Wouldn't that bring about a resolution of the problem, particularly as it wouldn't require withdrawal in the face of defeat?

Neutrality for all of southeast Asia, for the whole of that great peninsula, is a proper objective, providing that it is not a camouflage for a Communist takeover. If we were able to sustain the Saigon government sufficiently long to permit it to win its war, or if we were to stabilize the situation in this region in such a way that it would be possible to go with some trump cards to the conference table, then I think we might reach an international agreement, declaring this whole region to be neutral, and requiring the withdrawal of all foreign troops. We could guarantee the integrity of that agreement with our own military power. If it were violated by invasion from China or any other country, we could commit ourselves, along with the other nations joined in the international accord, to the maintenance of its integrity.

That would only guarantee territorial integrity from external aggression. How would that help in terms of internal insurrection?

The only answer to Communist subversion, borrowing from within a country, is to be found within that country itself. If its government is a decent one and enjoys general popular support, the internal Communist problem can be successfully dealt with. Malaya is a good example. There, a few years ago, Communists undertook the same kind of guerrilla war against the Malayan government as South Vietnam is plagued with today. The same tactics were used. The same dedicated, hard-core revolutionaries were at work and, too, there was a very large Chinese population in Singapore which might have given shelter and support to the Communist activity. Yet, Malaya was able to deal with this problem, to isolate the Communist guerrillas from the rest of the population, and to stamp out the insurrection. Malaya had the kind of government that enjoyed the confidence and support of the people. The thing for us to remember is that, unless the people themselves are willing to rally behind their government, unless they regard a Communist insurrection as a menace to their own well-being, there is no way that American forces can intervene to save the day.

If we move in and take over in an effort to thwart the impending success of a Commu-

nist insurrection, the Asian peoples involved will forget entirely our good motivation, and will come at once to regard the war as one between a white Western force on the one hand, and indigenous Asian forces on the other. And there is no way for us to win such a war on the Asian Continent. We have to recognize that the period of Western occupation and control in Asia is gone. It is now Asia for the Asians. Nothing would be more futile than to permit ourselves to be sucked into a war which would pit Western forces against Asian forces, for even if we were able, by brute musclepower, to take a large chunk of Asian territory, we could not stay there long. Our only harvest would be implacable hostility on all sides and the tides of history would, in the end, wash over us. No lasting victory could be achieved.

Everything you say seems to fit the situation in South Vietnam at the time that we are talking. We have had, in the last year or two, any number of regimes in South Vietnam, plus a war that seems to be hopelessly bogged down. Is it because of the failure of the Saigon government, or I should say governments, to fulfill the needs of the people?

I think that the Government in South Vietnam has been incompetent, to say the least. It must be viewed for what it is, a military despotism. Communist North Vietnam is also such a despotism, but this hardly gives the people in South Vietnam a clear-cut choice between free government and tyranny. Nor should we think of this war in terms of preserving a free economic system against the imposition of a socialist system, for the fact is that both the governments are committed to socialism.

Taking into consideration everything that you've said so far about our policy toward Asia, don't we face a rather difficult future now that China is a nuclear power?

Yes. The situation will become increasingly difficult once China has a nuclear arsenal. Of course, the recent detonation of a nuclear device is significant in terms of prospects, but the ultimate significance will be realized, say, about 10 years from now when the Chinese will probably have an effective nuclear arm. This would change the power balance in Asia immensely, and China might well seek to use her newfound power to establish a hegemony over southeast Asia, where China has traditionally enjoyed a sphere of influence. I would hope, by then, that we will have drawn our lines in strict conformity with our vital interests, so that we never find ourselves faced in southeast Asia with the dilemma that confronted Krushchev in Cuba, when he was compelled to withdraw under highly humiliating circumstances, simply because his gamble was not worth the candle. When it comes to nuclear confrontation, countries must make their stand conform to their mortal interests. The stakes must be absolute, for the consequences are too terrible to permit the frivolous commitment of nuclear weapons.

In other words, once China has atomic capability, any South Vietnam situation would be almost certain to end with the humiliation of having to withdraw or face a nuclear threat from virtually next door. Is that what you are implying, Senator?

Yes. Unless we look ahead and undertake now to revise our policy in Asia, we could face such a debacle sometime in the future.

Assuming that China will have a nuclear capability in the foreseeable future, does this automatically imply that China is going to take over all of Asia?

I wouldn't think so. Chinese divisions decisively defeated the Indian troops defending India 2 years ago, but China recognized that the conquest of India would not only strain her own resources to the limit, but would also result in greater problems for her than solutions, and, therefore, elected—having shown her capabilities—to withdraw her

forces once more. In the event that China establishes her own nuclear arsenal, it is much more likely that she will seek to create a sphere of influence in southeast Asia, similar to the one the old Chinese emperors once enjoyed, which would leave other countries like Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos somewhat independent, even though these countries may become Communist in name. The important thing to remember is that there is now an unraveling within the Communist world. It isn't all one great Red dominion as it appears on the maps. Today, even those who would regard it this way, concede that there are at least two Romes, and Moscow and Peiping grow increasingly hostile. Moreover, in Eastern Europe we see the satellite countries asserting their independence in more and more obvious ways, striving with some success to loosen the Russian grip upon them. The point is, that the same unraveling process is likely to occur in Asia as is now occurring in Europe, and that these satellite countries will become increasingly independent of domination from either Peiping or Moscow. Thus it will become more and more possible for us to establish our separate relationships with them, as we are even now doing in the case of both Poland and Yugoslavia.

One final question: vis-a-vis South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam, we seem to be in a position that can best be described as involvement. If the world situation changes or the war, for example, in South Vietnam cannot be won, how can we prepare ourselves as a nation, psychologically and politically, for a change from involvement to disengagement?

It's especially hard for a free, popular government to change course. We have a tendency to oversell our policy with respect to any given country in such a way that public opinion hardens behind it, and then it becomes very difficult to change course. I think we have to find the statesmanship to do this. It's possible that we have swung on the pendulum of public opinion, from the extreme of isolationism 30 years ago, when the prevailing opinion in this country was that it didn't matter to us what happened abroad, to the opposite extreme where we regard it as an American responsibility to maintain the governments of all those countries that are now nominally non-Communist. This, in a sense, is an imperial attitude, even though we seek no possessions, and even though we are not attempting to impose American rule upon any of these countries. However, unless we come to accept the fact that it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere, our policy is doomed to failure. Here again, the requirement for statesmanship is very high, but if we strive to inform the American people of the upheaval and ferment of our times, and if we give them all the facts, I think the American people will be prepared to support a flexible foreign policy, better tailored to serve the real interest of the United States in a changing world.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1964]

SENATOR CHURCH SEES NEED FOR A MAJOR SHIFT ON ASIA—ASKS FOR NEUTRALIZATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIA AS A PROPER OBJECTIVE

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, December 26.—Senator FRANK CHURCH has called for major changes in U.S. policy on Asia.

