

ing deadlines of nuclear weapons, which are becoming available to all nations, enhance the chances of a nuclear holocaust by accident or adventurism. India has, of her own volition, committed herself to a policy of employment of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes. As you are perhaps aware, India is one of the countries which is capable of exploding a nuclear device within a period of 12 to 18 months. After a vigorous debate in the largest democratic Parliament, India has decided against the manufacture of the bomb. We have done our duty in not adding to the threat of the destruction of mankind. We know that in a nuclear war there would be neither victors nor vanquished and the living could only envy the dead. Victory will be manifested only in death, darkness, and destruction. Peace, then, must be the summum bonum of international life. As President Johnson recently said, there are no losers in peace.

Aspiration is one thing, its achievement another. What appeals to one coterie appalls the other. In the ensuing cold war, hegemonial tension tends to be clothed in the ideological raiment. Upon this backdrop, each nation owes it to itself not to surrender its judgment to the high and the mighty but to work toward peace. Peace, unfortunately, is always accompanied by that unwanted guest—fear. Fear begets fear; trust begets trust. International interests can only be served in a climate of peace based on the bedrock of mutual respect and collaboration. We cannot build peace by preparing war. I want to emphasize, however, the relevance of deterrence as the fulcrum of foreign policy of a nation. We are too conscious that weakness invite aggression. War—that organized engine of violence—cannot be discarded in the current context of human development. In this shrunken world, peace, like pregnancy, cannot be partial. Nonetheless, we have to labor to abolish war as an instrument of policy. This can be achieved by building peace in piecemeal, which would be a working peace and not a protected peace.

Peace today has a new dimension. It includes international cooperation: From the spraying of DDT to the building of nuclear reactors. Diplomacy, too, has acquired new tools. Every embassy all over the globe maintains an information department to influence, to educate, and to enlighten the people. The art of putting one's best foot forward or allowing oneself to be photographed from the right angle, involves a myriad of trivial actions, which in themselves are unimportant, but which go a long way to win the battle for the minds of men.

Diplomacy alone, however, cannot arrest a worsening situation. It is only a cutting edge of the public opinion. Modern communications have pierced the stone wall of sovereignty. Minor incidents of local import assume international importance. This affects the projection of the image of a nation. Each nation has to be watchful not to fan the flames of cold war. Public opinion within a country should be directed and channeled to foster the forces of peace. In protecting the national interest, a nation should also serve international interests. Each nation should strive to serve the cause of peace.

In this drama, the individual, too, can play a meaningful role. Modern civilization is accompanied by centralization of authority and concentration of power at the cost of freedom of the individual. In a sense this is inevitable as the modern world cannot function without considerable centralization. In this process, authority corrodes individual freedom to such an extreme that it almost destroys it. The groups that hold power on behalf of the state tend to encourage this. Different and sometimes hostile ideologies, from their point of view, also encourage the accumulation of power in the state or in a group. This would ultimately result in human unhappiness and decay of that creative

genius which is so essential to the growth of humanity.

The individual must strive to understand other cultures. The follies, crimes, and massacres of history are the results of the surrender of individual freedom to the custody of the crowd. Some leaders anesthetized the public mind until their followers ceased to feel responsible for their actions. The people became bundles of prejudices and enmities resulting from narrow loyalties. Many times ignorance was mistaken for stupidity, paganism for barbarity, inertia for sloth, a difference in ethical standards for deceitfulness. This curtain of ignorance can be lifted if people try to learn more about each other through personal contacts and tolerance. Human relations could and should surmount the sanctuary of sovereignty.

In raising hosannas for peace, tolerance is really a gravid factor. Coming as I do from a social and cultural milieu that preaches and practices tolerance, I am capable of recognizing the existence of an unorthodox idea which may be unacceptable to me. I could even debate it without sacrificing my own convictions. That is because India, through centuries of continued history, never sought to impose her ideas on others. She accepted other cultures sometimes spontaneously, sometimes by compulsion but she assimilated and blended them into one, which is Indian culture. India had no crusades until Islam and Christianity arrived on her soil. Earlier reform movements like Buddhism and Jainism were assimilated into Hinduism. The god-intoxicated India, paradoxically, even accepts atheists into its fold. India has a secular tradition, which juxtaposes opposing ideologies.

To appreciate a viewpoint is not to applaud it. The complexities of life cannot be clearly comprehended unless we understand the diversities of life. Diversity is the natural law. No two trees, no two climes, no two dawns, no two fingerprints are identical. As President Kennedy eloquently put it, "Let us not be blind to our differences—but let us direct attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help to make the world safe for diversity." President Johnson, too, placed before his people the ideal of a world without war, a world made safe for diversity, in which all men, goods, and ideas can freely move across every border and boundary. Diversity, let us admit, need not be divisive or even destructive. On the other hand, different cultures, which have never been exposed, could be coalesced to form a unique unifying force binding all men together.

We should not, therefore, resign ourselves to the march of time or act as if mankind is a prisoner of drift, but we should behave like creative responsible nations. "The greatness of a nation is to be measured not by its material power or wealth, but by the quality of its people." The Great Society that President Johnson dreams of "asks not only how much but how good; not only how to create wealth, but how to use it, not only how fast we are going but where we are headed. It proposes the first test for a nation the quality of its people." You, as the educated elite, are required to draw up the plans for the future and sell it to the world. As pioneers in the promotion of peace, you will be accepting a challenge. The burden will be yours, so will be the glory. In this year of international cooperation you could gainfully emphasize what unites rather than what divides us.


Prime Minister Nehru, who originally propounded this idea of International Cooperation Year, in a speech at the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961, thought we should direct our attention to cooperative ventures, especially for peace and in the

interest of peace. The idea of cooperation, he admitted, would not solve the problems of the day, "but it will lessen this destruction and conflict which now afflict the world." He pleaded for a new way of thinking, a new attitude too and development of humanity.

We have to develop a positive attitude in thinking that the world today needs more emphasis on cooperation and not on conflict. If we cannot have peace at once, we can have peace by pieces by extending the existing ventures in functional cooperation. Even when we have enough explosions—bombs, babies, and bulldozers—to combat, let us turn the tide. It is always better to argue, to count votes rather than wars, for out of the clash of ideas truth emerges, embellished and anointed in the process. We shall plan a world ushering promise of future happiness, free from ugliness and misery that surrounds us, where diversity may flourish, freedom may prosper, men and nations may compete with each other peacefully. The essential conditions of existence demand co-existence and that liberty live with the forces opposed to it. But, let us not forget that freedom, like virtue, cannot live in isolation.

Poet Rabindranath Tagore sang of the glory of freedom in these words:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where then mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening thought and action
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

FE  Hall

Support for Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, the easiest way to obtain national publicity today is to stage a demonstration.

Take the following ingredients: A crowd of people, a 3-day growth of beard, a few two-by-fours, posters, and paint. Put them all together, march them by the Pentagon, and presto—instant TV coverage.

Recently, I received a letter from a young constituent in my district who, I believe, represents the majority view in the United States. He is not a demonstrator, but a young man who uses the force of reason to support his view.

Following is a letter from David M. Powell, of Springfield, Mo., a young high school student:

SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
June 7, 1965.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently, my sense of Americanism was aroused by the meeting, in Washington, D.C., of 3,000 college students and professors. They were representing the minority which protests U.S. involvement in Vietnam. They were demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops thus advocating isolationism.

These people, though they be a minority, are being listened to by Congress and the

administration because the majority is saying nothing to back up its belief. I have taken on the responsibility of representing the majority.

I am firmly against any withdrawal of any troops from Vietnam. If any action is to be taken it should be a stepped up offensive on the ground to flush out all guerrillas south of the 17th parallel.

It must be proven to the administration that the American people do support this particular facet of Vietnam policy. Sir, you can provide this proof by speaking to your colleagues, in the House, about what I have mentioned in the above. This would demonstrate to the administration that the American people are behind them.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. POWELL,

A Concerned Portion of America's Future Leaders.

Megalopolis: The Challenge for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Thomas F. Richardson, president of the Fairfield County Trust Co., Stamford, Conn.

As Mr. Richardson points out, Connecticut is on the threshold of a population explosion and needs to take coordinated action in both the public and private sectors to avoid being overwhelmed by growth. I know my colleagues will be interested, since it is a problem that will become increasingly important throughout the Nation.

The article follows:

[From the American Banker, Apr. 29, 1965]

MEGALOPOLIS: THE CHALLENGE FOR CONNECTICUT

(By Thomas F. Richardson, president, the Fairfield County Trust Co., Stamford, Conn.)

Early this month the little Greek seaport town of Megalopolis was torn by a violent, rolling earthquake. Megalopolis, halfway between ancient Sparta and ancient Olympia, gets its name from the Greek words "megalon" or great and "polis" or city. It was built originally to protect Arcadia from Spartan invasion, and was envisioned as a giant, spread city on the Ionian seacoast.

THE AMERICAN MEGALOPOLIS

The shocks and rents which recently devastated ancient Megalopolis could be a prophetic warning to 20th century America. Demographers and city planners have described a modern megalopolis on our Atlantic shore. Stretching from Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va., is a spread city of 41 million people, 21 percent of the Nation's population. Composed of some 65,000 square miles, the complex is a system of urban development made up of roads, people, and buildings which has coalesced over the years into an almost continuous chain of urban spread nearly 600 miles in length.

The 11-State region boasts not only one-fifth of America's population, but also 23 percent of its retail sales and 25 percent of the country's disposable income. The American megalopolis is a growing area, dynamic

with activity and extending its influence into every corner of the globe. Rapid and widespread change is the rule—orderly adjustment the exception.

The region is characterized also by close similarities and violent contrasts. The area's wealth is contrasted to some of the Nation's worst poverty pockets. Nestled snugly against its giant, central cities are suburban towns. Megalopolitan regions of high employment are often close by tracts of high unemployment. And while our Atlantic megalopolis is the acknowledged information and communications center for the world, it is also plagued by some of this Nation's most congested highways.

The average density of megalopolis numbers just under 800 inhabitants per square mile. But Manhattan Island strains under the pressure of 78,000 to the square mile, while neighboring Sherman, Conn.—a quick 50 miles away—can count only 39 people to the mile.

CONNECTICUT AND THE PEOPLE GLACIER

In the heart of American megalopolis lies the State of Connecticut, bridging the gap between the rest of New England and New York City. In this geographical setting, Connecticut faces the challenge of a projected population growth more rapid than a majority of the other States in the Union. And the Nutmeg State's population explosion will compound existing problems for both Connecticut and its neighbors.

Rumbling into Connecticut with immutable force is a thundering population avalanche * * * a people-glacier. Connecticut's 2½ million persons in 1960 represented the growth of 300 years. It took three centuries for Connecticut to build up to 2½ million people. By the year 2000, it will have all happened again. In a short 35 years the State's population will bulge to 5 million.

James S. Klar of the Connecticut Development Commission admonished last year: "Contemplate all of the schools, houses, highways, churches, and public buildings that we have today, then think about doubling the whole thing within the next 36 years. And just to make your contemplation a little more interesting, think of doubling within 36 years the results of three centuries—without a coordinated plan."

AN INTENSIFICATION OF PROBLEMS

In the final decade of this century, about 100,000 new Connecticut babies will be born annually, doubling the 50,850 births for each year during the 1950-60 decade. With a projected decline in the death rate from the current 1.06 percent to just 1 percent, the average number of births over deaths each year will increase from approximately 30,000 today to 57,000 during the 1990-2000 decade. In addition, each year in the final decade of the century, about 26,500 more persons will enter the State to live than will leave for residence elsewhere.

The doubling of Connecticut's population may occur intermittently in the next few decades or the increase may be evenly spread over the years. In either case there will be an intensification of problems.

TREASURED VALUES

Already the environment shows an evidence of losing some of its treasured values because of the haphazard building of housing developments, poorly located businesses, roads, industries, and other elements of intensive urban development. Coupled with environmental challenges are the complications of land use. In recent years the character of residential, commercial, and industrial building has been horizontal in construction, and open land is rapidly disappearing. But land is a fixed quantity, and there is no frontier on which to move. Judicious land use for residential building, commercial and industrial construction, and recreational needs is essential.

A fast growing population has accelerated

the intensification and expansion of development within the central valley and along the western coastal portion of the State. And future population growth is expected to compound the existing problems of these regions with greater intensity than other portions of the State.

THE TIME IS NOW

The people of Connecticut have been just about able to cope with all the problems of past growth and development. But many difficulties are now in their infancy stages ready to ferment, then to burst into staggering problems as they become further aggravated by population expansion.

Today, there is much concern with pollution in Connecticut waters. The obtaining of space on a salt water beach or fresh water lake under the summer sun is increasingly difficult. Taxes continue to rise as rural town governments, wrestling with problems of double sessions in schools, poorly maintained streets and trash accumulation, struggle to keep pace with demands. Additional population can do nothing but intensify these and other problems unless steps are taken to prepare for tomorrow's population. Connecticut residents must begin to think now of ways to accommodate and cope with the inevitable onslaught of additional persons.

THE "CITY OF CONNECTICUT"

By the end of the century, 98 percent of Connecticut's people will live in urban centers of 10,000 or more. The population explosion—today's 2½ million is almost triple that of 1900—may qualify our State by century's end to be known as the city of Connecticut.

FACING UP TO THE FUTURE

In a bold and farsighted action program, Connecticut's State government is facing up to the future. A State interregional planning program was initiated by the State's development commission in 1960. It was developed to assist Connecticut's regional planning agencies and to insure the compatibility of regional plans with one another and with State goals and responsibilities.

During the 1960-63 period, the Connecticut Development Commission, through the Connecticut interregional planning program and with the assistance of other State agencies and regional planning agencies, completed basic inventory studies at the Statewide and regional levels. During the conduct of these studies it became clear that a close integration of long-range planning activity was needed in order to establish a more comprehensive approach regarding the future growth and development of the State.

INTEGRATED PLANNING

To achieve this, initially three agencies of Connecticut State government—the Connecticut State Highway Department, the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Connecticut Development Commission—undertook to integrate their long-range efforts by joint participation in the planning phase of the Connecticut interregional planning program. While these and other governmental agencies have involved themselves for many years with long-range planning, their joint approach to Connecticut's future is a recent cooperative effort to insure the most productive achievements.

The integrated planning phase began in October 1963, and is scheduled to be completed by the middle of 1966. Through this program there will be introduced into State government an integrated, comprehensive and long-range planning process for anticipating and meeting the challenges of future development.

While the Nation's population expands from 192 million in the last census to over 300 million by the end of the century, Connecticut will be doubling its population in the next 35 years.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13459

gram organizations, the college work-study program, and neighborhood Youth Corps.

Once they are accepted into college, disadvantaged youngsters are able to apply for various Government and private financial assistance which is now available only to students already enrolled.

Upward bound—Summer programs, 1965

Recipient	OEO grant	Students
Independent schools talent search program (funded)	\$376,031	100
Florida A. & M. University, Tallahassee, Fla.	346,484	150
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.	265,739	75
Columbia University, New York City	187,020	160
Howard University, Washington, D.C.	135,406	200
Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga.	127,398	200
Texas Southern University, Houston, Tex.	127,194	200
Tennessee A. & I. University, Nashville, Tenn.	121,000	300
Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.	116,889	200
Dillard College, New Orleans, La.	114,848	200
LeMoyne College (funded), Syracuse, N.Y.	90,428	100
Webster College, Webster Groves, Mo.	77,940	200
Western Washington State, Bellingham, Wash.	48,271	50
College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.	40,927	80
New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N. Mex.	39,065	125
Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.	19,100	30
Total	2,194,640	2,370

NOTE.—Related program: Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala. 600 college students will provide tutorial assistance to 9,900 low-income students in 11 Alabama counties.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read two or three paragraphs from the press release:

Seventeen colleges have joined in a giant talent hunt this summer to discover youngsters in this category and get them upward bound. The Office of Economic Opportunity has made initial grants to these colleges of \$2.2 million.

Mr. President, this program deals with youngsters whose IQ's show that they are of college caliber, who could be a success in college, but who have not been prepared for college. Their intellectual potential will be wasted unless we follow such a course of action as Mr. Shriver announced today is being inaugurated. I continue to read from the press release:

Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, supported by leading educators, and the U.S. Office of Education will attack on a wide front the problems that bar hundreds of thousands of potentially talented young Americans from making use of exceptional minds and skills.

A special committee of leading educators, headed by Dr. Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and president of the University of Oregon, will assist in organizing the broad, long-range program.

I am proud to announce to the Senate that the Chairman of the Special Committee will be Dr. Arthur Flemming. I congratulate both Mr. Shriver and President Flemming for their outstanding leadership in connection with this effort, this much needed rescue program in the field of education, because that is what it is. We are rescuing, we are saving the educational future and intellectual potential of many young men and women who will be the beneficiaries of this inspired educational program.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, since he is prepared to make a speech.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall be glad to wait and move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I promise that my speech will not be long.

FE ~~WAV~~ Long

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is one thing that the junior Senator from Louisiana has in common with every other Member of this body; that is, that the thing which he most objects to is that he does not have more influence. That is true of every other Senator.

I might broaden the generality of that statement and say that I also object to the fact that those who agree with me do not have more influence. I suppose that that is just as true of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as it is true of the rest of us.

All the Senators of this body, save two, voted for a resolution at the time of the attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. That resolution was broadened to say that we disapprove of Communist aggression and we urge the President to resist it. When the Communists attacked us, we said we would resist aggression in that area. So far as I am concerned, that amendment meant what it said. We upheld the hands of the President and we supported the position he took when he sent more troops into Vietnam.

We believe that the only way to achieve peace, unless we want to surrender our freedom, is to have the people of this Nation and of other free nations stand together against Communist aggression wherever it occurs in the world.

We believe that to yield a single country to the insatiable desires of world communism to take over the world merely makes an eventual nuclear war more inevitable. In the last analysis the only way for peace, and I believe it to be the judgment of most people in Government—I know that represents the majority view in both the Senate and House of Representatives—is that we must stand firm against aggression. Where we have made a firm stand, we have been successful.

I discussed this subject before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at their opening session some time back. I said this:

This goal to save the freedom of the world without fighting a war of extermination is possible if we do three things:

1. Convince our adversaries of our determination to hold what we have on our side—in other words—convince them that we will do whatever is necessary, including nuclear warfare before we will surrender anybody anywhere.

2. Convince them that we have the ability to fight through to victory if they are so foolish as to engage in an all-out war.

3. Meet force with greater force wherever they insist upon being shown.

We are doing all three of these things today.

The point where we are experiencing our greatest difficulty is the first one—convincing our adversary of our determination in Vietnam.

We are losing brave men every day and risking a broader war to demonstrate our determination that not one additional free country shall be swallowed by the Communist conspiracy—not if we can prevent it.

Yet modern-day appeasers and isolationists are making our task difficult.

Every day they make speeches and engage in some sort of irresponsible student rally.

Our Communist allies are led to believe that we will surrender all of Asia to them without a nuclear showdown if they will just keep up the pressure.

So long as our enemies suspect that this may be the case, they are going to pay an increasingly greater price to test our will.

Therefore I have no doubt that our losses in Vietnam will increase so long as anyone suspects that the handful of Senators and Congressmen and the bearded beatniks with the peace-at-any-price placards represent anything more than a small poorly regarded fragment of American thinking.

Here is where the individual can make his greatest contribution today by supporting the position of his Government.

When you stand up for liberty and against Communist slavery, you encourage your representatives to stand up and they encourage the rest of the world to stand up.

Our friends of Britain have 50,000 men in the Pacific to the south of us.

If we withdraw, then their position in the Malay States and indeed in all Asia becomes hopeless.

The same is true of Thailand and Burma. It will prove true of Pakistan and India.

While these countries urge a soft line in public, they are praying quietly that we will stand firm.

We are confronted with the same decision that faced us in 1949 when this Nation made the mistake of thinking that we could wait until the dust settled in China.

Incidentally, some of those who urge a soft line today urged the same thing at that time. They urged that we should wait until the dust settled in China. When the dust settled in China, what happened? Six hundred million people plus, behind the Iron Curtain, were working to advance communism as we know it.

I went on to say:

We reacted with resoluteness and courage to save South Korea, to save Taiwan, Japan, to stand in southeast Asia.

If we pull out now, all of Asia will be gone before the dust can settle again.

Look for a moment at what we have done. We fought a war that could have been avoided to save Europe from Nazi slavery.

We spent more than \$100 billion helping to build the strength in Europe and around the world as barriers to Communist slavery.

We have confronted the Soviet Union at Berlin, Cuba, and elsewhere successfully.

We have thrown back aggression in Korea. We have confronted Red China successfully at Taiwan, and this has made it possible for the Nationalist forces to hold Quemoy against aggression.

The lessons are simple. Where we have feared to stand fast and fight for freedom, we have suffered disaster, in Eastern Europe, in China, in Cuba.

Where we have shown a determination to stand fast and to win whatever the cost, we have prevailed.

In most cases we have prevailed by a mere show of strength.

But that strength must be real, it must be backed by the iron will to fight.

It must not be a bluff. If your adversary is ever convinced that you bluffed him successfully on one occasion, he will be better prepared and he will call your bluff next time, and the next time after that.

Daniel Webster once said, "The only people who deserve freedom are those who love it and are ready to fight for it."

This love of freedom cannot be a part-time thing.

I am prepared to say to any bearded beatnick who comes down to Washington on a summer vacation to picket the White House that he ought to be in uni-

form and out fighting to save his Nation, as some of us were doing at their ages.

I concluded by saying:

We must be constant about it, ever willing to pay the price of loving liberty even more than life.

For this, America collectively and Americans individually have stood. This is our historic role. May God grant that it will always be so.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in

adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 16, 1965:

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on May 14, 1965, of William O. Gambill to be postmaster at Gallatin in the State of Tennessee.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13449

Code 24-201 and following), as amended, shall not apply."

SEC. 304. The Board of Parole is hereby directed to review the sentence of any prisoner who, before the enactment of this Act, was made ineligible for parole by section 7237(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and (1) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to marihuana or (2) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to narcotic drugs and had not attained his 26th birthday prior to such conviction. After conducting such review the Board of Parole may authorize the release of such prisoner on parole pursuant to section 4202 of title 18, United States Code. If the Board of Parole finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that such prisoner may benefit from the treatment provided under the Federal Youth Corrections Act (18 U.S.C. Chapter 402), it may place such prisoner in the custody of the Youth Corrections Division of the Board of Parole for treatment and supervision pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Action taken by the Board of Parole under this section shall not cause any prisoner to serve a longer term than would be served under his original sentence.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (58 Stat. 698; 68 Stat. 80; 70 Stat. 622; 42 U.S.C. 257), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 341(a). The Surgeon General is authorized to provide for the confinement, care, protection, treatment, and discipline of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming narcotic drugs who are civilly committed to treatment or convicted of offenses against the United States and sentenced to treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, addicts who are committed to the custody of the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act, addicts who voluntarily submit themselves for treatment, and addicts convicted of offenses against the United States and who are not sentenced to treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, including persons convicted by general courts-martial and consular courts. Such care and treatment shall be provided at hospitals of the Service especially equipped for the accommodation of such patients or elsewhere where authorized under other provisions of law, and shall be designed to rehabilitate such persons, to restore them to health, and, where necessary, to train them to be self-supporting and self-reliant, but nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to limit the authority of the Surgeon General under other provisions of law to provide for the conditional release of patients and aftercare under supervision.

(b) Upon the admittance to, and departure from, a hospital of the Service of a person who voluntarily submitted himself for treatment pursuant to the provisions of this section, and who at the time of his admittance to such hospital was a resident of the District of Columbia, the Surgeon General shall furnish to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent, the name, address, and such other pertinent information as may be useful in the rehabilitation to society of such person."

SEC. 402. The Surgeon General and the Attorney General are authorized to give representatives of States and local subdivisions thereof the benefit of their experience in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts so that each State may be encouraged to provide adequate facilities and personnel for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts in its jurisdiction.

SEC. 403. The table of contents to "Part III.—Prisons and Prisoners" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "313. Mental defectives * * *

4241" a new chapter reference as follows: "314. Narcotic addicts * * * 4251".

SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 405. Title I of this Act shall take effect three months after the date of its enactment and shall apply to any case pending in a district court of the United States in which an appearance has not been made prior to such effective date. Titles II and III of this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment and shall apply to any case pending in any court of the United States in which sentence has not yet been imposed as of the date of enactment.

SEC. 406. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of transmittal accompanying the administration recommendation, signed by the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes.

At the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, September 1962, many representatives concluded that a procedure should be established under which addicts convicted of a violation of law could be dealt with in better ways than are now available. Further, it was agreed that the penalty structure for sentencing narcotic and marihuana offenders should be modified. These views were reiterated in the final report of the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, November 1963. In addition, these recommendations were supported by the President in his special message to the Congress on "Crime, Its Prevalence, and Measures of Prevention," dated March 8, 1965. The enclosed legislative proposal would implement the recommendations of the Conference, the Commission, and the President.

Basically, title I of the legislation would establish a procedure through which a narcotic addict charged with a criminal offense could be civilly committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment in lieu of facing criminal prosecution on the charge against him. This would be accomplished by the court when it has reason to believe him to be an addict and also has reason to believe he is likely to be rehabilitated by proper treatment. In such an instance, the court could afford the defendant the option to elect to submit to a physical examination by the Surgeon General to determine whether he is in fact an addict. If, upon receiving the report of the Surgeon General and his recommendation as to whether the defendant should be civilly committed, the court directs such commitment, the criminal charge is held in abeyance pending the successful completion of institutional and aftercare treatment. At that time the charge would be dismissed, but if before that time the defendant is found unresponsive or uncooperative in treatment, the civil commit-

ment may be terminated and the criminal proceedings resumed.

Since a defendant must elect within 5 days after his first appearance in court whether to submit himself to an examination which might result in a civil commitment, this procedure not only provides an opportunity to get at what may be one of the underlying causes of criminal activity, but it has the significant advantage of swiftly effecting the removal from the streets of addicts who may be restored to useful citizenship.

Title II of the proposed legislation would amend title 18 of the United States Code to add a chapter providing for the indeterminate sentencing of narcotic addicts to treatment following conviction for criminal activity. As with title I, this title would provide a program of comprehensive treatment for addicts placed in the custody of the Attorney General after conviction.

Both the civil commitment procedure and the procedure for sentencing to treatment following conviction require as a condition to their use that the court find a person charged with a criminal offense is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated by treatment. Furthermore, in both instances, safeguards are provided to assure that uncooperative or unresponsive individuals will not be released, or if already released, they will be returned to institutional custody. Further, if such individuals had been committed under title I, they would face prosecution on the pending charge. Treatment procedures have been limited to exclude from their applicability certain persons who sell narcotic drugs, persons with repeated felony convictions, and other persons who are not considered suitable subjects for treatment and rehabilitation. Both facets of the legislation provide for institutional treatment and supervisory aftercare following release from confinement. In civil commitment the Surgeon General, and in commitment following conviction the Attorney General, would be authorized to contract with appropriate public or private agencies or persons for the supervisory aftercare. It is thus expected that local community personnel and facilities will play a significant role in this aspect of the treatment program.

Title III of the legislation would modify certain exclusionary features of the Young Adult Offenders Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-752, 72 Stat. 845) by making any narcotic drug or marihuana offender over the age of 22 and under the age of 26 eligible to receive an indeterminate sentence and conditional release under the Federal Youth Corrections Act. However, it would retain the provision that suspended sentence and probation shall not be available under the Federal Youth Corrections Act to offenders convicted of certain narcotics or marihuana offenses which require mandatory penalties.

The title would also amend section 103 of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 (Public Law 84-728, 70 Stat. 567) by making the provisions of parole under section 4202 of title 18, United States Code, and the act of July 15, 1932 (47 Stat. 696; D.C. Code 24-201 and following), as amended, available to all marihuana offenders.

In addition, it would permit the Board of Parole to review the sentences of prisoners who now stand convicted of marihuana offenses and prisoners convicted of a violation of a law relating to narcotic drugs who had not attained the age of 26 at the time of conviction. The Board would be authorized to release such persons on parole or place them under the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act as may be deemed suitable.

This title would permit greater latitude in handling certain violators when deemed necessary to individualize rehabilitative treatment, and at the same time leave intact the overall deterrent characteristics of the

mandatory penalties contained in the Narcotic Control Act of 1956.

In summary, the enclosed proposal represents a creative approach to accomplish what was implicit in the President's statement that it is essential to "seek to the fullest extent consistent with the public safety to give offenders a maximum opportunity for return to a normal life." Through the joint efforts of the courts and medical, correctional, and legal authorities, it is hoped that this legislation will be a key toward the rehabilitation of a substantial number of persons charged with crime and their resumption of productive places in society.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Secretary of the Treasury.

Attorney General.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] without losing my right to the floor.

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

FE ~~VA~~ Hart
VIETNAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last night, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], thoughtfully voiced his evaluation of the situation in Vietnam.

I listened. At the speech's conclusion, I intended to make a brief comment. However, discussion resumed on the pending business, the excise tax reduction bill, and I was reluctant to interrupt.

Today, I wish to express my appreciation. In listening to the speech, and later in reading it, I was struck by the responsible, prudent analysis of an admittedly difficult dilemma.

The distinguished Senator has the admirable ability to sort out the essentials of a problem without oversimplification.

There have been many persons across the land, during these months of common concern, who have spoken with the limitless confidence and absolute certainty that almost implies some sort of divine guidance. I might envy them, but I do not find that I can often agree with them.

The thoughtful man considering a complex problem finds that judgments must be based on an intricate balance of the bad against the less bad, and the good against the greater good.

The Senator from Arkansas has made these judgments and has arrived at what seems to me to be an excellent set of recommendations. His tone, and his evaluations offer the best promise of a safe passage for this country.

The speech must give the President of the United States—who in each hour of these past months has borne this burden—great comfort.

I anticipate that in coming weeks the speech will be subject to a great deal of analysis, and will doubtlessly come under attack by those who hold more extreme views.

It will be criticized because it was a thoughtful speech, and thoughtfulness is often mistaken for indecisiveness. It was a sensitive speech, and sensitivity is often mistaken for weakness.

But I believe that the distinguished Senator's point of view is a logical one—so much so that when anyone asks to know my position on Vietnam, I intend to answer simply: "Read the Fulbright speech."

OPPOSITION TO MAKING THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY A MILITARY AGENCY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in South Vietnam we have seen another takeover of the civilian government by the military in the last few days. This is the second time this year that the military leaders have there usurped the power of the civilian leaders, dominating not only the necessary military offensive against the Vietcong, but dominating as well the entire nation.

The Dominican crisis has its close parallels insofar as the domination by a powerful military group is concerned, bent on the overthrow of the civil authority.

In Egypt we have the long-standing domination of Colonel Nasser, who rose to power because he had power as a military officer, with the backing of his friends in the military establishment.

The dictator of Spain, Francisco Franco, in power these many years, was likewise a military man who seized control and who has never yet relinquished to civilian democratic processes the power which he then gained.

One could likewise call the roll of Latin American governments, living under the banner of a republican form legally and constitutionally established, which have over the years fallen, and sometimes repeatedly, to the dominance of a military clique, a clique which has felt that its military traditions of autocratic authority gave it qualifications to exercise that same autocratic domination in civil affairs.

Should one call the roll of history, examples would likewise be multiplied.