The Idaho Democrat, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that the United States should not have intervened in Vietnam following the French defeat there in 1954.

He recommended neutralization of southeast Asia as a proper objective for the United States and suggested that a role be found for the United Nations as a guarantor of national boundaries in that area.

Senator CHURCH opposed proposals for extending the Vietnamese war to North Vietnam. He said it was "folly" to believe that escalation of the war to the north would save the situation in the south. In addition, he expressed the belief that expansion of hostilities to the north would inevitably bring the Communist Chinese into the war.

On another Asian topic, Senator CHURCH recommended substantial reductions in U.S. military forces in Korea. His views were given in an interview in Ramparts, a magazine for Roman Catholic laymen.

"There is no military necessity for so large a continued American presence along the 38th parallel (in Korea), and I think that we would give added credibility to our oft-spoken purpose of leaving Asia for the Asians if we were to commence to withdraw American forces from Korea," Senator CHURCH said.

Asked whether the size of the U.S. commitment was not properly based on the vast military forces of Communist China rather than those of North Korea, Senator CHURCH replied:

"If we were to accept that premise, then it would follow that American troops must remain permanently on the 38th parallel so long as Red China endures."

Senator CHURCH dealt exclusively with the U.S. policy in Asia in the question-and-answer interview, which is in the January-February of the magazine. Ramparts is published by the Laymen's Press in Menlo Park, Calif.

OTHER DEMOCRATS ALSO CRITICAL

He indicated with his answers that he was among several Democratic Members of Congress who have expressed growing restiveness over the course of U.S. policy, especially in South Vietnam.

Others are Senators MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, who is majority leader; ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska; J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; GEORGE D. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska; CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, and GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin.

Of these legislators, Senators GRUENING and MORSE would like to see U.S. forces withdrawn from Vietnam now. Senator MANSFIELD, along lines similar to those enunciated by Senator CHURCH, has argued for considering neutralization proposals favored by President de Gaulle of France. Senator MCGOVERN has proposed a 14-nation conference to seek a political settlement in South Vietnam.

Many observers here believe that a major foreign policy debate is building up for the next session of Congress and that it will be unusual in that most of the heavy opposition to the administration policies may come from Democrats. The doubts among the Senators appear to have developed on the basis of personal studies and judgments. Senator CHURCH's office, for example, said in answer to an inquiry that he had received very little mail on the subject from his constituents.

SUPPORTS CUTTING SUPPLY ROUTE

Senator CHURCH, in his detailed answers, supported the idea of interdicting the supply routes to the Communist Vietcong insurgents in South Vietnam. These routes have been identified as coming from North Vietnam along the so-called Ho Chi Minh Trail.

The "trail," named for the head of the North Vietnamese Communist regime, is actually a system of jungle routes. But one major supply center is said to be the Tchepone Airport in Laos near the South Vietnamese border.

In recent days, reports have asserted that Tchepone and other spots in northern Laos have been bombed and strafed, presumably by Laotians in American aircraft. The State Department has said only "no comment" to these reports.

DIFFERS ON INVOLVEMENT

While endorsing possible moves to cut off Communist supply routes in South Vietnam in the current fighting, Senator CHURCH made clear in his interview that he differed with the major premises of U.S. involvement in southeast Asia.

"It's especially hard for a free, popular government to change course," Senator CHURCH said. "We have a tendency to oversell our policy with respect to any given country in such a way that public opinion hardens behind it, and then it becomes very difficult to change course."

"I think we have to find the statesmanship to do this. It's possible that we have swung on the pendulum of public opinion, from the extreme isolationism of 30 years ago when the prevailing opinion in this country was that it didn't matter to us what happened abroad, to the opposite extreme where we regard it as an American responsibility to maintain the governments of all those countries that are now nominally anti-Communist."

"This, in a sense, is an imperial attitude, even though we have no possessions and even though we are not attempting to impose American rule upon any of these countries. However, unless we come to accept the fact that it is neither within the power nor the interest of the United States to preserve the status quo everywhere, our policy is doomed to failure."

SAYS DULLES ERRED

Discussing the situation in South Vietnam, Senator CHURCH said:

"Looking back upon it, I would say that Mr. Dulles [the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles] was mistaken when he persuaded President Eisenhower that we ought to intervene in South Vietnam after the French defeat.

"After all, the French had fought for years with an army of some 400,000 men in a vain effort to preserve French Indochina, and that proud army was defeated by ragged guerrilla forces which could not be overcome. Nevertheless, we did make that decision and we have to live with it."

The United States, he went on, in answer to a question, must continue to honor its commitments. Thus for the time being, he made clear, he believed in continuation of massive military and economic support. "But in the end," he added, "the capacity of Saigon to win the war will depend on the cohesiveness of public support that can be achieved."

The Senator said that if it is developed that the Saigon government, despite U.S. assistance, could not "prevail," because it simply lacks the indigenous support of the people of the country, "then I would hope that we would recognize that it is not our country and never has been."

Senator CHURCH said that he hoped that the United States would never be forced to withdraw, but that if it came to that "we must be prepared for that possibility."

"Neutrality for all of southeast Asia, for the whole of that great peninsula, is a proper objective, providing that it is not a camouflage for a Communist takeover," he said.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as will be seen from a perusal of these earlier statements, the position I took in my Senate speech of February 17 derived from gathering doubts of longstanding duration.

There is one other comment I feel obliged to make concerning a story which has been given general currency. The story comes in two versions, both of which are much too pungent to be resisted. They put one in mind of the Italian say-

ing—"Se non e vero, e molto ben trovato"—if not true, it is very well invented. I would leave the story unanswered, except that both versions tend to discredit the President.

The first version was published in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, February 28, 1965, and reads as follows:

At a recent White House reception for Members of Congress, President Johnson approached Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho. The two men hadn't spoken since the Senator, in a major speech, had urged the administration to make a big-power deal pulling Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia out of the cold war.

"Who'd you talk to before giving that speech?" the President wanted to know.

"Why, Mr. President, I had a long talk with Walter Lippmann," CHURCH replied.

"Well, FRANK," the President shot back, "next time you need a dam in Idaho, why don't you talk to Walter Lippmann."

The second version appeared in the March 12 edition of Time magazine. It reads:

All the while, President Johnson played it cool, continued quietly about the business of rounding up domestic support for his Vietnam policies. He invited dozens of previously critical newsmen and Congressmen into the oval office for visits that sometimes ran for 3 hours or more, persuaded impressive numbers of them that his way is the right one. Sympathetic Congressmen were quietly advised by White House aids that the State Department was only too ready to crank out Vietnam speeches for them to deliver. In a series of White House receptions for Members of Congress and their wives, the President invariably took the law-makers aside for lengthy and intensive briefings on Vietnam.

But persuasion was not his only weapon. There was, for example, a widely attested (and publicly denied) conversation with Idaho's Democratic Senator FRANK CHURCH, who had been making headlines with his Senate speeches suggesting U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

At one of the White House receptions, Johnson spotted CHURCH, went over to him and said: "FRANK, you've been making some speeches that haven't been very helpful."