I believe, Mr. President, that history furnishes us with sufficient examples, reinforced by the experience of many a nation in our own time, so that one might state as an approximation to truth a paraphrase of an ancient verdict of Scripture, "Where there is no vision, the people perish"—"Where there is no civilian government, the people's liberty is endangered."

We in this Nation have been richly blessed by the heritage of wisdom with which our Founding Fathers were endowed. They saw the dangers lying within the very nature of the military leader, who by the essence of the military structure must become not only a leader but an autocratic leader, who in his very psychology of command so easily develops the psychology that he was born to command, to command not only within the military structure but within the totality of the Nation, giving orders as a benevolent dictator rather than

taking the slow democratic route of consensus granted by fellow citizens. It was George Washington who warned against "those overgrown military establishments which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

Or, to quote from that great predecessor document of the Constitution, the Virginia Declaration of Rights—adopted at Williamsburg almost exactly 189 years ago, on June 12, 1776—"that, in all cases, the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power."

One of the grievances set forth in the Declaration of Independence, whose adoption followed the Virginia Declaration by only 3 weeks and a day, was that "the present King of Great Britain has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power."

The State of New York in the document with which its delegates, "having maturely considered the Constitution for the United States of America," gave their ratification to our basic document over the signature of George Clinton on July 26, 1788, included a statement of principles, many of which were later embodied in the Bill of Rights. Among them was this:

Standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, and ought not to be kept up, except in cases of necessity; and that at all time, the military should be under strict subordination to the civil power.

Mr. President, I have spoken on this topic before, on Thursday last, and at greater length than I shall do today. But I believe it is in the best interests of our Nation, in accord with the expressed desire of the Founding Fathers and our long traditions, in harmony with the thought of many of our great modern leaders, and in keeping with the law as passed by the Congress as recently as 1958, that we should maintain the dominance of our civilian leadership in high posts of government by voting down a bill soon to be called up from the calendar, S. 1900.

The majority leader has indicated that this will be the pending business tomorrow after the consideration of a resolution.

The bill would set aside the express requirement of the Federal Aviation Act that its Administrator should be a civilian. It would breach the wall of separation between civilian and military, which is no less a necessity to our form of government than the wall of separation between church and state, and which has an equally ancient and wise relationship to our oldest traditions. Passing this bill would punch a hole in the dike beyond which lies the sea of military domination from which flood waters have poured in to inundate the civilian governments of South Vietnam, of the Dominican Republic, of Castro's Cuba in its prostrate dictatorship, of Spain, of other nations ruled by those who, as military leaders, have set themselves up as the indispensable men.

This, it may be said, would be only a little hole in the dike.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13455

has the respect of all who worked for him. The son of a country doctor, whom he often quoted in making decisions—and he made many of the most important ones that had to do with the security of the United States.

General McKee is the kind of man who has volunteered to give up his pension rights if he felt the Congress of the United States thought that would be the right thing to do. I do not believe in punishing a man, just because he did not go into banking or politics. I do not believe that a man should lose his retirement pay just because he continues to serve his government at the request of his President.

If he takes this position, he will take a reduction in pay, because under the law he loses, after the first \$2,000, 50 percent of his retirement pay.

Nobody has questioned his ability. Nobody could question the administrative capacity of W. F. McKee. It is known throughout this town.

Tonight the name of John F. Kennedy has been mentioned. When Gen. Curtis LeMay was out of the country, General McKee took his place, representing him on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our late beloved President told me several times of his tremendous respect for the capacity, wisdom, and managerial ability of the nominee for this position.

I believe that the decision is a simple one: Having served his country long and faithfully—in the uniform of the United States—does he accept the new and vitally important position with the good will of the Congress, or will we decide to punish him and reduce his pay in order that he may continue the magnificent service that every man in South Vietnam and every man in this body who wants to study his record knows he has rendered to his country?

Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his invariable courtesy in permitting me to make these brief remarks tonight. I shall speak on this matter further tomorrow, but I would hope, inasmuch as the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has seen fit to attack the appointment recommended by the President, he will possibly rearrange his plans.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am in a difficult position. Mrs. Morse is visiting an injured friend, and I wish to join her.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to get to my speech—

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to make a very short statement in defense of the Senator from Montana, who is in the chair. I believe that it is fair to say that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] did not attack the nomination. I am not attacking the nomination. The truth is that—

Mr. MORSE. I have only a very short speech. I must go to the hospital with Mrs. Morse to see an injured friend.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield me one moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana wish me to yield for only 1 minute?

Mr. METCALF. One minute.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana for 1 minute.

Mr. METCALF. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] that last fall I promised the people of Montana that there would be a hearing in Montana on the Bureau of Land Management approach to some of the mining claims situations under the so-called Engle law.

Tomorrow, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I are going out to conduct that hearing.

It has been long established. It is a matter of great concern to the people of the State of Montana. I have asked the majority leader to put this over. I have told him of my concern, as I say, to the Senator from Missouri. I do not know General McKee. I have no grudge against him.

The only point I wish to make is the point that the Senator from Indiana has made, that this is a civil Government, and that it should be kept under civilian control. I know that the Senator from Missouri wants that. I am very sorry that I cannot be here tomorrow to talk about this very important and very significant nomination, which is far more important than General McKee, far more important than who is going to be head of the Federal Aviation Agency, a matter which has come down to us from the time the Constitution was established.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask the Senator from Montana if he will be good enough, when he returns, to read what I have had to say. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Montana is most welcome.

FE ——— VN ——— Morse
VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in speaking yesterday about our difficulties in Vietnam, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] prefaced his conclusions with a reference to what he calls our policy of seeking the end to the war at the earliest possible time by a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides.

Surely, that is a strange and novel interpretation of our policy in Vietnam. It is not the policy stated over and over again by the Secretary of State, when he declares repeatedly that it is our policy to make North Vietnam and China stop interfering with their neighbors. Secretary Rusk has said many times that this is the purpose of our bombing—to make

North Vietnam stop giving alleged aid to the rebels, and presumably to warn China that the same treatment is in store for her if she aids them to any degree.

I do not doubt that the President and his administration would like to hear a favorable response to their statements that we would negotiate with China and with North Vietnam, but not with the Vietcong who, of course, are the enemy. Such a position enables the United States to take a public posture in favor of negotiations without any real chance that the offer might lead to negotiations.

But never in any presentation in public or in private have I heard any indication from administration spokesmen that this country is ready, right now, to sit down with the Vietcong, and to make major concessions in return for major concessions on their part. If that is indeed the policy of this Government, then the Senator from Arkansas must have been told something at the White House that no one else has been told.

It seems to be the view of the Senator from Arkansas, and the view of the administration, that our offer to negotiate with the nonenemy is a mark of our national benevolence. But I wonder how benevolent we are to the people of Vietnam. It is our power and our money and our military might that continues the war in Vietnam. It is our napalm that burns them, and that destroys their meager possessions. I do not know of any weapon, or any terror of the Vietcong that has destroyed as much in South Vietnam as U.S. aircraft have destroyed.

All in the name of benevolent persuasion. But we are not persuading the Vietcong to negotiate by such means, any more than our air attacks on the north have persuaded the North Vietnamese to negotiate.

It would appear from the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas that he expects some kind of negotiating to be done while the war continues. This would be in the pattern of the French wars in Indochina and in Algeria. It can only be deduced that the Senator from Arkansas, and presumably the administration, have the same thing in mind.

That is not the same as stopping the war pending a political negotiation. This is why I am not impressed with the recital of the ways and means whereby we have sounded out China and North Vietnam about negotiations. The Senator from Arkansas mentions their rejection of the Indian proposal for an Afro-Asian peace force. He says we were ready to discuss it, but it was rejected by North Vietnam and China.

I do not know why we believe we must have their agreement on how to stop the war. We could have taken up the Shastri proposal whether our "nonenemies" approved it or not. An Afro-Asian peace force does not need the approval of China or North Vietnam in order to separate the warring factions in South Vietnam and pacify the area.

The eternal excuse that North Vietnam and China reject this or that is only an excuse for the continuation of the war.

The way to stop the war is to bring in a peacekeeping mission. It could be

Afro-Asian; it could be the United Nations; it could even be SEATO.

I also point out that there is no approval from China, at least, needed for countrywide elections in Vietnam, as called for by the Senator from Arkansas. We could call for them right now. We could see that representatives of South Vietnam do what they refused to do in 1955 and 1956—in which we played such an ugly part in preventing—and that is meet with representatives of the north to fix the time and conditions for countrywide elections.

Mr. President, let the RECORD show again that the United States more than any other force in the world prevented the application of the principle of self-determination in Vietnam in 1956.

I was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee then, as I am now, and I listened to the intelligence reports of my Government. Why did we join in blocking that election? We joined in blocking it because our intelligence reports showed that Ho Chi Minh would be elected President of both North and South Vietnam and would bring about a united Vietnam as provided for in the Geneva accords, with a vote of at least 80 percent in South Vietnam.

I have listened to no evidence which would lead anyone to believe that Ho Chi Minh would not receive 80 percent of the vote in South Vietnam tomorrow. He is still a most popular figure in both North and South Vietnam.

However, our Government does not wish to face that fact because we cannot reconcile it with the warmaking propaganda with which this Government is flooding the country, and misleading and confusing the American people as a result.

I entirely share the view of the Senator from Arkansas that a complete victory that enables us to impose a peace upon southeast Asia would cost this country infinitely more than it would be worth, if it could be done at all. In the end we would be happy to settle for a return to the original 1954 agreement, including the reunification of Vietnam under whatever government its people choose in supervised elections.

Let us not forget that the Geneva accords provide for supervision of that election by the International Commission that was set up by the accords themselves, consisting of a representative from Canada, Poland, and India. Of course, we could do that now. There is nothing to prevent the United States from supporting a movement from an election now.

But we could do that now. If we wait for China to approve everything we do in Indochina, we will either have to exterminate her with nuclear bombs or fight forever in Indochina.

I greatly fear that the events of recent months and years do not bear out the hopes of Senator FULBRIGHT that by digging in and stalemating the ground war in the South, a time will then come when negotiations will result. We were engaged in a stalemated struggle before February. But people became too impatient; it was decided that we could speed things up by bombing North Viet-

nam, and thereby forcing them into negotiations.

That policy was an utter failure, if that was its objective at all.

Now the Senator from Arkansas proposes that we go back to the stalemate on the ground, only now it will be a stalemated fight carried out on one side by Americans, and on the other side by Asians.

One of the most disappointing things about the Fulbright speech was that he proposed that we keep on killing until after the monsoon is over, that we keep on bombing, and that we continue to make war. Does anyone think that will hasten the day for negotiations? That will increase the hatred against the United States in Asia for more years to come.

I would like to have heard the Senator from Arkansas propose that we stop our bombing. As I have asked so many times on the floor of the Senate, when will this administration give the American people whatever information it can give in regard to the people we are killing in North Vietnam? There is much talk about bombing bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps and roads, but not one word about the human beings we are killing.

We do not proceed to declare war against North Vietnam. That is what the Constitution calls for, if we are to make war. Yet we have a President who continues to act unconstitutionally by conducting a war in North Vietnam without a declaration of war, and a Congress which in two resolutions has exceeded its constitutional authority by attempting to give the President power to make war without declaring war, as article I, section 8 of the Constitution calls for.

I see no prospect whatsoever that any negotiations will result from a situation like that, either. I cannot imagine that the Pentagon or even the public will long be satisfied with such a condition. Many of us are receiving mail from servicemen in Vietnam, complaining that they are forgotten, abandoned, and lacking the material support from home that would, in their words, "Put an end to the war." Each escalation, each new increment of forces, brings more complaints from our soldiers that they need more air support, more firepower, and more troops. Even professional soldiers, as most of them are, are not going to settle for a war which they believe, however erroneously, could be won by a greater military effort. They are not interested in hopes that eventually the other side will be ready to negotiate. The Pentagon won out when it came to bombing North Vietnam, and it will win out when the next decisions are made of how to prosecute the war.

The State Department surrendered to the Pentagon. McNamara became the de facto Secretary of State. He has been in control of American foreign policy in Asia for many months.

So I say the Pentagon won out when it came to bombing North Vietnam, and will win out when the next decisions are made of how to prosecute the war, and we are going in deeper and deeper, and

more blood will be let and more Asians and more Americans will be killed in a completely unnecessary, shocking, unjustifiable war, in contradiction to all our professed ideals about being a nation of peace and a believer in the rule of law. There is all the difference in the world between our talk and our action. Usually we recognize that when there is a difference between talk and action, the result is hypocrisy.

That is why around the world the United States is being charged with hypocritical actions in South Vietnam and North Vietnam, and we are guilty, and history will so record.

That is why I continue to say that the problem is not one of forcing the other side—however that term may be defined—into negotiations. The problem is to stop the war.

I know it is a novelty to diplomats and international politicians to think in terms other than the traditional ones of direct action. There is not a nation in the world that has yet thought of its own international relations in terms of international bodies created to keep the peace. India, Pakistan, Turkey, the Soviet Union, Greece, Cyprus, Portugal, the Arab countries, Israel, and above all, the United States, despite their membership in the United Nations and in regional organizations which lay claim to peace-keeping functions, all ignore these organizations when their own national interests are involved.

So today our Government is not thinking about what world agency may be used to stop the fighting. It is only thinking about how much old style force it will take to bring about old style negotiations. To make war, and then to negotiate a peace—those are the traditional ways of military and diplomatic thinking.

It is sad to find that even this country, which has given more lip service to international law and to the purposes of the United Nations than any other, has no more understanding of their use in matters affecting itself than has any country in the world, including Communist China. Insofar as a matter affects the United States in Indochina, or the Dominican Republic, we have no more appreciation of the use of the United Nations than does Communist China in the matters affecting her.

In my opinion, the world is long past the stage where it can rely upon national judgments of when to press an adversary with military power in the hopes of reaching negotiations.

We must find the means of using some peace force in Indochina, or we will never reach the negotiating stage.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate two Senators, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] made the plea again that the senior Senator from Oregon has been making for almost 2 years on the floor, that the United States ought to resort to the United Nations, that the United States ought to keep its commitments under the United Nations Charter. The fact that our allies have run out on their obligations under the charter does not justify our actions.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13457

The press carries the information that shortly the President of the United States will journey to San Francisco for a ceremony memorializing the birth of the United Nations.

It we are not careful, he will be attending the funeral of the United Nations. There is no nation in the world more responsible for the weakened condition of the United Nations today than is the United States.

The United States has broken its bond with the United Nations as a result of its outlawry in Asia, violating the Geneva accords time and time again, violating article after article of the United Nations time and time again.

I recommend to my President that he go not to San Francisco, but to New York City. I recommend to my President that he exercise the prerogative of the United States under the charter to call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I recommend to my President that he walk out on the historic platform in New York City under the roof of that great temple of international justice and rule of law and say to the world, "At long last the United States is ready to lay this threat to the peace of the world in Asia before the United Nations for its determination and handling, and the United States pledges to the United Nations its wholehearted support to help carry out the program that the United Nations could very well work out for keeping the peace in Asia and enforcing the peace."

In my judgment, neither Red China, North Vietnam, nor any combination of Communist powers would ever defy the united action of 80, 85, 90, 95, or 100 nations, members of the United Nations, that at long last will wake up to the fact that they have a great moral obligation to bring this war to an end. The war cannot be brought to an end by any proposal from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or any combination of groups in the United States for bilateral negotiations between the United States, North Vietnam, and Red China. There is no chance of it. They have no intention of surrendering to the United States.

But should we let a third party, a noncombatant force representing the United Nations, sit at the head of a proposed international conference table, we would have a chance to negotiate a peace. If we do not take advantage of that opportunity—if Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, and all of our allies do not take advantage of this opportunity—the danger is that mankind will continue marching toward the abyss of a nuclear war.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is the only hope left. If it can be done through a 14-nation convening, fine. If it can be done through making use of any of the other existing treaties that provide for joint action in maintaining the peace, fine. The difficulty with the U.S. action is that it is unilateral. We make nice-sounding offers. We deliver speeches with idealistic phraseology in them. But the United States has not been willing to

resort to the procedures of the United Nations for a complete jurisdictional takeover of the war in Asia.