Said CHURCH: "Well, Mr. President, if you read the speech all the way through, it isn't the same as the headlines."

Said the President, "The headlines are all I read and all anybody reads. When you were in trouble out in your State, FRANK, I used to come out and give you a hand, didn't I?"

Answered CHURCH defensively: "Mr. President, what I've been saying isn't much different from what Walter Lippmann has been writing."

The President had the last words. "Walter Lippmann," he said, "is a fine man. I admire him. Next time you're in trouble out in Idaho, FRANK, you ask Walter to come help."

CHURCH has since noticeably modified his criticisms of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I just want to corroborate what the Senator from Idaho, one of the outstanding Members of this body, has at least by implication said and will say more fully later, I am sure. I have not seen the Senator's speech.

Contrary to the magazine and newspaper reports, the President did not make

any such statement as was alleged to have been made by him. One of the reasons I made the remarks I did at the Democratic conference yesterday was because of stories of that type. I recall to the Senator, and indeed to my colleagues, that at the first Democratic conference we held this session I said there would be speculation. I would tell Members on this side of the aisle not to be taken in by it but to go by the facts, and the facts only. I am delighted that the Senator is making the speech that he is in this forum of free debate.

Mr. CHURCH. The only reason I am speaking today is to repudiate these stories, which seem to me to discredit the President.

In the first place, no one knows better than President Johnson that my views on Vietnam are not for sale. I am not susceptible to intimidation, and the President would be the last one to attempt to silence me with a political threat. We have had a frank conversation about Vietnam, and a cordial exchange of letters. Neither the New York Herald Tribune story nor the Time magazine account of the conversation is true.

The actual facts concerning the matter were given by Edward P. Morgan in his radio broadcast on March 5.

He said:

While the Republican leadership in Congress grows more belligerent toward the Communists, it turns out that President Johnson is substantially less belligerent toward Democratic critics of his Asian policy than had been reported. One newspaper account given wide currency described the President as angrily confronting Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and demanding to know with whom he had counseled before making a speech emphasizing the importance of negotiating a settlement in Vietnam. When CHURCH replied that he had spoken to Columnist Walter Lippmann, the President was quoted as retorting that the next time he wanted a dam for Idaho he could counsel with Lippmann, too.

The President and the Senator did have a firm and friendly encounter on the subject but a careful check of White House and Senate sources reveals that no such angry exchange took place, but, disturbingly enough, it develops that one high administration official had pointedly encouraged the belief that it did. In fact, Senator CHURCH so far, both publicly and privately, has supported President Johnson's reprisal policy against the Vietnamese Communists, north and south.

Finally, Mr. President, let me add that, as to my present position on Vietnam, it has not changed in any way. The debate in the Senate on this crucial question is not over. It has just begun.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am so glad that the Senator from Idaho has made the speech he has just completed. I was shocked when my attention was called to the articles which were published in the New York Herald Tribune and in Time magazine.

I rarely read the New York Herald Tribune, although I have a high regard for it, its publisher, and its reporters.

I never read Time magazine, although I, too, have a high regard for the poor reporters working for the so-called weekly news magazine.

In my opinion, as I have stated on the floor of the Senate many times before, Time magazine is merely a journal of plutocratic opinion.

However, I would hope that the individuals who are responsible for the stories about the Senator from Idaho would make an apology to him. I suspect that perhaps they may do so.

It was an outrageous thing to do, without a word of truth in it. The article did the Senator from Idaho grave damage, damage without a shadow of excuse. I am delighted that the Senator from Idaho has taken to the floor of the Senate and nailed their lies to the wall.

In my view, the opinions with respect to Vietnam which the Senator from Idaho has been advocating on and off the floor of the Senate deserve the most respectful attention. They are views which should have a wider hearing than they have had. I am happy that the majority leader, in his remarks to the Senate Democratic conference a day or two ago, made it clear that a part of the constitutional function of every Senator is to speak his views firmly and freely as a part of the advise-and-consent process.

I support the President of my country. I hope and pray that our present policy in Vietnam will be successful. However, we have an obligation, as the majority leader has said, to review on and off the floor of the Senate the implications of all our policies in South Vietnam and to explore the alternatives; and though expressing support for our President, once he lays down the line in terms of the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy, we must not shut our eyes to the grave and disturbing facts which need to be considered as we move on to a conclusion of the most unhappy situation in South Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I appreciate his remarks. However, if any apologies are in order, they are due the President, not me.

The people of Idaho know that I will stand up for my views regardless of the pressures. These stories tend only to discredit the President. That is why I have undertaken to respond to them. I have ignored other criticisms in articles and columns directed at me. But I believe that I owe it to the President to set the record straight in this particular matter.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Idaho that an apology is due the President of the United States, and I hope it will be forthcoming from both publications which have printed this scandalous material.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

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

Mr. MORSE. I highly commend the Senator from Idaho for his defense of the President, although the President needs no defense among those of us who know him as we do. Nevertheless, it is a good thing from the standpoint of American

public opinion to have this eloquent statement of the Senator from Idaho spread on the RECORD this afternoon, giving the lie to the unfair stories which have been published with respect to both the President and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

It is particularly appropriate that there be reprinted at this point in our discussion the admirable statement made by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], to the Democratic conference yesterday, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one pertinent paragraph from his remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe the President is quite content with the progress on the legislative program in the Senate. He has not made any comment at the leadership meetings on the discussion of Vietnam on the floor or on any repeat—any Senator's speech in connection therewith. In my judgment that is a most appropriate course for the President to follow just as the debate itself has, in general, been most appropriate and helpful from the point of view of illuminating the great complexities of this situation and its implications for the national interest. Newspaper accounts have appeared which alleged that the President and the majority leader have, in effect, twisted arms on the Vietnam issue. Because of these reports I will read what I said to the caucus on January 3 and inserted in the RECORD for January 22.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad the majority leader made that statement. It clearly reinforces the statement of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know of anyone who has criticized or differed more with the President's policy on Vietnam than I have. I am unalterably opposed to the President's policy in Vietnam. I will not support the President's policy on Vietnam short of a declaration of war.

I shall have more to say about that later this afternoon.

However, I have the greatest respect for the President of the United States. Our difference is a sincere and honest one. I do not speak for him, of course, but I am satisfied that there is a mutuality of respect in regard to the difference.

In my opinion, he would be the last man in Government to seek to interfere with the duty of a U.S. Senator in carrying out his trust as a Senator to stand up and disagree with the President of the United States if the Senator felt that disagreement was in the public interest.

In order not to seem too solemn, perhaps the Senate may enjoy a comment that the now President and then Vice President of the United States made in 1962, when he closed my campaign in Oregon on a Saturday night before election in Medford, Ore.