We must find means of using some peace force in Indochina or we shall never reach the negotiating stage and we shall continue to send increasing thousands of American boys to Asia. We have heard the last and most recent step of this administration announced by the Secretary of Defense from the Pentagon this afternoon. I would have the reservationists in the Senate read the announcement of the Secretary of Defense this afternoon and try to reconcile it with speeches made on the floor of the Senate by Senator after Senator when there was before us not so long ago the bill sent up by the President to provide an additional sum of \$700 million to fight a war in Asia. Although, as I pointed out in my answer to the proponents of the bill, the President, admitted that he did not need the money and admitted that he had the power to transfer funds, he also frankly and honestly said to the Congress of the United States, "I am asking for your vote on this bill because we shall interpret it as to whether or not you give me a vote of confidence in continuing my policies in Asia."

I shall always be proud that I voted against the measure, one of three Senators, because I shall not give him a vote of confidence in the unjustifiable, unilateral military action that the United States is taking in violation of both our Constitution and our treaty obligations as I outlined them only a few moments ago.

This afternoon thousands more of American boys, it was announced, will go to Asia. Some of the reservationists in their speeches on the floor of the Senate, thinking that this alibi and this rationalization would give them some excuse back home, got up and said—and let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak for itself—"Mr. President, I want it understood that when I vote for the bill this afternoon I am not giving the President a blank check." Some of them said, "I want it understood that when I vote for this measure I am not approving the sending of more troops in any numbers to Asia. I expect to be consulted."

Those statements sounded good, did they not? I replied to them in that debate—and let the RECORD speak for itself—by saying, "I want to say to you reservationists that you are being consulted right now, and this is the last consultation that you will get from the President of the United States before he sends more troops to Asia."

Mr. President, it was not 96 hours after those reservationists voted again to approve of the exercise of an unconstitutional power by the President of the United States that this administration announced that more thousands of boys would go to Asia. Let the RECORD speak for itself.

After the announcement was made by the administration, I took the floor of the Senate and said to those reservationists, "Were you consulted? If any of you were consulted, tell me that you were consulted."

Of course, they were not consulted. Tonight on the floor of the Senate I ask

the following question; and I shall welcome an answer to it from any Senator in this body tomorrow: "Were you consulted before McNamara announced this afternoon that thousands more boys are to be sent to Asia?" And let us face the ugly and awful reality—a large number of them will die in Asia.

Of course they were not consulted.

Mr. President, the sad fact is that in the United States of America today the military is running away with this Government. The sad fact is that in the United States today the military is determining American foreign policy in Asia.

All I can do is to repeat what I have said so many times: "America, wake up. American public opinion, wake up."

To the American people I say, "Start holding your Government to an accounting. Make clear to your Government that you are not sanctioning this killing in Asia, and that you want to see peace restored to the world."

I hold in my hand—and would that it could be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a cartoon printed in one of the most courageous little newspapers in America. I spoke about this newspaper the day before yesterday on the floor of the Senate. It is the Gazette & Daily, of York, Pa. That newspaper courageously has opposed the President's policy in Asia. I said the other day that that newspaper, along with the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Knight papers, the New York Times, and a few other newspapers, have really been defending the right of a free press as some of us have been defending the right of free speech in the historic discussions in opposition to the warmaking policies of the United States in Asia. But this cartoon catches my eye and my fancy. Its heading is, "Yes, there is a way out." The cartoon shows war clouds and lightning strikes. It is labeled "Vietnam Civil War." It shows an American citizen holding a newspaper headed "Killing." But there is a road sign pointing in the opposite direction from the warmaking which reads, "United Nations Approach to Peace."

Mr. President, as I said the other day, and repeat tonight, I am satisfied that at the grassroots of America there is growing concern about the failure of the present administration to resort to its obligations under existing treaties.

When in a packed Madison Square Garden I addressed more than 18,000 fellow Americans the other evening, together with other speakers, and closed my appeal by urging that my Government make use of the procedures of the United Nations, it started a demand in that mass meeting for a march on the United Nations Building. I said in closing that speech that we were meeting within a few blocks of the great international temple of international law and peace. I made my plea that our Government make use of the procedures available within that temple of international justice.

A demand developed for a march on the United Nations Building. At 20 minutes before midnight that march started, two by two, efficiently handled by the New York police, who had only a little

more than an hour to get ready for the march. More than 2,500 fellow Americans, including a good cross-section of our citizenry, and including a considerable number of members of the clergy, marched down Broadway and across 42d Street to the Plaza of the United Nations, where at 1 o'clock in the morning a second rally was held, and many hundreds joined the more than 2,500 who had started from Madison Square Garden.

Last Saturday night, speaking at Santa Monica, Calif., in the Civic Auditorium, without an empty seat, as speaker after speaker, including the senior Senator from Oregon, made a plea for the use of the procedures of the United Nations, that audience left no room for doubt of its disapproval of the failure of our Government to resort to the rule of law instead of practicing the jungle law of the military mind in the jungles of Vietnam.

There is no language of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense, or the Bundys, or the Taylors, or the Lodges, or the President himself, that can change the obligation of this country to stop making war and to start calling upon other countries of the world to join in keeping the peace. So I dissociate myself from any suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that we ought to continue to bomb; that we ought to continue to kill; that we ought to continue military operations until after the monsoon season. I am convinced that if we follow that course of action, which can best be described as barbarism, we shall be further from the peace table at the end of the monsoon season than we are now.

Increasing numbers of American soldiers will be dead before the end of the monsoon season. But not only American soldiers; other human beings, as well, whose skin color is yellow. But they, too, are the children of God.

"UPWARD BOUND"—THE WAR ON TALENT WASTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had the privilege this noon to participate in a conference at the Office of Economic Opportunity, when a really great American and, I think, remarkable statesman, the head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Sargent Shriver, made what I consider to be not only an inspirational but a significant announcement in connection with the educational problem that confronts us as a part of the educational crisis. Mr. Shriver announced the beginning of the program upward bound. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire press release that Mr. Shriver presented to the group of educators who came from all over the country, including college presidents, deans, and administrators, and members of the press, as well.

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

SHRIVER OPENS WAR ON TALENT WASTE

A new national campaign to halt America's greatest waste was opened today by Sargent Shriver, Director of the Nation's war on poverty.

"America's greatest waste," according to Shriver, "is the loss of skill and exceptional minds of those young people who are capable of going to college, but cannot do so because of the psychological, social and physical conditions of poverty."

Seventeen colleges have joined in a giant talent hunt this summer to discover youngsters in this category and get them upward bound. The Office of Economic Opportunity has made initial grants to these colleges of \$2.2 million.

Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity, supported by leading educators, and the U.S. Office of Education will attack on a wide front the problems that bar hundreds of thousands of potentially talented young Americans from making use of exceptional minds and skills.

"Among the estimated 300,000 potentially capable young people who are being needlessly tossed on the scrap heap of unemployable surplus labor each year, there are surely great doctors, great scientists, great leaders whose talents may never see the light of day," Shriver said.

"Through the combined effort of the Federal Government and dedicated educators we intend to see that they get this chance. This is the most that the people of this Nation can do for themselves, and the least they can do for the deprived youth of America."

Named upward bound, the new program: Will seek out the potentially talented youth from among the underachievers, those whose poverty background lacks motivation for academic study, and those who suffer from the cultural bias of tests and educational materials that are directed toward middle class students; develop new testing methods, and new teaching materials to awaken the desire to learn in disadvantaged youngsters; put the disadvantaged youth in contact with people who really care; develop transitional programs and other supplemental services in both high schools and private schools and universities to help intelligent disadvantaged youngsters who are not producing at or near their maximum potential.

The 1965 summer program announced by Shriver is expected to increase knowledge about the relationship between upward bound and the youngsters, and to furnish guidelines in the areas of selection, appropriate curricular material, staffing and evaluation.

A special committee of leading educators, headed by Dr. Arthur Fleming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and president of the University of Oregon, will assist in organizing the broad, long-range program. Members of the committee will be announced at a later date.

"We plan to explore all the problems, test all the possibilities," Shriver said. "And we will do this with all the speed and energy that a program vital to the national interest deserves."

The pilot upward bound programs announced today include:

Educational Service Inc.: A leading educational research and development organization, ESI hopes to develop new learning materials for the disadvantaged and train teachers in their use. Centers in the program are located at Fisk University, Dillard University, Howard University, Texas Southern University, Webster College, and Morehouse College.

University of Oregon: Some 75 students, none of whom now meet university admission standards, will be enrolled in a special 8-week summer program. Those success-

fully completing the course will be enrolled in the university as special students.

Columbia University: Columbia College students will actively participate in the teaching of 160 ninth graders to measure what can be done for students with special attention from a teacher. Achievement levels of the 160 youngsters will be compared with youths who did not participate in the project.

Western Washington State College: 50 high school juniors will be enrolled in an intensive summer course, then make periodic return visits to the campus throughout their senior year. New methods and educational materials will be tested, and the achievement of the 50 students will be compared to 50 students who did not participate in the project.

Ripon College: A program involving 30 students, an 8-week summer course will emphasize special assistance to youngsters of Indian descent. Selection will be made on the basis of recommendations of principals, teachers, counselors, and social workers.

New Mexico Highlands: High school seniors who have already been accepted for college, but whose academic records indicate that, without extra help, they will become drop-outs, will be enrolled in an 8-week course.

Tuskegee Institute: Although this is not specifically an upward bound program, some of its goals are much the same as the related projects. Some 600 college students involved in the work-study program will provide special tutorial assistance to 9,900 low-income high school students in 11 counties of Alabama.

Independent schools talent search (previously funded): The OEO is supporting 45 9th grade boys who will attend Dartmouth College and 35 9th grade girls who will attend Mount Holyoke College. Under this program those students who successfully complete the intensive academic curriculum in math and English at these colleges will be admitted with a full scholarship to 1 of the 70 private preparatory schools which help to make up the independent schools. The success of these 100 students in these schools will be reported to OEO during the academic year. What OEO will attempt to demonstrate is that schools can and should include in their enrollment culturally disadvantaged students, who according to the usually prescribed tests are considered average or below average.

The concepts incorporated in upward bound programs that will be started this summer were tested successfully in the summer of 1964 when some of the Nation's foremost colleges and universities, some with special help from the Carnegie Foundation, independently started special motivational programs to bring higher education to disadvantaged youth.

Such institutions as Yale, Dartmouth, Princeton, Brandeis, Reed, Swarthmore, Oberlin, Carnegie Tech, and the University of California (Berkeley) reported that results exceeded original expectations.

Dartmouth and the urban school in Boston, conducting extensive tests, reported that disadvantaged students who went through their summer programs showed impressive gains in reading, achievement, and IQ scores.

Students tested before and after the summer program showed a 100-percent gain in reading comprehension, with gains ranging from 20 to 168 words per minute.

The summer programs funded by the OEO today are expected to serve as the springboard to year-round programs that are necessary to prepare low-income youngsters for the competitive business of college admission. For maximum effect, they would be integrated with other war-on-poverty efforts, including some 600 community action pro-

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13377

Mr. JACKSON. It was originally contemplated, I believe, in figuring a different total, which would have been larger, that the interest would be included in the limit on the authorization. However, upon checking, we discovered that this was not necessary, and that the interest would be paid. However, it is not necessary to include that in the ceiling.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I wish to say a word about my amendment and its purpose. For several years the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has followed a uniform policy of not making open end authorizations—a policy which I favor.

It seems to me that we should not in any instance, make open end authorizations. The distinguished chairman of the committee has agreed in this instance that the authorization be closed at a specific amount. This is the stock language which we have included in other similar reclamation bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is correct. The language of his amendment is in conformity with the precedents established by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have no objection to the amendment. It should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the measure pending, S. 1761, to authorize the construction of a third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam is of vital importance to Washington, the Pacific Northwest, and the Western United States, for that matter.

Who can tell now what home in what part of the West will be lighted, or what boy now in elementary or high school in Washington, Oregon, or Idaho will have a job 10 years from now simply because we have taken this step in providing the power for growth.

Industry soaks up electrical energy much as arid land soaks up water. In Washington, I am proud to say, we can do both. The drop of water which turns the turbine then can do double duty by helping to produce crops in the Columbia Basin reclamation project.

The experts have testified as to the importance and the value of undertaking this project now. Testimony taken by Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is full of facts.

We know the cost-to-benefit ratio of this third powerhouse at Grand Coulee is better than 3 to 1.

We know that the 12 generators planned for installation will provide 3.6 million kilowatts of installed capacity. Add this to the 2 million kilowatts of installed capacity in the two existing powerhouses and Grand Coulee's production will be about 5.6 million kilowatts. This, once again, will make Grand Coulee the world's largest power producer.

We know that our governmental officials, of both political parties, endorse this project.

As our President pointed out in his letter of endorsement:

The United States must construct additional power-generating facilities at its existing system of dams to take full advantage of this potential.

He referred, of course, to the Columbia River Treaty signed last year with Canada, and which Canada has already moved to implement through construction of huge dams to store water on its side of the border. As President Johnson pointed out, these reservoirs will provide 15.5 million acre-feet of water storage in Canada.

I am also mindful of another statement which President Johnson made in transmitting his letter of endorsement to Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by my colleague, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, and I quote:

The rapidly growing demands for electric power in the Pacific Northwest will readily absorb the power produced by the proposed powerplant. However, some of the peaking power and secondary [not regularly available] power that is surplus to the needs of the Northwest in the early years of the project can be marketed in the Pacific Southwest over the intertie.

These facts and statements are compelling. They tell us once again how we can build further, draw greater dividends, and build greater promise, through the investment which we made so wisely and well in constructing Grand Coulee Dam initially.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 314), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

Purpose of S. 1761, which is sponsored by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, of Washington, is to meet the growing power needs of the Northwest, to provide additional peaking power for the Southwest, and to enable the United States to take full advantage of the additional water storage that will be available as a result of the new Canadian Treaty proclaimed last September.

The bill would accomplish these purposes by authorizing construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in the State of Washington. This plant would add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world. The measure does not authorize nor contemplate any change in the height of the Grand Coulee Dam itself, and will have no adverse effects upon fish or irrigation.

The entire cost of the measure, estimated at \$364,310,000 will be repaid in full in 50 years, with interest, and revenues will exceed by nearly a million a year the annual amounts of such repayment.

The benefit-cost-ratio is the exceedingly favorable one of 3.24 to 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1761

An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant with a rated capacity of approximately three million six hundred thousand kilowatts, and necessary appurtenant works, including a visitor center, at Grand Coulee Dam as an addition to and an integral part of the Columbia Basin Federal Reclamation project.

(b) Construction of the third powerplant may be undertaken in such stages as in the determination of the Secretary will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the waters of the Columbia River.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the third powerplant and necessary appurtenant works including a visitor center at Grand Coulee Dam, the sum of \$364,310,000, based on estimated costs as of April 1964, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Passed the Senate June 16, 1965.

Attest:

Secretary.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FE ~~VA~~ Clark
THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for not in excess of 10 minutes.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join a number of Senators who have spoken in commendation of the important speech made on the floor of the Senate yesterday with regard to Vietnam by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

In my opinion, he has laid down a sensible Vietnam policy for our Government for the next several months—a policy with which I am in complete accord. The Senator from Arkansas has steered his course between two extremes, adopting neither the one advocated by certain Senators who think that we should get out of Vietnam unconditionally, nor the other urged by Senators who believe that we are fighting a holy war against godless communism which must be won without regard to the number of American boys who would be killed in the process.

In my opinion, the truth lies about half way between those two extremes.