He had asked for support for me, and as he closed, he said—and I shall try to paraphrase him accurately: "As I now close my speech, I ask you to send your senior Senator back to the Senate because we need him. Of course, I wish

March 9, 1965

you to know that the day we swear him in, or the next day, he will be just as likely to get up on the floor of the Senate and criticize the Vice President of the United States if he believes that he should be criticized, but that is the reason why I am asking you to send him back."

How could anyone find a broader gaged, broader minded man, more dedicated to the trust that each one of us owes our Government, including our trust to disagree with the President of the United States when a Senator believes that he is as wrong, as I believe the President is wrong in regard to his policy in Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for his comments. He has stated the principle which led me to conclude that I must take the floor of the Senate this afternoon to set the record straight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am pleased to hear the statement of the Senator from Idaho, but so far as I am concerned, I never placed any credence in those scurrilous newspaper statements. I believe that someone picked the stories up in an attempt to make them true and I am sure that the Senator from Idaho has become embarrassed by that sort of thing, as most of us would be. Someone takes it up and keeps repeating it as though it were correct.

I am pleased the Senator made his statement, because the statements to which he has referred had reflected discredit upon the President. The Senator from Idaho has been very generous in making his statement, to clear up the record.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF THE SENATE—CIVIL RIGHTS—THE FORTHCOMING MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT ON VOTING RIGHTS—THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there was filed today, pursuant to action by the Senate, a report by the Committee on Rules and Administration on the revision of rule XXII, reporting adversely on Senate Resolution 6 and Senate Resolution 8, the two alternative courses before the Committee on Rules and Administration. The vote in committee was close—5 to 4—and dissenting and supplementary views were filed with the report by three of the nine members of the committee, Senators CLARK, SCOTT, and COOPER.

Naturally, the question has arisen as to when this matter may be considered. I have made some inquiries on that score. I express confidence that the measures and the report will be called up at a time when it will enable us to give them earnest and proper consideration, not under the pressure of adjournment, and with a full and fair opportunity to act upon them with that deliberation which I know will be required in order to act upon them intelligently.

It is well known that I am very much in favor of a change in the rule. I testified before the committee. I felt that on the day when the report was filed—although I understand the majority leader made a statement on the subject yesterday—it should be noted as having been filed and as being now before us on the calendar, eligible to be called up.

Based upon my inquiries, I express my confidence that there is every intention of its being called up, with full and adequate opportunity to have justice done.

This, of course, ties into the whole group of matters, including what we hope very much will be the forthcoming message from the President of the United States, which will give greater force in law to the effort to register voters, which is at the very base and root of the grave difficulty which the country is now facing in the events at Selma, Ala.

This effort to alleviate the rigors of rule XXII is a part of the same complex, a filibuster on it having been broken only once by a cloture vote, in 1964. It is most gratifying that the President of the United States himself has seen fit to make a statement assuring Congress—and he said it within the context of the Selma situation—that he is sending legislation to us so that we may act, in order to facilitate the recognition and the enjoyment of the voting right by our Negro citizens, especially in the South.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to finish my thought. I say to the Senator that his attitude on this subject has been excellent. I shall be happy to yield to him in a moment.

I spoke most feelingly yesterday—and many others also have spoken—on the events in Selma, Ala. I know the President has not acted in respect of marshals, or whatever other security forces are required, to assure the citizens of the United States of their constitutional rights and to deal with the terror which was substituted for law on Sunday.

I do not know what will happen to this suggestion—and of course the plan has not yet been disclosed. The problem concerns not only the interest of citizens in Alabama, which is at stake, but the very life and morality of the Nation is at stake.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from New York made the statement that only once had a filibuster been broken by cloture. It would be well for the record to reflect that on two previous occasions, previous to the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Congress had passed voting rights legislation. It passed such legislation in 1957, and again in 1960. Then it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

On the two previous occasions, those of us who opposed the bill, were of the opinion—and that was one reason why the bills came to a vote—that in the event a motion for cloture were filed, and a filibuster were attempted on the bill, the Senate would vote for cloture, if not on

the first vote, then certainly on the second vote.

I am of the opinion, without regard to whether or not I vote for it—and whether I vote for it would depend on what it looked like—that a bill that appears to be reasonably tailored to meet the problem that exists, using no more Federal interference than is necessary to meet the problem, will pass the Senate, and will pass the Senate under the existing rule, without the rule being changed.

For that reason, the Senator from Louisiana hopes that the Senate will schedule a voting rights bill when it is reported, and vote on the bill on its merits. If we did so, it might not be necessary to have to vote on a proposed change in rule XXII.

It should be remembered that rule XXII does more than protect those who are opposed to some civil rights measures. As the Senator knows, there was a measure before the Senate to prevent the reapportionment decision of the Supreme Court from going into effect, which perhaps could have been passed by a majority vote. It was defeated. So this proposal tends to work both ways.

I should like to see a rule acted on without reference to any particular bill, particularly if the bill itself can pass on its own merit without changing the rule.

I wished to make my position clear for the record, without necessarily taking issue with the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator's position is critically important. It is most statesmanlike that he will do more than merely say it will happen, because I have heard him actually pledge himself to use his best efforts to see that it does, and that there will be action by voting on a rights bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not seen the President's message. I do not know what the President will say. I have not seen any particular bill. I am perfectly frank to admit that there are situations which exist in my own State in connection with which the local authorities will have to respect the right of Negro citizens to vote, or someone will have to do something about it. That will happen whether I vote for a bill or not.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have expressed my confidence that we shall have an adequate and full opportunity to act on rule XXII. I welcome the statement of the Senator, and I am deeply gratified by the assurance of the Senator, or at least the feeling of the Senator—of course, he cannot give assurance—that we shall be able to act on a voting rights bill, which is critical under existing conditions, and that in his judgment we shall not face the impediment of a Senate filibuster.

I should like to make one more observation on Selma, Ala. I certainly appreciate the views of the Attorney General of the United States, which are also reported on the news ticker, that the United States will use troops or marshals to restore public order with the greatest reluctance.

I point out, however, that it is a fact that in Alabama, in Mississippi, and in Little Rock other Presidents had to do just that.

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress and the national administration adopt a system of price supports and production controls for agricultural commodities now covered by price supports that will assure adequate income for farmers and assure solvency for all of rural America; and by so doing, avoid the necessity in the future for solving new social and economic problems related to highly congested urban areas; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress and the national administration develop bold, imaginative plans to utilize the productive capacity of rural America more effectively in combatting communism, hunger, and disease around the world, and continue to seek new markets for agricultural products now in surplus; be it further

Resolved, That Public Law 480 be administered and developed to its maximum effectiveness; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the chairman of the U.S. House and Senate Agricultural Commission, and each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

ARTHUR A. LINK,
Speaker of the House.
DONNELL HAUGEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
CHARLES TIGHE,
President of the Senate.
GERALD F. STAIB,
Secretary of the Senate.

LESSON IN MANNERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, every day or so it seems that we pick up the newspapers and read about demonstrations against American property in countries around the world. While administration spokesmen have indicated with their words that Uncle Sam will not long tolerate these attacks on our property and the lives of American overseas, there has been no clear indication of a change in our policy which would deter these aggressions.

Recently, there appeared in the Aberdeen American News, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., an editorial devoted to these aggressions and our lack of action to deter further incidents. It is an excellent editorial. I ask that it be printed at this point in the Congressional Record; and I commend it to the reading of all.

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

LESSON IN MANNERS LONG OVERDUE

President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk have both said the United States will not long tolerate wholesale attacks on American property and lives overseas without some form of reprisal. In his state of the Union message, the President said:

"We are prepared to live as good neighbors with all, but we cannot be indifferent to acts designed to injure our interests, or our citizens, or our establishments abroad." Secretary Rusk has publicly expressed concern about the "violent acts which appeared to be connived at or acquiesced in by the authorities of the host state, or in which the authorities are slow in taking action to control mobs of rioters." As a warning, he added, "these violent actions cannot but affect relationship between nations."

The attacks on U.S. property, including embassies and U.S. Information Service libraries, have not only continued but have increased in tempo and destructiveness.

Here is a partial list of the more serious incidents, all of which occurred after the warning by the President and the Secretary:

January 22, Buddhists attacked an USIS library in Saigon.

January 23, antigovernment demonstrators attacked another USIS library in South Vietnam.

February 9, a mob of more than 1,000 attacked the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, while police stood by.

February 10, the Embassy in Montevideo, Uruguay, was attacked with tar.

February 13, students attacked a USIS library in Malaysia in a 4-hour demonstration.

February 15, windows were smashed in the U.S. legation building in Sofia, Bulgaria.

February 16, the American flag was torn off the Embassy in Uganda, ink was hurled at the Embassy in Caracas, Venezuela, and Indonesia seized the USIS library at Jakarta—all in one day.

February 17, a mob of Indonesian youths stormed both the USIS library and the consulate at Medan.

February 27, Indonesia's Foreign Minister ordered the shutdown of the USIS throughout the country.

Until now, the reprisals promised by the President and the Secretary have consisted of nothing more than curtailing new requests for aid. Such actions of course do not constitute reprisals. Nor will they deter further aggressions against Americans or American property overseas.

Uncle Sam has turned the other cheek so often to vandals, rioters, and government-inspired attacks on anything American, he has become a target of friend and foe alike.

What would be wrong with, just once, picking up a little bad boy like Sukarno by the seat of his pants and teaching him, and the world, the rudiments of good manners?

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Concurrent Resolution 2 to establish a Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] may proceed out of order on an unrelated subject for a brief period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

ADEQUACY OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, two articles which have appeared in Washington and New York newspapers within the past 2 days greatly disturb me.

If these stories are accurate—and on the basis of responses from the Administration, I can only conclude they are—then I believe a congressional inquiry is in order.

One, by Peter Arnett, of the Associated Press, emphasizes growing complaints from U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam of being forced to fight with shoddy weapons, shortages of ammunition and a lack of equipment.

Mr. Arnett quotes one U.S. Army engineer as asserting, "I was better equipped in World War II." At the same time, the engineer held up a World War I pistol belt and some rusty cartridge magazines.

Another told Mr. Arnett that ammunition issued for personal weapons is often rusty.

It was packed as far back as 1952 for Korea—

The soldier said. When we complain about it we are told: "Clean it."

One Army officer said many items in short supply can be found on the Saigon black market. He declared that he knew he could, by making a scene, obtain them from U.S. military headquarters in Saigon but that if he did—and again I quote:

But then I would remain a first lieutenant all my life.

This article, appearing in the Sunday Star of March 7, is a deplorable commentary on the logistics support of our military men in South Vietnam.

The second article appeared in the New York Times of March 8, under the byline of Theodore Shabad.

I would like to quote two paragraphs from that article, which carries a Moscow dateline:

Vietcong infiltrators were said today to be among the South Vietnamese being trained by American instructors in the use of modern arms and military equipment.

This infiltration, reported to have been going on since late 1961, would enable the guerrillas to incorporate into their arsenal any U.S. weapons that are captured.

I would like to footnote those two paragraphs with a companion story that appeared in the same newspaper, with a Washington dateline:

There was no comment by the Pentagon today on the report that Vietcong infiltrators were concealed among the troops being trained in South Vietnam by American instructors.

However, a report by Edgar Snow, in the February 27 issue of The New Republic on an interview with the Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-tung made a similar assertion.

Mr. President, to say the least, I am shocked by these articles. I believe the American people should and must have an accounting.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles, "Weapons in Vietnam Shoddy, Soldiers Say," from the Sunday Star of March 7, and "Units Trained by the

United States Said to Include Vietcong," from the New York Times of March 8, be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Mar. 7, 1965]

**WEAPONS IN VIETNAM SHODDY, SOLDIERS SAY—
NEW AMERICAN COMPLAINTS ALSO INCLUDE
SHORTAGE OF AMMUNITION**

(By Peter Arnett)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A flurry of new complaints came yesterday from U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam that they are fighting with shoddy weapons, shortages of ammunition, and a lack of equipment—although, they said, some items are for sale on Saigon's black market.

One U.S. Army adviser said Soviet-made ammunition clips taken from the Vietcong are better quality than those sent from the United States. The American ones jam the U.S.-made weapons, he said.

NEW COUP RUMORED

In the field, fighting continued around the joint United States-Vietnamese air base at Da Nang. The field there is the jumping-off point for air strikes against Communist North Vietnam and Laos.

Here in Saigon rumors of a new coup were afloat and there was a possibility of anti-American demonstrations.

Coup talk got started after Vietnamese Air Force planes flew a mock bombing raid on the city. Their flights apparently were touched off by the presence of troop reinforcements in the city to guard against possible anti-U.S. demonstrations.

Complaints from U.S. servicemen about their weapons and equipment are nothing new in this war but the latest batch comes at a time when U.S. involvement here has been deepened.

UNITED STATES TO INVESTIGATE

In Washington, the Defense Department said the new complaints would be looked into.

"It is and has been the policy of the U.S. government to give U.S. forces in South Vietnam a blank check for obtaining any and all material and logistical support needed in connection with their activities. Equipping our forces in South Vietnam has had and will continue to have the highest priority," a spokesman said.

One U.S. Army adviser stationed in central Vietnam claimed that although the war was getting more serious, the most up-to-date weapons have not come to all units.

"The armalite automatic rifle would fill the bill nicely with its proven effectiveness," he said.

"But only the Special Forces and some privileged units get these. The best we get is the automatic carbine. As things get worse here, we need the best weapon for personal protection."

EQUIPMENT CRITICIZED

Another adviser said the ammunition clips for the carbines are too lightly constructed and jam easily under the hard usage.

"The clips for the Russian weapons we pick up from the Vietcong are much stronger and more heavily constructed," he said.