In support of the speech made by the Senator from Arkansas, I ask unanimous

13378

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 16, 1965

consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an interesting column by James Reston which was published in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Washington: The Politics of Vietnam."

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

WASHINGTON: THE POLITICS OF VIETNAM
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—A sharp domestic political issue is now developing over the Nation's military strategy in Vietnam.

On one side, some Republican leaders are reverting to the Goldwater objective of total victory over the Communists, with main reliance on aerial bombardment of targets in the areas of Hanoi and Haiphong.

On the other, the administration is hoping to bring about a negotiated settlement by limited bombardment south of Hanoi and Haiphong and a limited holding action on the ground through the summer and autumn.

All the Republican leaders are not urging a more vigorous bombing campaign. The minority leader in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, is backing the President's strategy of limited pressure, but Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, chairman of the Republican conference in the House of Representatives, has figured out how to embarrass the President no matter what happens.

LAIRD'S STRATEGY

In a formal statement, he has criticized the administration for seeking a negotiated settlement, for failing to aim at total victory in Vietnam, and for using large numbers of American troops for limited ends rather than using the bombers against military targets around Haiphong.

"If our objective is a negotiated settlement," Representative LAIRD says, "it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

"One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam."

Representative LAIRD does not explain how we are going to achieve his dual objectives of limiting American casualties and "driving the Communists out of South Vietnam," but since there is a lot of support for this policy at the Pentagon, and he is addressing a clever political argument to a very political President, his case is worth analysis.

It is based on the assumption that the only trouble with our bombing campaign is that there has not been enough of it, that it will "protect American lives" if only we bomb the populous supply areas in the North within the range of the North Vietnamese fighting aircraft.

President Johnson is staying away from these precisely because he believes raiding Haiphong and Hanoi will kill a lot of civilians, produce a major invasion of the South by North Vietnamese forces, and thus tip the power balance against the Americans as well as the South Vietnamese.

FULBRIGHT'S COMPROMISE

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has recently been talking privately with President Johnson, stated the case against the Laird strategy as follows:

"I am opposed to further escalation of the war, because the bombing thus far of North Vietnam has failed to weaken the military capacity of the Vietcong in any visible way; because escalation would invite

the intervention, or infiltration, on a large scale of great numbers of North Vietnamese troops; because this in turn would probably draw the United States into a bloody and protracted jungle war in which the strategic advantages would be with the other side; and finally, because the only available alternative to such a land war would then be the further expansion of the air war to such an extent as to invite massive Chinese military intervention in many vulnerable areas of southeast Asia or general nuclear war."

Senator FULBRIGHT believes that our policy has been and should remain "one of determination to end the war at the earliest possible time by a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides." He concedes that the war will get more savage this summer and that pressures to expand the war will increase as American casualties rise. But he feels it would be better to take limited losses rather than risk an unlimited war.

Here, then, is the issue now being argued out within the administration and increasingly outside as a partisan political question. LAIRD thinks more bombing will protect American lives, FULBRIGHT thinks it will do precisely the opposite. LAIRD's objective is victory over the Communists and fewer American troops; FULBRIGHT's is a negotiated settlement through an American-supported stalemate.

Either way it is a political headache for the President. If he doesn't get a negotiated settlement he will be stuck with an unpopular war, and if he does he will be accused of appeasement. No wonder there is a look of settled melancholy on his face.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is one aspect of the speech made by the Senator from Arkansas which I should like to dwell on in a little greater detail. The Senator referred to the importance of recognizing the nationalism of the underdeveloped countries of the world as an important factor in the world international political scene. This, of course, is true. However, I should like to emphasize the prime and continuing need for more internationalism in connection with our foreign policy, and, indeed, the conduct of affairs all over the world.

I welcome the passage by the Senate this morning of the concurrent resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], which I am happy to note was cosponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] as well as by myself. The concurrent resolution was agreed to without a dissenting vote.

This resolution gives effective support to the United Nations which is about to celebrate its 20th anniversary in special ceremonies in San Francisco toward the end of this month.

I deplore the attacks which are increasingly being made on the United Nations and on the efforts of those of us who seek to bolster the United Nations in order to make it a more effective force for the maintenance of peace and the achievement of that general and complete disarmament which was made the policy of the United States of America by former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in his series of brilliant addresses in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

It has been my pleasure to be the principal sponsor, along with 25 oth-

er Senators, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, which would move the Kennedy policy of general and complete disarmament even further ahead. There were interesting hearings on this measure in the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 10th and 11th of May of this year. These hearings are now printed. I invite the attention of those interested in peace and disarmament to the contents of those hearings.

In order to indicate what the extreme rightwing thinks of these efforts to advance the cause of peace and disarmament, I ask unanimous consent that a scurrilous letter, entitled "Liberty Letter," dated June 1965, apparently coming from one of the two groups which opposed Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 at the hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DISARM PLOTTERS UNVEIL GRAND DESIGN FOR
APPEASEMENT—LEFTISTS MAY HAVE OVER-
REACHED THEMSELVES WITH WILD SCHEME

Almost unnoticed by many patriots, Senator JOE CLARK, leftwing extremist, from Pennsylvania, quietly introduced on April 8, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, titled "Planning for Peace." Twenty-five liberal Senators cosponsored it. The same resolution has been introduced in the House.

The high-sounding resolution calls on the President to "formulate as speedily as possible" plans to set up an international authority "to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament." These plans are to include:

An international disarmament organization.

A permanent world peace force.

World courts with power to "settle" international disputes.

Financial arrangements to support peace-keeping machinery.

While the "gravediggers" are putting forth their grand design for final appeasement of the Communist conspiracy, American boys are at war in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam. Is this a coincidence? Or can it be part of an overall plan to frighten the voters with threats of an atomic war and then offer them a "grand design" for peace—and surrender?

Other parts of the grand design seem to be the sudden campaign to repeal the Connally reservation which protects Americans from the reach of the World Court, the iniquitous consular treaty (scheduled for hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee soon), renewed promotion of the Genocide Treaty and the proposed firearms registration law. Given this package of tools, the appeasers will dismantle the personal security of Americans and crumble the walls of national security.

Already, the Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32. With the chairman out of the country, Senator CLARK hurriedly notified more than 20 leftist and pacifist groups to testify in favor of his own bill. He practically held the hearings alone: during 2 days only one Republican and two Democrats dropped in briefly. As for witnesses, only liberty lobby and Americans for National Security testified against the resolution.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has still to hold hearings. It is essential that patriots write now to their Congressman and Senators vocally protesting this planning-for-peace resolution. The Communists boast that they can get 50,000 fellow travelers and liberals to write to Congress on any issue. The Communists are deeply interested

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13379

in disarmament. Can Conservatives get 100,000 letters and wires to the House Foreign Affairs Committee (Dr. THOMAS MORGAN, chairman) immediately?

Send copies of your letters to your Congressman and Senators. Write now to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Dr. THOMAS MORGAN, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Send a wire to Dr. MORGAN if you can; there is a special, low rate for wires to Congress. Enlist your clubs and friends in this campaign of protest.

Remember: Your influence counts; use it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, rarely have I seen so utterly illogical and badly phrased a document as this letter, entitled "Disarm Plotters; Unveil Grand Design for Appeasement."

A well-known rightwing columnist, John Chamberlain, has written with more restraint on the subject. Nevertheless, I consider it a damaging and unjustified attack on the United Nations. His column appeared in the Washington Post for Tuesday, June 15, under the heading "The U.N. at 20." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

THESE DAYS—THE U.N. AT 20
(By John Chamberlain)

June 26 is the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The anniversary day comes at a time when the U.N. has never been more powerless to affect the behavior of nations.

The U.N. General Assembly met this year without ever daring to put anything to a vote, lest Soviet Russia, which has refused to pay its share of the bill for past peace-keeping operations, should be forced by the regulations either to pay up or be deprived of participation in Assembly decisions.

What this means is that the U.N. has no way of forcing its members to obey its own internal rules. How, then, can it make its writ effective in the world at large?

The answer is that U.N. peacekeeping has always been at the mercy of chance. The one important U.N. action, which was taken in Korea in 1950 after a Communist army had invaded South Korea from the north, came at a time when the Soviet Union had absented itself from the Security Council and so failed to use its veto.

The U.N. has had a couple of successes in preventing conflagrations in the Middle East, and it achieved a most dubious victory in the Congo by driving Moïse Tshombe out of his home Province of Katanga. But this just about completes the record of the U.N.'s peacekeeping accomplishments.

Meanwhile, terrible things have happened while the representatives of 100-odd nations talked and talked and talked in the glass house hard by the waters of Manhattan's East River. Khrushchev's tanks rumbled into Hungary in 1956 and the U.N. did nothing. When Nehru, supposedly one of the U.N.'s true believers, sent Indian troops into Portuguese Goa, there wasn't a peep out of the glass house. The Soviets moved their missiles into Cuba, and it took the eyeball-to-eyeball action of President Kennedy to do anything about that.

It was suggested at the time that the U.N. provide inspection inside Cuba to see that the missile sites had really been dismantled, but we are still waiting for that to happen. And now, as the tempo of warfare rises in Vietnam, and the OAS takes the play away from the U.N. in the Dominican Republic, the U.N.'s U Thant wrings his hands and bemoans his lack of power to do anything.

When the speechmakers converge on San Francisco a few days from now to celebrate the U.N.'s 20th anniversary, they will no doubt pay pious tribute to the world organization as "the last best hope." And, in so doing, they will be helping to perpetuate an illusion that has ruined the teaching of political science in the United States.

For a generation now American students in high school and college have been led to believe that the peace of the world can be kept by machinery, or by gimmicks, not by the will of statesmen to deploy power to the ends of making war unprofitable. Our people have had their eyes diverted from realities, and, like all dreamwalkers, they have not been able to act responsibly when confronted with crises.

This does not mean that the U.N. is useless. The business of making your diplomacy stick, and of balancing the power, is a matter of convincing others, and the U.N. offers a forum that can be just as useful as the old meetings of plenipotentiaries. But the point is that the U.N. is merely a place for a meeting of the powers, not a power in itself.

The great disservice that all the professional "friends of the U.N." have done is to confuse the categories. The schoolchildren whom they herd through the gates of the U.N. to tell them about "world government" grow up with mush in place of brains.

A lot of things will be said at San Francisco on June 26. But will anyone have the courage to come up with one honest speech?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chamberlain states as his opinion, with which I find myself in complete disagreement, that when the speechmakers converge on San Francisco a few days from now to celebrate the U.N.'s 20th anniversary, they will foolishly be paying tribute to the world organization as "the last best hope for peace."

He refers in a rather sneering way to the efforts of various peace organizations to explain to the children of America the need to turn toward some kind of internationalism if we are to avoid world destruction in a nuclear holocaust. He says that these advocates of internationalism, these "professional friends of the U.N.," as he calls them, have done a great disservice to the people of the United States. I do not believe that many persons, except those of Mr. Chamberlain's readers, who believe that the effort to create effective international institutions is an outmoded way to seek peace, feel that way, but I state on the floor of the Senate my profound disagreement with his view.

The principal aim of our foreign policy must be to support limited internationalism in the field of world peace and disarmament. There is no better way to insure the success of this policy than by seeking to bring about a detente with Soviet Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, entitled "Foreign Affairs: A Third Revolution in Russia?" by C. L. Sulzberger, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: A THIRD REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—The Soviet Union is "on the threshold of grandiose changes," on the verge of a "third revolution" which will ultimately lead in the direction of intellectual freedom

and political democracy. This is the remarkable conclusion of Mihajlo Mihajlov, the young Yugoslav professor who was recently sentenced to 9 months imprisonment for slandering Russia in two articles for a Belgrade literary magazine.

The first, published in the monthly Delo, created a stir in January.

The issue of Delo containing the second article was banned after publication and Mihajlov was subsequently tried and convicted. His third article was never printed in Yugoslavia, but has now reached American and European editors.

YUGOSLAV EMBARRASSMENT

Mihajlov's forthright comments are doubly embarrassing to Yugoslavia. In the first place the young professor has made observations concerning the Soviet social structure that are sometimes also applicable to Yugoslavia. In the second place, as Tito edges toward closer relations with Moscow, he wants no Yugoslav critiques to upset the process.

Tito was already embarrassed by his former lieutenant, Milovan Djilas, now in prison for his efforts to sponsor political reforms, his attacks on the "new class" of Yugoslav bureaucrats and his published recollections of conversations with Stalin. Djilas was a powerful figure, but Mihajlov is only a hitherto unknown intellectual. Yet his forceful comments after a Soviet visit have made another cause celebre.

MIHAJLOV'S ANALYSIS

The burden of Mihajlov's analysis is that a "third revolution" is brewing in Russia which is based on intellectual, democratic and Western trends. These in turn, he feels are not only indigenous—dating from 19th century arguments between "Slavophiles" and "Westernizers"—but are being hastened along by Moscow's sharpening quarrel with Peking.

Mihajlov recalls that past Russian philosophers had anticipated an inevitable conflict with China. Now he sees as a logical possibility that contemporary Soviet leaders might find it convenient to summon the arguments of such "authentic Russian thinkers" against China much as Stalin revived interest in patriotic saints during the war with Hitler.

His prediction is reinforced by the contention that "at this moment the Soviet Union is leaving Asia and is joining Europe" and that "the threat from the Asiatic peoples will no doubt speed up the creation of a new ideology." Mihajlov's theory is that such an "ideology" will be brought about by intellectual forces of the new Soviet generation much as technicians previously had staged a managerial revolution and seized power from the political Communists who made and inherited the original Bolshevik state.

On the basis of his own experience during a long visit to the U.S.S.R. last summer, the perceptive Yugoslav suggests that young Soviet thinkers are already ripe for such development. With remarkable assurance he insists: The Soviet Union is on the threshold of grandiose changes.

It is perfectly apparent why Delo never published these observations which are among the most startling heard inside the Communist orbit for two generations. Delo was already in sufficient hot water by having ventured to print the initial installments of Mihajlov's commentary. And it is clear that the forecast of a Soviet political upheaval in the name of freedom could be almost as embarrassing to Communist Yugoslavia as to Communist Russia.

But Mihajlov's audacity symbolizes a novel and vital tendency that now can be observed throughout Eastern Europe as well as inside the U.S.S.R. itself. This is the increasing intellectual ferment and the questioning by the postwar generation about its role in society and its aim in life itself. In varying degrees in various Communist lands such

profound self-interrogation is being expressed by young poets, painters, historians, and philosophers.

QUEST FOR LIBERTY

Apparently it has proved impossible to silence this as might once have been done with Stalinist methods. That segment of the Communist world stemming from the European mainstream is reviving the eternal quest for liberty that has featured this Continent's intellectual history.

It is difficult to judge the accuracy of this analysis but the same conclusion can be drawn from the Mihajlov case that could be drawn earlier from that of Djilas. This is simply that freedom of the mind cannot be rationed. Once an energetic people begins to ask questions, the process becomes both endless and endlessly embarrassing to any regime seeking to halt it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to say that as a result of the disarmament debate in the United Nations, which has been going on for several weeks, a decision has been made to go back to Geneva and to reconvene the 17-nation conference on arms control and disarmament. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial, entitled "Progress on Arms Control," printed in the Record at this point.

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

PROGRESS ON ARMS CONTROL

The 7-week session of the 114-nation Disarmament Commission draws to a close on an unexpectedly positive note. Despite abstention by Moscow and the Communist bloc, the nonaligned nations obtained an 83-to-1 majority for early resumption of the 17-nation Geneva conference, where there could be serious work toward arms control and East-West détente. Yet it was precisely to avoid such a Geneva meeting—and, on the contrary, to make a public demonstration of hostility to the United States over Vietnam—that Moscow had engineered the convening of the 114-nation Commission.

The Soviet Union not only failed to discourage world interest in a return to Geneva, but it found little enthusiasm among the new nations for its efforts to turn a disarmament forum into a propaganda vehicle on Vietnam. Complaints were voiced even by African delegates normally sympathetic to the Soviet view, and Russian speeches in the latter stages were toned down.