"I was better equipped in World War II," said a U.S. Army engineer, holding up a World War I pistol belt and some rusty cartridge magazines.

"I read somewhere that the Defense Department says the Americans in Vietnam are the best equipped fighting men ever to go overseas," he added. "They still have to show that."

The most recent complaint to come to light before this was that of U.S. Army Capt. John King of Sebring, Fla. In November he wrote his family that U.S. rifles, carbines and

machineguns had not been properly maintained by the Vietnamese. A month later King was killed in action.

SENATE HEARING HELD

A secret Senate hearing in Washington 4 weeks ago upheld King's critical report. Previous to that there have been complaints from U.S. airmen who said World War II-type B-26 bombers fell apart in the air. The old B-26's have been phased out.

Last November the Defense Department acknowledged that first-aid kits issued to American troops in the Mekong River delta area were unserviceable and had been replaced.

The new round of complaints came from Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force advisers. They were interviewed separately. They all asked not to be quoted by name lest they get into trouble.

One item in short supply is camouflaged nylon poncho liners used as lightweight blankets.

AVAILABLE ON BLACK MARKET

"Saigon says they don't have any left, but I know they are available on the black market in Saigon," one lieutenant said. "I know that if I went to U.S. military headquarters in Saigon and made a scene I would be issued a poncho liner and the other items I am lacking. But then I would remain a first lieutenant all my life."

An American pilot said he has not been issued a flying jacket.

"Supply says it hasn't got any, but there are hundreds being sold on the streets in Saigon," he said. "I won't buy one there on principle."

The pilot of an Army spotter plane claimed:

"We can't get chamols leather to strain gasoline at the tiny airstrips we refuel from. But this chamols can be bought on the Saigon black market without any trouble."

BAD AMMUNITION CHARGED

From U.S. Navy advisers came these complaints:

"Some of the ammunition for our cannons is in pretty bad shape when it gets here. The guns on one ship jammed every 20 or 30 rounds."

"The skin hull of one of the Navy ships sent over here from the States was so rusted you could punch a hole through its armor with a pencil."

Men in the central highlands claim that the ammunition supply there is low. Others reported shortages of artillery shells.

One Army man said ammunition issued for personnel weapons is often rusted.

"It was packed as far back as 1952 for Korea," he said. "When we complain about it we are told: 'Clean it.'"

[From the New York Times, March 8, 1965]

**UNITS TRAINED BY UNITED STATES SAID TO
INCLUDE VIETCONG—PRO-COMMUNIST
JOURNALIST REPORTS RED INFILTRATION—ABILITY
TO UTILIZE CAPTURED ARMS IS CALLED THE
GOAL**

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, March 7.—Vietcong infiltrators were said today to be among the South Vietnamese being trained by American instructors in the use of modern arms and military equipment.

This infiltration, reported to have been going on since late 1961, would enable the guerrillas to incorporate into their arsenal any United States weapons that are captured.

The infiltration programs was described by Wilfred Burchett, a Communist-oriented Australian journalist who lives in Moscow. A free-lance writer, he returned recently from several months in Vietcong-controlled territory.

Writing in Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, Mr. Burchett said the arms booty had given the Vietcong forces fire superiority

over the Government forces at the company level—about 100 men. The strengths were said to be equal at the battalion level—450 to 700 men.

Only Government forces of regiment strength—900 to 1,100 men—are "clearly superior" to the comparable Vietcong units, Mr. Burchett wrote.

He said this superiority hinged on the availability of tanks, heavy artillery and aerial support.

A Vietcong unit commander was quoted by Mr. Burchett as having said:

"During the war against the French colonizers, we usually attacked only if we had overwhelming numerical superiority. We did not have enough firearms and military equipment. Now we have arms and equipment plus fighting spirit that cannot be compared with the enemy's."

Mr. Burchett said desertions from the Government side, which he put at 80,000 last year, could no longer be offset by new enlistments. He quoted Vietcong military leaders as having said that Saigon's units were on the average a third below strength and that some had only half of their normal complements.

Since much of the South Vietnamese countryside is controlled by rebels, Mr. Burchett said, the Government forces are having trouble finding recruits. Even when Government forces raid Vietcong territory for manpower, he wrote, they find the young men have already joined the rebels or are hiding in the woods or in tunnels.

In another article, in the newspaper Literaturnaya Gazeta, Mr. Burchett said recruits were being "seized in front of Saigon movie theaters and sent to training camps without being given a chance to say goodbye to their families."

"These youngsters desert at the first opportunity," Mr. Burchett wrote. "I saw dozens of them, not yet 20 years old, who even if they were not drawn to the (Vietcong) side by patriotism, at least preferred to fight on the side of the winner."

Mr. Burchett said the Vietcong controlled the key highways out of Saigon at points 15 to 20 miles out of town. According to his account, the Vietcong forces allow civilian buses to approach the road barricades. The passengers are required to walk a few miles to the next roadblock, where they can again board buses.

PENTAGON MAKES NO REPLY

WASHINGTON, March 7.—There was no comment by the Pentagon today on the report that Vietcong infiltrators were concealed among the troops being trained in South Vietnam by American instructors.

However, a report by Edgar Snow in the February 27 issue of the New Republic on an interview with the Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-tung made a similar assertion.

Chairman Mao, Mr. Snow said, told him that the Vietcong rank and file and officers were being armed and educated with the help of the "American intervention."

**MERGER OF THE RESERVES WITH
THE NATIONAL GUARD**

Mr. MILLER, Mr. President, in the Sunday, March 7, issue of the Washington Post there is a splendid analysis by Howard Margolis, of the Washington Post, on the proposed merger of the Reserves with the National Guard. Of particular interest is the fact that, when all the arguments are boiled down, the actual savings that would result from such a merger would come to approximately \$1 million a year. The author indicates that the arguments for or against the

March 9, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4397

judge. He was a dedicated public servant and he devoted a large part of his life to maintaining the dignity and prestige of the District Court for the District of Connecticut and to maintaining the dignity and prestige of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. His courtly ways, his unflinching courtesy and thoughtfulness of others, gave him an unforgettable place close to the hearts of us all. Not demonstrative and sometimes almost shy, he had a warm and affectionate nature that all who were close to him knew so well.

He was a wonderful team worker on our court. His memoranda distributed to the other members of the panel before our conference were never shallow or perfunctory. They always revealed some significant interpretation of the cases cited in the briefs or some new and helpful point of view to be used by whoever it was to whom the writing of an opinion in a particular case was assigned.

He wanted to help. It never bothered him that somebody took some of these good things out of his memoranda. That's what he put them in there for. That was the way he worked on the team.

He hardly ever returned a concurrence tab without suggestions for improvement or clarification. Indeed, in one case he got me to clarify my opinion to such an extent that the lack of clarification in the trial judge's instructions to the jury was all too clear and we got reversed by the Supreme Court.

In the good old days once in a while some intrepid soul would suggest to the Old Chief, Learned Hand, some changes in style or expression, and once or twice in matters of grammar or syntax. I can't imagine it but they did. He rebuffed them all. And if I told you literally what I have seen him do on one or two occasions with such suggestions, you would recognize him all right.

But when a suggestion came from Carroll Hincks, the Old Chief was as meek as a lamb. He would sit right down there, get his pen out, and make the change. He didn't care, no matter what it was. I don't really remember Carroll Hincks suggesting any changes in grammar or syntax, but he might have and he might have been right. But anyway, coming from him it was different.

Now we all know Learned Hand. And we know what Learned Hand thought of Carroll Hincks. And, oh, my! What precious memories I have of being with them!

There is another thing I didn't have down here that occurred to me. There was one word that Carroll Hincks thoroughly disliked. He had been so long a district judge that the word "reverse"—he shunned that word. He would write an opinion that would come out "Judgment below vacated," "modified," or "case remanded." But that word "reversed" (laughter), he just didn't like that word. That was all there was to that.

Once in a while, if he was particularly outraged over what the Judge below had done, he would put it in. But he never liked it. And the ingenious ways that he got around it were very interesting.

He was not quick to make up his mind, but once he did he was as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar. No vacillating or jumping from one side to the other for him. When he took his stand, you knew that was the way he was going to keep on standing until Kingdom come.

He added greatness to a great court and was admired, respected and beloved by all.

Chief Judge LUMBARD. I am sure we are all grateful for these fine and moving tributes which have so well expressed the feelings of all of us. We are grateful, too, for those of you who have come to join us. I note that Judge Gibson has come here from Vermont and Assistant Attorney General Dolan from Washington. We are very gratified that we should be joined in this tribute to one who after all was a Connecticut judge just as he

was a Federal judge, by the presence here of the chief justice of Connecticut and so many members of the State bench.

We shall have with us always the memory of Carroll Hincks as the district judge patient and courteous, as the circuit judge wise and considerate in counsel, as the man who, to all who knew him, was a man for all seasons.

This session of the court having accomplished its purpose, we now stand in adjournment and the crier will so announce.

Balliff ORI. Oyez, oyez, oyez. The Honorable U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the Honorable U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, now stand adjourned.

COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT CERTIFICATE

United States of America, District of Connecticut, ss.:

I hereby certify that the attached transcript is a true and correct transcript of notes taken by me to record all proceedings held at a joint session of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, held in memory of Hon. Carroll C. Hincks, on Monday, December 21, 1964, at 2 p.m., at the U.S. Courthouse, second floor courtroom, New Haven, Conn., Hon. J. Edward Lumbard, chief judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, presiding.

AUSTIN M. PHELPS,
Official Court Reporter.

JANUARY 11, 1965.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—VII

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, swiftly escalating events in Vietnam pose for the people of the United States the fundamental question of whether a great nation—a nation economically and militarily the most powerful in the history of the world—can admit publicly that its position in South Vietnam has deteriorated to the point of nullifying its original objectives, and that it now seeks to bring peace to the area, through taking the issues to the conference table, as requested by friendly nations and by a growing and very substantial segment of American public opinion.

That is the issue confronting the people of the United States today.

In my opinion, the United States is economically, militarily, and morally strong enough to take such a position.

It is a course of action which I have been advocating for a year, now—a year which has seen our position in South Vietnam steadily deteriorate, while the war is steadily escalating, and is, indeed, becoming the "wider war" which President Johnson has stated we do not seek.

My mail is running more than 100 to 1 in favor of my stand that we should take the issues in Vietnam to the conference table.

Typical of the letters received is one from Dr. Jerome D. Frank, the eminent nationally and internationally known psychiatrist, who states the issue as follows:

It seems to me that the chief problem today is how to persuade the United States to admit that it has made a mistake, so that we can cut our losses and wage the battle for freedom and human worth more successfully. In individuals the ability to admit an error is a sign of moral courage, maturity and true strength. Surely if a nation in the world were secure and powerful enough to admit error, it is the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Frank's letter to me, together with his attached analysis of the situation in Vietnam, be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a biographical sketch of Dr. Frank, taken from "Who's Who," which reveals his eminent qualifications.

There being no objection, the letter, the analysis, and the biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL,
Baltimore, Md., March 3, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to congratulate you on your courageous stand with respect to South Vietnam.

It seems to me that the chief problem today is how to persuade the United States to admit that it has made a mistake, so that we can cut our losses and wage the battle for freedom and human worth more successfully. In individuals the ability to admit an error is a sign of moral courage, maturity and true strength. Surely if any nation in the world were secure and powerful enough to admit error, it is the United States. It is only highly respected persons like yourself who might be able to get this message across.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a statement on Vietnam which you may find of interest.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

JEROME D. FRANK, M.D.

STATEMENT ON SOUTH VIETNAM

The war in southeast Asia seems to be degenerating into a battle of wills, centering on our military presence in South Vietnam. The Vietcong are determined to drive us out and we are determined to stay, so that the national prestige of both sides is involved.

Once a conflict assumes this form, two great dangers arise. One is that long-term goals will be lost sight of. The other is that the conflict will escalate to a disaster. In battles of will, the conflict becomes polarized and the issues oversimplified. For example, the State Department white paper no longer recognizes the agonizing complexities of the situation, nor admits any flaws in our policy toward South Vietnam. This despite the facts that, though possessing overwhelming superiority in manpower and equipment, the South Vietnamese have steadily lost ground to the Vietcong, that most of the recent recruits to the Vietcong are South Vietnamese, and that the Buddhists want the United States to withdraw its forces. The struggle is presented as simply the effort to repel infiltration by the North Vietnamese. We are told that our withdrawal would lead automatically to Chinese domination of all south Asia, ignoring the deep-seated fear of China by all nations that border on her. It is also claimed that thousands of our South Vietnamese supporters would be massacred, as if there were no way of arranging for their protection after our withdrawal.

Further evidence for polarization of the conflict is that the question of whether or not we can maintain our military forces in South Vietnam has come to overshadow everything else.

We probably have the power to keep our troops in South Vietnam at the cost of inflicting vast destruction and misery on its inhabitants and those of neighboring countries including noncombatants. It would be hard to maintain that such a policy wins friends for us or defends freedom. On the contrary, it strengthens the false image of Americans as ruthless white imperialists—probably the most effective of all propaganda weapons used by the Communist Chinese.

We are increasing the distrust and fear of the white race among all the nonwhite races of the world and thereby making new converts of communism.

The danger of escalation to a disastrous level arises because each side feels impelled to respond to a blow from the other with a counterblow. This leads to a steady increase of emotional tension. That emotion interferes with judgment has been demonstrated by the disastrous mistakes in almost all wars made by military commanders when under great stress. When combatants are emotionally aroused, furthermore, they tend to rely more and more on naked violence. Any conciliatory move by one side is interpreted by both as a sign of weakening of its will and purpose. Those who suggest negotiating instead of fighting are accused of cowardice, and of undermining their side's will to resist. In the past, the risk of progressive escalation under these circumstances was tolerable because the limited destructive power of weaponry prevented too great damage. Today, when escalation could eventually involve the use of civilization-destroying nuclear weapons, the risk becomes intolerable.