The debate at the United Nations was perhaps most valuable in showing the urgency of action to prevent proliferation of national nuclear forces. Countries that now face a decision on whether to become nuclear powers, such as India, Japan, Sweden, and Egypt, disclosed increasing resistance to a blanket pledge not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons unless the present nuclear powers reduce their atomic arsenals or give guarantees against nuclear attack.

The debate indicated that the nonaligned nations agree with the United States that priority should be given to measures to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and to extend the atmosphere test ban to underground nuclear explosions. Their opposition to tests of all kinds puts them on record against China's nuclear program. Yet it was also clear that an overwhelming majority wants Peiping brought into future disarmament talks. Last week's 89-to-0 vote for a world disarmament conference including Communist China showed the United States largely isolated on this issue.

The debate provided the new nations with a valuable education in the complex issues of disarmament. They demonstrated throughout that they take the matter seriously and want action. Unfortunately, none

of this means that Russia will now reverse position and agree to an early resumption at Geneva. The Kremlin, for the moment, seems more interested in disproving Chinese charges that it lacks militancy.

In the end, however, Moscow will have to take into account the view of these new nations. Competition in militancy with Peiping may pay some dividends within the Communist bloc. But the meetings of the Disarmament Commission have shown that influence in the nonaligned world—and, perhaps, even at the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers this month—demands a commitment to peace.

Mr. CLARK. When the 17-nation Conference gets back to work in Geneva one of the most important things it will take up will be the question of an agreement to prevent further proliferation of nuclear armaments. Our Government should be giving greater attention to the need to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, and less attention to determining how close to the nuclear trigger we can let West Germany get. We should also pay more attention to the effect of the vicious practice of promoting sales of armament around the world, in which the United States is taking a leading part. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that a news article from the New York Times of May 24, 1965, entitled "United States Leads World in Sales of Arms; Allies Irritated—Trade Is \$1.5 Billion a Year—Big Promotion Effort Resented in Europe," be printed in the Record at this point.

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

UNITED STATES LEADS WORLD IN SALES OF ARMS; ALLIES IRRITATED—TRADE IS \$1.5 BILLION A YEAR—BIG PROMOTION EFFORT RESENTED IN EUROPE

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—With sales amounting to \$1.5 billion a year, the United States has become the biggest arms merchant in the world.

It is in competition not only with the Soviet Union for strategic reasons, but also with Britain and France for economic reasons.

To promote its arms sales, the United States maintains a special program in Western Europe at a cost of about \$500,000 a year.

This active drive to sell arms in Europe, including credit guaranteed by the Pentagon, has caused considerable annoyance in Paris and London, where some bitter newspaper articles have appeared lately.

For example, the military correspondent of the Daily Telegraph, in London, Brig. W. F. K. Thompson, accused the United States last week of pressuring the West Germans to buy American arms inferior to those produced in Britain.

Referring to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's arms-standardization effort, he wrote:

"So far standardization has meant for Americans the acceptance by others of American ideas and equipment."

UNITED STATES SENSITIVE TO CHARGES

Government officials here are markedly sensitive to being labeled "merchants of death," the appellation used a half-century ago against private international arms dealers. These officials point out that although it is determined to increase arms sales, the United States denies itself \$500 million in such sales annually.

"We are not ruthless rug merchants, ready to sell anything to anyone just to cover de-

ficiencies in the balance of payments," an official said.

The countries that have made fruitless efforts to buy arms here are not identified by officials, since the negotiations are invariably secret.

It is known, however, that the Republic of South Africa has sought to buy arms in the United States and has been turned down. There was a potential arms sale of \$100 million to \$150 million involved in that effort, according to an expert estimate.

It is also known that although the United States has made occasional sales in the Middle East, countries in that region and in Africa and Latin America are regularly turned down in attempting to buy arms.

In addition to refusing to sell military equipment to these countries for diplomatic and political reasons and thus upset delicate power balances, the United States has taken local economic factors into consideration.

SOME NATIONS ANGERED

Frequently the United States has refused to sell arms to a relatively undeveloped country in order not to contribute to a weakening of its economy, and the leaders of the requesting countries have as one source put it—"gone away mad."

What disturbs some U.S. officials is that attention has been called to this Government's arms-sales campaign but that critics have ignored the efforts made to control arms sales. The United States not only exercises care in its own direct government-to-government sales of military equipment, but also controls, through export licenses, sales by private concerns.

If these controls were less strict, arms sales might contribute more to lessening that part of the balance-of-payments deficit which results from the stationing of American troops in Western Europe. There is now a difference of \$1.1 billion in the amount spent to keep the troops abroad and the amount brought in from the sales of weapons.

Although many high officials here over the years have recommended substantial reductions in U.S. troops in Europe for no other reason than to cut the dollar costs, the burden has been carried by successive administrations.

At the same time, especially under Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, arms merchandising—taking the place of past arms grants in military-aid programs—has a priority status at the Pentagon.

Henry J. Kuss, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of the arms-sales effort, was awarded the Defense Secretary's Meritorious Civilian Service Medal last week because of the success of the effort.

The citation, praising Mr. Kuss's "energy and zeal," said:

"His imaginative leadership combined with unparalleled ability as an international negotiator has assisted in a unique fashion to develop the military export-sales program and other significant logistic efforts."

Recently Mr. Kuss said the defense industries in the United States could look to a potential yearly market of \$5.4 billion in military exports by 1967.

By 1971, he added, the minimum military-export market should amount to \$10 billion and the potential market to \$15 billion a year.

He emphasized that U.S. efforts to reduce the balance-of-payments deficits were a major factor in the arms-sales program. Inevitably this sales program has placed the United States in a growing competition.

World expenditures on arms and munitions, according to a United Nations report, totaled about \$135 billion last year. Eighty-five percent of the outlay was accounted for by seven countries—Canada, Communist China, France, the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States, and West Germany.

June 16, 1965

13381

Estimates of sales of military hardware are classified in most countries, although the United States publishes its own. The Soviet Union, for example is reported from time to time to have sold arms to various countries, but the estimated amounts are usually believed to be understated.

Most estimates do not put Soviet arms sales anywhere near the U.S. \$1.5 billion a year, chiefly because the biggest U.S. customers are big powers in Western Europe. Total Soviet military sales up to this year are said to be slightly more than \$3.5 billion. Last year's total is said to be \$400 million.

The chief U.S. market for the sales program has been Western Europe, particularly West Germany. Here the United States has provoked a bitter reaction from British and French competitors.

Many Britons are particularly resentful because of the cancellations of some of their pet missile and aircraft programs—such as the Blue Streak and the TSR-2—in favor of U.S. missiles and planes.

The reply here to such criticism, and among British Government officials responsible for arms transactions with Washington, is that the United States spends so much more on research and development and arms production than any other country that it will inevitably come up with comparative bargains.

France has pushed into the world arms business, including even the sale of antitank missiles to the United States. French exports of military material were valued at \$412.7 million for the first 9 months of 1964, compared with yearly averages of \$85.8 million from 1950 to 1960.

Sweden also has undertaken a major arms-sales program, but apparently is her own best customer, chiefly because of her development of a new fighter-bomber, the Viggen. A caustic British comment directed at the United States was the report in the Daily Telegraph by its aviation writer, Air Commander E. M. Donaldson, that the Viggen was better than the U.S. new F-111.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the way to peace is not to be found through escalation of the war in Vietnam. It is not to be found by imposing our will on the Dominican Republic. The true path to peace is to be found in a policy of steady effort to achieve progress in international cooperation through the United Nations toward the goals of peace and disarmament.

YOUTH AND THE FUTURE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the members of the graduating class of 1965 at the University of Missouri at Columbia were privileged to hear a fine address delivered by my distinguished colleague, Senator SYMINGTON.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] considered the prospects and problems facing the American people in a number of areas of our national life, and from several points of view. The result was an outstanding commencement address. At the same ceremony, Mr. President, the university conferred upon my colleague the highest honor that our State university offers. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] received the honorary degree of doctor of laws, in recognition of his excellent public service to Missouri and to our Nation.

So that the remarks of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], may be more widely read and enjoyed, I

No. 109—13

ask unanimous consent that his commencement address to the class of 1965 at the University of Missouri be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the citation at the time of presentation of the honorary doctor of laws degree be printed following the address.

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

YOUTH AND THE FUTURE

(By Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri)

President Ellis, members of the board of curators and faculty, honored guests, parents, and fellow members of the class of 1965, it is indeed a privilege to be with you here today and I am most grateful for the honor bestowed upon me by our university.

In an address of this character, it is generally considered appropriate to present to the graduates some suggestions with respect to the future. With some hesitation I will do so, but first let me in turn present a few thoughts which form the basis of these suggestions.

It is now clear that never before in our history, or for that matter in the history of any country, have the members of graduating classes faced the challenges which now confront you in this the end of the second decade of the nuclear-space age.

And the manner in which you handle these challenges will determine, not only your own future, but that of all people.

The nature of the primary challenge—survival under law, and with honor—is one which unfortunately has required further centralization in the structure of our Government. I say unfortunate because the history of our Government is one long history of resistance to further centralization. We are a people who believe in the rights of States and individual liberty; and who have a profound respect for grassroots authority.

The Constitution itself was born out of a compromise between those who favored a more centralized government, and those who did not; a balance between men who stood for a continuation of decentralization along the lines of the Articles of Confederation, and those who wanted a country which, while protecting the rights of all its citizens, would also be possessed of the precious attributes of sovereignty, in its dealings with the other nations of the world.

In transmitting the Constitution to the old Congress, George Washington himself wrote:

"It is obviously impracticable, in the Federal Government of these States, to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all. Individuals entering into society must give up a share of the liberty to preserve the rest."

At this time more than liberty is involved in the further identification of the State with the Federal Government.

As illustration, for years it has been our conviction that the future of Missouri depends primarily on two developments: (1) the full utilization of its water resources, and (2) attainment of adequate educational facilities of highest quality.

Every week we discuss with people in the State how to expedite water projects that are now proceeding in recognition of the growing partnership in this field between Missouri and the Federal Government.

Seldom does a day go by that we are not talking with some member of that now far-flung institution known as the University of Missouri about the initiation or acceleration of various educational programs under a comparable partnership.

Missouri needs new industry and new overall business activity. It needs them very

badly. Its chances for success to that end are in direct proportion to the development of its water and its educational facilities.

It is interesting to note also that further centralization, since the days of the Founding Fathers has been, in large measure, dictated by developments in communication and commerce, among the people of the several States. The railroad, telegraph, automobile, radio, and airplane have brought Americans in ever closer relationship with one another.

Actions of people in one State, reverberating in their effect on other States, often necessitated a common, and therefore more centralized, rule for all.

Recent communications development in the international field, correlated with the telescoping of time and space, have in turn required additional centralization—in the interest of both our international trade and our national security; and these improved communications will be of great help in the promotion of better understanding.

Take for example the current situation in Africa. Since World War II, European colonial empires have vanished from that continent; and in their wake have come the efforts and struggles of millions to assert their nationhood internally as well as externally.

"Tribe" has been, and in many ways still is, the word which best describes social organization on the African Continent, a continent with over 700 languages.

Today Africa has 37 independent countries; and 27 of those countries have been created as nations in the last 5 years.

Along with other countries throughout southeast Asia and Europe, every one of these African nations is now struggling for national identity, a matter they consider of first importance.

Is it not ironical that we in the United States, recognizing the importance of more understanding and more neighborliness in the search for world peace and prosperity, have been developing our policies on an international basis, while at the same time our friends and allies are turning to the nationalistic approach.

Our defense of the international effort is based largely on realization that, today, the people of every nation are neighbors of the people of every other nation; and this emphasizes the importance of the message these new communications satellites can bring home to all countries, new and old, as we strive for better understanding in effort to avoid a nuclear war.

In military time Red China is closer to us today by air, than Kansas City was to St. Louis, by air, as late as the end of World War II.

In effect, therefore, every country in the world is now in the adjacent county; and what these new "neighbors" think about us, and about human welfare, and about the importance of personal dignity, will have a profound effect upon our destiny.

The concept of the good neighbor, desirable 30 years ago, is now important to survival.

"The cause of America," said Tom Paine, is "the cause of all mankind." He was probably right then. He is certainly right now.

The Almighty has now given man the knowledge of new forces which present him with a choice—either he can use these forces in effort to attain a life of comfort and happiness never before dreamed of, or he can use them to destroy civilization.

That is the basic challenge which you and I face today.

We do not have all the answers. We do not know all the solutions. But I believe that the new scientific tools currently available for better understanding give us the right to be more optimistic.

Again as example, by means of the new satellite, Early Bird, the various opinions of various world leaders were recently tele-

June 16, 1965

vised into the homes of millions of people, all around the globe. (It is interesting to note that the power of that satellite, passing pictures and information and opinion to every corner of the earth from its position 32,000 miles above the earth is not more than one-tenth of the power used in an ordinary light bulb.)

There are other straws in the wind which might give us cause for more optimism. One occurred last March 18.

A young Soviet lieutenant colonel, sportsman and artist as well as pilot and scientist, stepped out into the emptiness of space for the first time in human history.

When asked, "Do you think Soviet and American spacemen will ever have a meeting in space?", Colonel Leonov's reply, carried by television, may have had a glow in it for the future when he said:

"We have never objected to friendship in resolving our common task of mastering outer space. And I always see all earth men as one family, because we shall then go off to other planets, worlds, and there will be representatives of many nations abroad. And so we must be friends."

Could it be that the exploration of this new ocean of space will have a major influence in leading the people of the world:

"To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
Beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

That would be our hope. That will be part of your challenge, because the right use of the new force will depend on knowledge.

The thoughts that lie behind this hope may be unwarranted, however. We may be indulging in wishful thinking; and in any case we intend to pursue realistic policies, as evidenced by President Johnson's determination to resist Communist imperialism in the future as we have in the past.

I say "continue" because for many years we have been resisting this aggression in such places as Korea, the Formosa Straits, West Berlin.

Let those who, for any reason, disagree with the President's reasoned but firm policy, read the recent autobiography of Anthony Eden. The lesson to be learned from that volume is expressed in its title, "The Reckoning." It is a sad and costly story of too little and too late.

In all probability Eden took that title from the words of Britain's greatest citizen of this century. After the tragedy of Munich, Winston Churchill observed on the floor of the House of Commons, "Do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning."

There is a well-known quotation about those who forget history being forced to repeat it; and as the Red Chinese rush to complete their plans for delivery of the nuclear weapons we now know they have, this quotation could well be remembered.

And so my friends, it is a dangerous world; but an exciting one, full of challenge. The stakes are high; the opportunity great.

And now a few suggestions to the members of this graduating class who someday will be counted on to take over the leadership.

First, let me urge you to carry on your efforts to be informed. In the past 4 years, your imaginations have been stretched, your concerns widened; and that process should be continually renewed if your formal education is to be of service in the adult world you are entering.

You may "discharge your obligation for the education you have received, not only by reflecting light, but by spreading it as well."

Secondly, in that the habits and customs of our times are changing with such unprecedented speed, may I suggest that, as citizens, you recognize the importance of prompt and constant adaptation to change.

Not long ago the patriarch of the elec-

tronics industry, David Sarnoff, stated that changes in our method of life in the next 35 years—up to the year 2000—would be greater than all the previous changes of history.

If a few years from now you pass a friend who appears to be mumbling to himself, don't be sure he is absent minded. He may be talking to his friend in the Philippines. If he holds in his hand what looks like a little mirror and appears to be vain, don't be sure. He could be looking at that friend.

And finally, because we do live in the frenetic and stirring world I have portrayed this evening, let me suggest that, above all, you preserve your sense of humor. Otherwise these challenges could be overwhelming.

It has been said, "Men will confess to treason, murder, arson, false teeth, or a wig; but how many of them will own up to a lack of humor?"