The struggle with communism is essentially an ideological one. We are engaged in a worldwide effort to defend and promote a social philosophy of freedom and individual dignity and a political system based on consent. This is a battle for men's minds and hearts. It is most successfully waged by propaganda and by promoting education and economic prosperity under conditions of peace.

The sparing use of limited, carefully focused violence and intimidation may perhaps be necessary occasionally to check our opponents. On a large scale, however, violence negates the very values we are trying to promote.

Ideological wars have almost always ended indecisively after inflicting enormous misery on all involved. Apparently the lesson that one cannot change men's thoughts by violence is never learned. There is every reason to think that the current ideological war, like most previous ones, cannot be conclusively won by either side, but it carries the new danger that it may end with the destruction of all societies involved.

Sometimes it is necessary to admit error. In view of the demonstrated failure of our policy in South Vietnam, a strategic acceptance of a short-term setback, in order the better to promote our long-term objectives, should be seriously considered. This might require an open admission that our policy needs modification. In an individual, the ability to admit error is viewed as a sign of moral courage and of self-confidence, maturity, and strength. If any nation in the world's history is secure and powerful enough to do this, it should be the United States.

Insistence on maintaining an untenable position weakens the chances of achieving our long-term goals and steadily increases the likelihood of a major disaster. If we can find the courage to admit that this round has been a bad one for us, and seek to arrange for a military withdrawal, requiring only that the physical safety of persons loyal to us in South Vietnam be safeguarded, we could put ourselves in a much better position to win the ultimate victory for freedom and human dignity.

JEROME D. FRANK, M.D.

"Who's Who" BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Frank, Jerome David; psychiatrist, educator, born New York City, May 30, 1909; son of Jerome W. and Bess (Rosebaum) fm; A.B. summa cum laude Harvard 1930; A.M. 1932; Ph. D. in psychology 1934; M.D. cum laude 1939; married Elizabeth Kleeman, January 4, 1948; children, Deborah, David, Julia, Emily; instructor psychiatry Johns Hopkins Medical School 1942-46; research associate

group psychotherapy research project VA, 1946-49; instructor Washington School Psychiatry 1947-49; clinical associate professor Howard University, 1948-49; faculty Johns Hopkins Medical School 1949-; professor of psychiatry 1950; psychiatrist in charge of psychiatry outpatient department Johns Hopkins Hospital 1951-61; director of clinical service Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic 1961-; acting chief, department of psychiatry 1960, 1961, 1962; advisory board of Patuxent Institute, 1954-; member Advisory Commissions National Institute of Mental Health, 1951-55, 1957-58, 1959-61; Advance Committee Psychiatry and Neurology Service, Department of Medicine and Surgery, VA Central Office, 1960-; board of directors Metropolitan Baltimore Association of Mental Health, 1952; national sponsor National Committee SANE Nuclear Policy; member National Advance Council Student Peace Union, fellow Center Advanced Study Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif., 1958-59; served to major, U.S. Army, 1943-46; fellow, American Psychiatry Association, American Psychology Association, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (member council 1962-); American Group Psychotherapy Association; member, American Psychopathological Association (president 1963); Group Advancement Psychiatry, AMA; American Association University Professors; Phi Beta Kappa; Sigma Chi; Alpha Mega Alpha. Author: "Persuasion and Healing: A Comparative Study of Psychotherapy," 1961 (with Florence Powdermaker); group, "Psychotherapy: Studies in Methodology of Research and Therapy," 1953; also articles. Home: 603 West University Parkway, Baltimore 10; office: Phipps Clinic, Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, Md.

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution overwhelmingly adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

This is a resolution deploring recent decrees of the U.S. Department of Labor which confounded the intent of Congress and set a prohibitively high minimum wage rate for untrained volunteers under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

I fully agree with the Texas House in its call for return to congressional intent in this matter and I join in its commendation of the position of the Governor of Texas on this arbitrary ruling that endangers widespread and effective operation of antipoverty programs.

Mr. President, the Senate has available for its consideration a bill that would apply the prevailing-wage concept to the Economic Opportunity Act. I introduced this bill last week as S. 1382, and it is at the desk until the close of business Thursday, March 11, for the consideration of possible cosponsors.

I commend to the attention of those Senators concerned about this problem the resolution passed by the Texas House, and, in order that a full explanation of this situation may be readily available, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of S. 1382, a companion measure, S. 1383, and my remarks upon introduction of those bills on March 4 be reproduced at this point in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, remarks, and bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE STATE RESOLUTION 120

"Whereas one of the most important and promising features of the National Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the President's war on poverty was the creation of the work training program known as the Neighborhood Youth Corps; and

"Whereas this program was established by the Congress as an effort to place deserving high school students in gainful part-time employment to prevent drop outs due to hardship; and

"Whereas it was stipulated in the act that these young people would be paid wages 'appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region and proficiency of employee'; and

"Whereas the U.S. Labor Department, by regulation issued on October 2, 1964, recommended to local school districts that 'enrollee wages should be a little below the prevailing entry rates for inexperienced workers in similar occupations,' and on this basis 23 Texas school districts filed applications under the program; and

"Whereas the U.S. Labor Department, contrary to the intent of the act and its own October 2 directive, has now ruled that unskilled high school students must be paid \$1.25 per hour, the Federal minimum wage, regardless of the prevailing wage in the community or wages paid adult workers performing the same duties; and

"Whereas spokesmen for the Labor Department in the press February 24 attempted to label Gov. John Connally as a roadblock to this program, when in truth the Labor Department itself changed the rules of the game after it was in progress and the Governor intends only to protect the school districts of this State which will finance 50 percent of this program beginning in 1966; and

"Whereas Governor Connally has announced that he will do everything possible to implement this program for the needy youth of Texas despite this arbitrary ruling which endangers its success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the house of representatives deplores this unwarranted action by the Labor Department and urges that the intent of Congress be restored in the administration of this program; and be it further

Resolved, however, That this resolution shall in no way be considered either an insult to President Lyndon B. Johnson or a statement of opposition to the President's war on poverty; and, be it further

Resolved, That the house of representatives, 59th legislature, commends Governor Connally for his position that the program should be used for the benefit of needy high school students rather than to further the social and political aims of any person or organization which seeks to misuse the program or to alter its true purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Labor and all Members of the Texas congressional delegation.

"BEN BARNES,
"Speaker of the House."

I hereby certify that House State Resolution 120 was adopted, as amended, by the house on February 25, 1965, by the following vote: yeas 116, nays 15.

DOROTHY HOLLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

AMENDMENTS OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, WITH RESPECT TO WAGES PAID FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF WORK AND CERTAIN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce an amendment designed to remove all chance for any Federal poverty volunteers to be