This illuminates the high premium we put on a sense of humor—so high that even those who lack one will never admit it.

Humor is balance, and very few will admit to being off balance.

It might even be said that we owe the safe founding of our Nation to the steady influence of humor. Let us remember the closing moments of the Constitutional Convention—September 17, 1787—Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

The issue had been hard fought, tempers flared, but the majestic presence of Washington as President of the Convention, along with the gentle touch of Franklin, contained the sparks of dissent and bitterness.

The beloved sage, infirm of voice, but not of spirit, passed his remarks to James Wilson, of the Pennsylvania delegation, who read them to the assemblage. He said:

"I confess that there are several parts of this Constitution which I do not at present approve, but I am not sure I shall never approve them. * * * The older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and to pay more respect to the judgment of others. Most men indeed, as well as most sects in religion, think themselves in possession of all truth, and that wherever others differ from them it is so far error. * * * Few express this so naturally as a certain French lady who, in a dispute with her sister, said: 'I don't know how it happens, sister, but I meet with nobody but myself that is always in the right.'"

After brief further discussion, in which he characterized our enemies as waiting with confidence to hear that our councils are confounded like the builders of Babel. Franklin concluded with this memorable advice. "I cannot help expressing a wish that every member * * * would with me, on this occasion, doubt a little of his own infallibility and, to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument."

His advice was taken; and the Constitution of the United States was born.

Yes, humor, if you will, is perspective; it is insight into the fallibility of man.

We use it aggressively to expose the fallibility of others, those with whom we disagree. We use it sparingly to expose our own. It has been said that a man who has never laughed at himself is a poor servant and a worse master.

Throughout the great trials of our history, gifted men have appeared to show the way. Perhaps the greatest of these was Lincoln. And not the least of his gifts was humor.

Only the truly strong can survive ridicule. Lincoln had his share—he was the butt of the crude and whispered joke; and in this he could give as good as he got.

I have no doubt his humor was in large part responsible for sustaining him through his days of personal and national adversity.

Not wit alone—for that flimsy art is not to be confused with humor—but humor itself—the other face of tragedy—the recognition of man's mortality, the brevity of his visit here. The balance of what is against

what could be, the wisdom to know the difference, love for one another, understanding, and finally, faith.

These are the treasures of the spirit to which true humor is the key.

May I suggest, don't lose that key. Don't throw it away, and never let it rust from disuse.

DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE AWARDED TO SENATOR
STUART SYMINGTON

(Presentation by President Ellis, of Missouri
University)

STUART SYMINGTON, statesman, leader of industry, civic leader extraordinary, you are honored today by this institution for your distinguished career as a corporation executive, for your statesmanship, and for your outstanding leadership in the U.S. Senate.

Born in Amherst, Mass., Senator SYMINGTON was educated at Yale, worked with various electric, iron, and steel companies before becoming president of Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. of St. Louis in 1938. He entered Government service in 1945 as Chairman of the Surplus Property Board; became Assistant Secretary of War for Air in 1946; the Nations first Secretary of the Air Force in 1947; Chairman of the National Security Resources Board in 1950; and Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1951. First elected to the U.S. Senate in November of 1952, Senator SYMINGTON is the senior Senator from Missouri, and was reelected to the Senate in November of 1964. Senator SYMINGTON is a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and is the only Senator to serve on both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. He is an ex officio, voting member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Armed Services and Space Appropriations and a member of the Senate Democratic policy committee. As a Member of the Senate, Senator SYMINGTON has taken a leading role in legislative efforts to improve national agricultural administration, and in unification of the Department of Defense and Foreign Service Academy.

As a prominent statesman, you have brought honor to the State of Missouri and the State university takes great pride in bestowing upon you her highest honor today.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the board of curators, I hereby confer upon you the honorary degree of doctor of laws with all the honors and privileges thereunto appertaining. In token thereof I present to you this diploma.

WATER RESOURCES: A COGENT ANALYSIS OF A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the problem of water resources is a domestic consideration of national dimensions. We must maintain, protect, and increase these resources through the conservation and use of water which now flows into the ocean during times of flood.

This year the situation is especially critical in several areas of the East and Midwest. Yet, our concern is not a new one. Since early days—when the first pioneers pushed across the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers—the arid West has been plagued by water problems.

The Western States have faced up to these problems.

An effective partnership between State and Federal Governments—beginning with the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt and the Reclamation Act of 1902—has produced impressive results.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13373

"(4) Loans shall be approved only upon the furnishing of such security or other reasonable assurance of repayment as the Secretary may require considering the objectives of this section which are to upgrade commercial fishing vessels and gear and to provide reasonable financial assistance not otherwise available to commercial fishermen. The proposed collateral for a loan must be of such a nature that, when considered with the integrity and ability of the management, and the applicant's past and prospective earnings, repayment of the loan will be reasonably assured.

"(5) The applicant shall possess the ability, experience, resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable him to operate and maintain new or used commercial fishing vessels or gear.

"(6) Before the Secretary approves a loan for the purchase or construction of a new or used vessel which will not replace an existing commercial fishing vessel, he shall determine that the applicant's contemplated operation of such vessel in a fishery will not cause economic hardship or injury to the efficient vessel operators already operating in that fishery.

"(7) An applicant for a fishery loan must be a citizen of the United States.

"(8) The United States citizenship of each applicant shall be established within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to the satisfaction of the Secretary."

Sec. 4. Section 4(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121), as amended (16 U.S.C. sec. 742c(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) There is created a fisheries loan fund, which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund to make loans for financing and refinancing under this section. Any funds received by the Secretary on or before June 30, 1970, in payment of principal or interest on any loans so made shall be deposited in the fund and be available for making additional loans under this section. The Secretary shall pay from the fund into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations available as capital to the fund from and after July 1, 1965, less the average undisbursed cash balance in the fund during the year. The rate of such interest shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield during the month preceding each fiscal year on outstanding Treasury obligations of maturity comparable to the average maturity of loans made from the fund. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest. Any funds received in the fisheries loan fund after June 30, 1970, and any balance remaining therein at the close of June 30, 1970 (at which time the fund shall cease to exist), shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There is authorized to be appropriated to the fisheries loan fund the sum of \$20,000,000 to provide initial capital."

Sec. 5. The provisions of this Act shall be effective July 1, 1965. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, any balance remaining in the fisheries loan fund at the close of June 30, 1965, shall be available to make loans for the purposes of section 4 of said Act from July 1, 1965, to the close of June 30, 1970.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish

and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels, and to extend the term during which the Secretary can make fisheries loans under the Act."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 325), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to extend for an additional 5 years the fishery loan program administered by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The loan program was initiated under section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and expires June 30, 1965. The legislation was introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. Public hearings were held on May 11.

The present loan program authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for financing and refinancing the operations, maintenance, replacement, and repair of fishing gear and vessels and for research into basic problems of the fisheries. The Secretary may not make the loan if the funds are otherwise available on reasonable terms.

This has been a successful program of encouraging American fishermen at little or no Government expense. During the past 8 years of actual operation under the program, the Secretary has received over 1,600 loan applications for \$42 million. Approval has been given to 850 applications for \$19 million. The record of losses is exceptionally low, amounting to only \$320,000 during the 8-year period. During the same period, \$9 million of the principal has been repaid and almost \$2 million in interest has been collected and accrued.

In addition to extending the program for an additional 5 years, the bill, as amended, would modestly expand the scope of the present program to permit a loan to be made regardless of whether the vessel to be acquired will replace an existing vessel. In testifying before the committee the Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Donald L. McKernan, supported the amendment as a means of attracting younger men to the fishing industry and of further modernizing the commercial fishing vessel fleet. Frequently, younger fishermen are ineligible under the present program because they have no vessel of their own to replace. At the same time, vessel owners cannot obtain a loan to replace their old vessel because of an inability to locate a purchaser who has a means of financing the old vessel. The vessel owner is also ineligible for a new loan under the present program if he sells his old vessel for use as a commercial fishing vessel because he is not replacing a vessel that has actually left the fleet. Testimony in strong support of this amendment was given by August Felando, general manager of the American Tuna Boat Association. Separate legislation (S. 2013) specifically proposing this change was introduced in the Senate at the request of the Secretary of the Interior on May 21.

The bill, as amended, would also remove the present minimum annual interest rate of 3 percent and substitute a formula for establishing the interest rate. The formula provides for the annual payment to the Treasury from the loan fund of interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations available as capital to the fund taking into consideration the average cost of all outstanding interest-bearing Treasury obligations of comparable maturity. At the present time, this

would result in a 4-percent interest rate. Although a minimum of 3 percent is permitted under the present law, the practice generally has been to charge 5 percent and it is anticipated that this practice would continue under the proposed amendment.

The committee amendments added certain specific conditions to the making of loans. The conditions, which are similar to those now in Department regulations, relate to the requirement of adequate security, requirements regarding the applicant's ability and experience to operate a fishing vessel, and the applicant's citizenship. In addition, the Secretary is required to determine that a loan on a vessel, which will not replace an existing vessel, will cause no economic hardship to efficient vessel operators already operating in that fishery. These proposed amendments do not mean that the committee believes that the Bureau has not been sufficiently cautious in making loans in the past. In fact, the very opposite may be true. The program to date has proved profitable to the Government and beneficial to American fishermen. But it should be emphasized that one of the most important purposes of the loan program is to encourage the construction of a modern fishing fleet and use of modern fishing gear. Risks are obvious and inherent in the success of any loan program to modernize capital equipment. The public acknowledgement of the extra risk is part of the justification of the program. The success of the program should be measured more by the number of intelligent business decisions supported, and perhaps even stimulated, than by the profit made by the Government on the loans.

The final amendment provides that the money now available in the fund will remain available for use from and after July 1, 1965.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZ.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1285) to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out "That, notwithstanding the acreage limitations in the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes' approved June 4, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869-869-4), the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon application from Pima and Maricopa Counties, Arizona, or the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, at any time within five years following the date of enactment of this Act, convey to such county or city for recreational purposes in accordance with the provisions of such Act at \$2.50 per acre, any land which, on January 1, 1965, was leased to such county or city under the provisions of such Act for recreational purposes, or with respect to which there was on file on such date in the Department of the Interior an application by such county or city for such a lease." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "That the acreage limitations on conveyances in any one calendar year set forth in section 1(b) of the Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869(b)), shall not apply to any

conveyances made under that Act to Pima County or Maricopa County, Arizona, or to the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, of any lands which, on January 1, 1965, were leased to such county or city under that Act or for which such county or city had filed an application for a lease under that Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the acreage limitations on conveyances in any one calendar year set forth in section 1(b) of the Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869(b)), shall not apply to any conveyances made under the Act to Pima County or Maricopa County, Arizona, or to the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, of any lands which, on January 1, 1965, were leased to such county or city under that Act or for which such county or city had filed an application for a lease under that Act.

Sec. 2. Any conveyance authorized by this Act shall provide that the lands so conveyed shall be used for recreational purposes, and that in the event such lands are not used for such purposes, title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 323), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

S. 1285, introduced by Senator HAYDEN for himself and Senators FANNIN, ANDERSON, and MONROVA, waives a restriction of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act which limits political subdivisions to obtaining not more than 640 acres of public lands per calendar year, as it relates to lands leased or under application to lease by Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and the city of Albuquerque on January 1, 1965.

NEED

The land involved is near Phoenix, Tucson, and Albuquerque, fast-growing urban communities in needs of parks and recreation areas.

DISCUSSION

Maricopa and Pima Counties contain approximately 80 percent of Arizona's population, and local officials are faced with the problem of providing adequate recreational areas when most of the suitable and available land is under Federal ownership. Albuquerque faces a similar problem.

To meet this burgeoning demand, Pima and Maricopa Counties have leased land from the Federal Government. However, in order to protect the large investment necessary to provide adequate facilities, purchase of adequate acreage is required. This is thwarted by the present limitation of 640 acres a year. It is estimated it would take Maricopa County 113 years to acquire the lands now leased, and Pima County 14 years just to purchase the Federal lands included in only one of its most valuable parks—Tucson Mountain Park.

The city of Albuquerque has leased and purchased what land it could from the Government, but under the limitation of the 1926 act it is estimated it would take the city 10 years to get the additional lands that it needs for park and recreational purposes.

The bill permits the two Arizona counties and the city of Albuquerque to purchase the park and recreation lands now under lease,

or on which lease applications have been filed as of January 1, 1965, for the price of \$2.50 per acre, as stated in the 1926 act.

As of January 1, 1965, there were 88,458 acres leased, or under application to lease, pursuant to the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, to the beneficiaries of S. 1285. This total breaks down as follows: Maricopa County, 72,929 acres; Pima County, 6,000 acres; and the city of Albuquerque, 9,529 acres.

PECOS NATIONAL MONUMENT,
N. MEX.

The bill (H.R. 3165) to authorize the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 321), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3165 is to provide for the establishment of the Pecos National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, as a site of exceptional historic and archeological importance. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of approximately 342 acres of land or interests therein and to administer, protect, and develop the same as the Pecos National Monument in accordance with the laws governing the national park system.

NEED

H.R. 3165 seeks to set apart and preserve the remains and artifacts of a 17th century Spanish mission and an ancient Indian pueblo near Pecos, N. Mex. The Indian pueblo was founded in the 1300's, discovered by the famous Spanish explorer, Coronado, in 1540, and continued in existence until 1838. The Franciscan Mission of Our Lady of the Angels of Porciuncula was founded in 1621 and served the people of the area from then to 1782 when it was abandoned. Today, the ruins of the pueblo and mission are silent monuments to a long and colorful chapter of human experience.

In modern times, the pueblo has become a site of major significance to archeological science. The National Park Service has called the committee's attention to the fact that it was here that the world-renowned archeologist, Dr. Alfred V. Kidder, and his colleagues developed the standardized archeological nomenclature, the theory of cultural sequences for the Southwest, and the professional excavation techniques which are major tools of research in this field.

The Department of the Interior and the committee regard the Indian pueblo and Spanish mission ruins as of national significance. Their preservation as a national monument will help to carry out the purposes of the Antiquities Act (act of June 8, 1906, 34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.). The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its May 1962 meeting, recommended that such action be taken.

The Department plans an interpretive program for the proposed Pecos National Monument which will reveal to its visitors the way of life of the ancient Indian people, stimulate an appreciation of the pueblo culture and the historical and scientific aspects of the Pecos story.

The State Museum of New Mexico has offered to donate to the United States the

63-acre tract now comprising the present Pecos State Monument. Mr. E. E. Fogelson, an adjoining landowner, in contemplation of legislation, has executed a deed donating an additional 279 acres of land to the United States for the Pecos National Monument.

FE THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon in this Chamber I listened attentively to the masterly address of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I am in complete agreement with his views that "This new phase of the war in South Vietnam is going badly for our side." I agree also that our Nation should be prepared at all times to enter unconditional conversations to end the war in South Vietnam which, as I have said, has been going from bad to worse. We should at all times be eager to try to end it at the conference table. Of course, Chairman FULBRIGHT's assertion that we should make a determined effort to end the war by negotiation expresses the proper and a most honorable attitude. Further, he concedes in his remarks what is self-evident, that our bombing of North Vietnam has failed to weaken the Vietcong.

This morning, the New York Herald Tribune feature news article on page 1 states:

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, said here yesterday the only answer to the Vietnam dilemma is a "negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides" which will "offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory."

I approve of and agree with that statement.

Mr. President, in April, one of our distinguished colleagues made one of the so-called guided tours, which we Senators sometimes take, and spent a week in South Vietnam. Upon his return, he reported in May and also this month that the South Vietnamese and the Americans were winning the war in South Vietnam. Time and events have proved him wrong in that assertion.

I have never been in South Vietnam; but I have been thoughtful and diligent in studying all aspects of the situation there. However, since I have not spent a week there, I do not pose as an expert. Nevertheless, our situation in Vietnam certainly seems to have gone from bad to worse.

In 1954 President Eisenhower, at the invitation of the South Vietnamese Government, complied with the request of the then ruling group in Saigon and committed 700 men of our Armed Forces as military advisers. Time and events have demonstrated that this was a bad decision. Now we have nearly 70,000 men of our Armed Forces committed to combat in Vietnam. Now, some 13 or 14 governments later, there is another takeover of the ruling group in Saigon.

When Gen. Maxwell Taylor was recently asked what action we should take, in his opinion, in the event there is a coup in South Vietnam and the new government requested the U.S. Government to remove all of our Armed Forces, the Ambassador evaded answering this ques-

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13375

tion saying there was no possibility of such action. The obvious answer is, of course, that if any such eventuality develops, we should withdraw our Armed Forces. We are there on invitation, according to the claim we have been making to the world. If invited out, we should get out. We would be in a peculiar position indeed were we to grasp other arguments to justify our presence there with thousands of combat soldiers.

Mr. President, I take a dim view of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as ambassador. It would be an act of wisdom on the part of our President to reassign him and appoint a new ambassador.

By the way, he had hardly reached Saigon when there was a coup and the Government there was overthrown. Yet he had said that he did not look for any such event as that.

When questioned regarding the instability of the Saigon Government and referring to the fact that there had been 12 changes in the ruling regime in Saigon in 13 months, he denied that this number of changes had been made. This places him at variance with a statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The facts are there have been 12 changes or turnovers or successful coups changing the governing authorities in Saigon, all within a period of 13 months. Furthermore, just last week Ambassador Taylor in Washington stated that he did not expect the Quat government to be overthrown. Within 24 hours after he made this statement Quat was ousted. Even before Ambassador Taylor returned to Saigon what was unexpected to him occurred. Quat was ousted and the military took over. This indicates that either the judgment of Ambassador Taylor is poor or his intelligence information faulty.

There is evidence of further weakening of the Saigon Government and further evidence of the commitment by our Government of more combat soldiers and planes in the effort to keep the Vietcong from overrunning South Vietnam. This is in the nature of a calamity. This seems to reduce the best remaining hope of a negotiated settlement. Such settlement would seem necessarily to have the approval of the Vietcong and South Vietnamese rebels. The Vietcong forms the basic Communist fighting force on the ground. Communist China has announced opposition to a negotiated settlement. At the moment there seems little likelihood of a conference. I try to continue to be optimistic and hopeful of such a conference. The President's military advisers claim that the Vietcong is merely a projection of the Hanoi regime. To me this does not necessarily seem to be the situation. There is no question but that thousands of North Vietnamese regular soldiers are fighting alongside the Vietcong and that the Hanoi Government exerts strong influence on the Vietcong. However, it is also a fact that many of the Vietcong are, in reality, South Vietnamese Communist rebels. If we cannot in good faith negotiate directly with the Vietcong, we should at least not discourage any attempts by the South Vietnamese Government to do so.

Mr. President, it appears to me that any Senator is 100 percent wrong when he reports as of last month, or this month, that we are beginning to win the war in South Vietnam. Disasters to our side seem to have been horrendous in recent weeks and the loss of lives of Americans and South Vietnamese soldiers has been increasing. The time is here, following another coup and turnover in the South Vietnam Government, to reappraise our situation.

South Vietnam's top generals are trying to decide how to form another government. We on our part would do well if our President were to replace General Taylor as Ambassador with a skilled and experienced civilian who has the confidence of the American people. General Taylor, while in Washington recently, made a poor impression on me, and I feel other Senators share my views. Our situation is so serious that I urge, Mr. President, that Gen. Maxwell Taylor be assigned by President Johnson to some other position in the administration, and that at this grim time Ambassador at Large Averell Harriman or U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Ambassador to South Vietnam, or former U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating, or some other highly competent and experienced civilian be appointed Ambassador to South Vietnam.

At Dong Xoai last Thursday 400 South Vietnamese regulars and irregulars were overrun by the Vietcong. Thirty-one American officers and men were also killed, wounded, or are missing. Fierce fighting is continuing. The South Vietnamese have been largely on the defensive. There may be some truth in those reports that the Vietcong losses are far in excess of those of the South Vietnamese. Forces on the offensive invariably suffer greater losses than those on the defensive. Unfortunately, also, many, many civilians, including women and children, have been burned to death or hospitalized with severe injuries due to our napalm bombing.

Any American looking at the map of South Vietnam in weekly magazines or newspapers can readily see the difference in the territory held by the South Vietnamese now and a year ago. Less territory in South Vietnam is now firmly held by the South Vietnamese and our forces than was held 6 months or 1 year ago.

It is strange under such circumstances that anyone can assert that we are winning, or even beginning to win, the war in South Vietnam. It would appear that we need a man at the top who, as Ambassador, will bring a fresh view to a complex situation and who will enjoy the confidence of the American people.

The tendency in this administration has at times seemed to be to exalt military authority over civilian authority. There are too many generals, including Gen. Maxwell Taylor, in high-salaried positions in the executive branch of our Government and at the same time receiving their adjusted retirement pay. We should adhere to the principle laid down by our Founding Fathers that civilian authority should be supreme over military authority.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN A THIRD POWERPLANT AT THE GRAND COULEE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business (H.R. 8464) be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 301, S. 1761.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1761) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, S. 1761, which I sponsored for myself and the able Senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would authorize construction of a gigantic third powerplant on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam, already a magnificent monument of our achievements in conservation. This third powerplant would add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world.

Mr. President, S. 1761 has the enthusiastic support of the overwhelming majority of the people of the Northwest, the State governments, and of the Federal administration. In fact, a text of proposed legislation identical to S. 1761 was transmitted to the Congress directly by President Johnson himself in a special message on April 13. I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Johnson's message be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the President's message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., April 13, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Electricity is a basic requirement of modern society. It is vital to our industries, farms, and homes. The Nation's rapidly expanding use of electricity is expected to more than double and perhaps triple by 1980. This calls for the combined efforts of all segments of the power industry—private, cooperative, and public. Therefore, I am pleased to transmit herewith the

report of the Secretary of the Interior concerning the economic and engineering feasibility of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River and a draft of authorizing legislation. I have approved the Secretary's report and recommend that the draft legislation be enacted to authorize the construction of this outstanding project.

The proposed third powerplant will ultimately add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts at the two existing powerplants. When completed, the total capacity of the powerplants at Grand Coulee Dam will total 5.6 million kilowatts. It will be larger than any single hydroelectric development in the world today.

Authorization and construction of the third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam will further the orderly development of the vast water resources of the Columbia River. This is the next logical step following two important events which occurred last year.

First, Prime Minister Pearson of Canada and I met last September to proclaim the Columbia River Treaty for cooperative development of the Columbia River—one of the great rivers of this continent. Canada has already started construction of huge dams to store water on its side of the border. These reservoirs will provide 15.5 million acre-feet of water storage in Canada. This storage capacity will provide increased protection of people and property in both countries from devastating floods and greatly enhance the hydroelectric potential of powerplants on the Columbia River.

The United States must construct additional power-generating facilities at its existing system of dams to take full advantage of this potential. The Grand Coulee Dam, because of its location in relation to other Columbia River powerplants, its height, its large reservoir capacity, and the reregulation of riverflow by Chief Joseph Dam immediately downstream, will develop a major share of the increased power potential made possible by the treaty.

Second, the Congress approved last year a four-line, extra-high-voltage transmission intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. It represents exciting new developments in electric power technology. It is the largest single electrical transmission program ever undertaken in this country and is one of the finest examples of cooperation among publicly owned and privately owned utilities and the Federal Government.

The rapidly growing demands for electric power in the Pacific Northwest will readily absorb the power produced by the proposed powerplant. However, some peaking power and secondary (not regularly available) power that is surplus to the needs of the Northwest in the early years of the project can be marketed in the Pacific Southwest over the intertie. Thus, the intertie will permit maximum utilization of the waters flowing past Grand Coulee Dam, resulting in conservation in its truest sense.

The economic and financial feasibility of the third powerplant are exceptionally favorable. The benefit-cost ratio is more than 3 to 1. Revenues from the sale of power will more than pay for the capital investment within 50 years. In addition to power benefits, the project will provide increased flood protection benefits by improving control of water stored in Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake behind Grand Coulee Dam.

Accordingly, I commend the Secretary's report to your consideration and recommend early enactment of the authorizing legislation which I have transmitted.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam will restore this amazing structure as

the largest hydroelectric powerplant in the world. The original dam, including the 2 million kilowatt powerhouse, was the world's largest hydroelectric project when it was completed in the 1950's. Its 10 million cubic yards of concrete would be sufficient to build a modern highway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Physically it is a project three times the size of the great pyramid in Egypt. Electrically, it is the key structure in the United States-Columbia River power system.

Over the past 10 years the Soviet Union has built three larger dams in Siberia and on the Volga River. The Bratsk plant on the Angara River in Siberia presently has installed capacity of some 3.5 million kilowatts and is the largest single hydro project in the world. The addition of 3.6 million kilowatts to the existing 2 million kilowatts at Grand Coulee will return to the United States world leadership in the construction of large powerplants.

The Grand Coulee third powerhouse will permit full use of improved streamflows that will result from construction by Canada of three storage projects and construction by the United States of Libby Dam. Last year the United States and Canada finally consummated a treaty for cooperative development of the Columbia River, a treaty which had been under negotiation for many years. Under terms of the treaty Canada will build three large storage projects in British Columbia which will regulate the flow of the Columbia, making it possible to better utilize the available water for both flood control and power generation in the United States. These Canadian projects will nearly triple the storage now available above Grand Coulee Dam and, by holding back floodwaters and releasing them during the low-water season, they will greatly increase the usable streamflow. The first of the three Canadian storage projects is now underway, and contracts have been let for start of construction of the second project. The recommended schedule for construction of the Grand Coulee third powerhouse coincides with the completion of all three Canadian treaty projects. The last of the three Canadian storage projects is scheduled for April 1973.

To meet the forecasted load growth of the Pacific Northwest, the first of the 12 recommended 300,000-kilowatt generators is needed by April 1973; the next 3 generators by 1974; and all 12 by 1983. Without these additional units, the existing 2-million-kilowatt powerplant could not be operated efficiently, and much usable energy would be spilled and wasted.

The third powerhouse is an overwhelmingly economic project. The Secretary of the Interior, who testified on behalf of its authorization indicated that revenues from the sale of power will repay to the Treasury the full investment, including interest, within 36 years. During the normal 50-year repayment period for such projects, the third powerhouse will pay into the Treasury a surplus above investment of \$265 million. The Secretary's testimony fur-

ther stated that the benefit-to-cost ratio of this project is 3.24 to 1.

Grand Coulee storage has been included in all major plans for flood control on the Columbia River. The total of 5,232,000 acre-feet of active storage at Grand Coulee will be more effective for flood control purposes after the third powerhouse is built. Even though Grand Coulee could be credited with additional flood control benefits as a result of the third powerhouse, no allocation to flood control has been made.

I have stated that the third powerhouse at Grand Coulee is an economical project. I can further state that this is a noncontroversial project. Before Grand Coulee Dam was finally started in July 1933 as an irrigation and power project of tremendous proportions, it was the object of great controversy for many years. The dam has since proved its worth by producing nearly half of the total kilowatt hours produced on the Columbia River since 1938. In contrast to the situation 30 years ago when the construction of the original Grand Coulee Dam was the subject of a bitter battle between public and private power, the third powerhouse proposal now before us has been endorsed by spokesmen for both public and private power utilities and organizations. The authorization for the third powerhouse has been commented upon by the State governments and other departments of the Federal Government who have an interest in its authorization. Expressions have indicated concurrence, endorsement, and wholehearted support for the authorization of the third powerhouse at the earliest possible date.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Colorado proposes the following amendment:

On page 2, line 4, strike out all through line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the third powerplant and necessary appurtenant works including a visitor center at Grand Coulee Dam, the sum of \$364,310,000, based on estimated costs as of April 1964, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished chairman of the committee.

It is my understanding that the interest cost during construction does not have to be placed in the bill because the interest cost would be paid anyway.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have stricken out of the amendment the proviso for interest. However, the interest will be paid.

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13333

astrous to our Nation. For only as each of us strives to carry forward humane values can mankind understand and control the vast forces unleashed by technology and power.

Let me just say here among you who have shared these delights, what you already know: that he who is a stranger to any tongue but his own; he who believes what he likes and likes what he believes without ever having submitted his ideas to scrutiny; he who has never dwelt with Homer and Shakespeare; he who is deaf to the exaltation of music, blind to the eloquence of paint, marble, and metal—that man is so much the less a full human being.

I believe that we Americans of today are entering a society which is more and more conscious of these values of the humanities. It is no exaggeration to say that we are in the midst of a cultural renaissance in this country. Mr. Alvin Toffler in his recent book "The Culture Consumers" deserves the credit for bringing this trend to public attention. Consumer spending on the arts rose from 1953 to 1960 by about 130 percent, or considerably more than twice as rapidly as spending on all recreation, and better than six times as fast as outlays for spectator sports.

Take the visual arts as an example. One new gallery or museum opened every fourth day last year in the United States, and more people visited galleries and museums than went to baseball games. As a result of this growth, there are more galleries in New York City today than there were in the entire country in 1950.

Similar developments might be traced in the field of music. For example, here in Michigan the Detroit Symphony's attendance has risen from 300,000 to 700,000 in a decade. Or, we could examine the paperback revolution in publishing. It brings scholarly books, formerly passed from hand to hand by faculty members, into the possession of millions of students. In the past 5 years, book sales as well as library circulation have increased three times more rapidly than the population.

Even the mass media have contributed to the cultural explosion. A recent nationwide broadcast of "Hamlet" was seen by more people, in one evening, than the total number who have seen it performed since it was written.

Perhaps it may seem wrong to speak of the arts and the humanities in terms of dollar volume, attendance, and sales. Numbers, of course, are no indication of quality, and the fact that millions of people watched "Hamlet" over television tells nothing about what benefits, if any, each of those millions derived from the experience.

But in another sense these statistics are very significant. For there cannot be a great flowering of art or of the humanistic studies unless audiences, facilities, and resources are available. Just as students and scholars need books, so painters need galleries, dramatists need theaters, and musicians need orchestras. It is certainly clear that the great cultural epochs of the past were firmly rooted in certain material conditions. When we think of the greatness of Greek drama, we think automatically of the great theaters at Athens and Epidaurus. When we marvel at Shakespeare's achievement, we cannot overlook the challenge that shaped his art: the Elizabethan theater and its London audience avid for rich language and exciting action. The sculpture of Michelangelo and the music of Bach both drew their inspiration and their material support from the church, the great patron of the arts in that time.

In short, statistics and trends are important because they show whether or not a culture is ripe for certain kinds of development. The kinds of support and encour-

agement of the arts that these figures reveal are the lifeblood of a healthy cultural environment.

As a growing number of instances show, the economic prosperity of whole communities today is directly affected by their cultural climates. Communities and regions that formerly attracted new industry by advertising cheap labor or low-cost power now advertise orchestras, theaters, and universities. Business Week recently quoted the public-relations chief for a large Detroit manufacturer who summed up the new attitude of many corporations toward supporting culture. This executive said: "We have to be interested in the shape of the arts in cities where our plants are located, because if there are none, engineering and scientific people won't come."

Incidentally, the cultural explosion which I have described is having definite effects on the career opportunities. There is, for example, a need for managerial and executive ability in the whole cultural field. "As talent is needed to create and perform a work of art," wrote the recent Rockefeller Panel on the Performing Arts, "so equal talent—though of a different sort—is needed to create and govern the institutions that provide the settings for these arts."

Recognizing this need, the Ford Foundation has supported, over the past few years, an inservice program to train managers for arts organizations, as well as provided graduate fellowships (through Yale and New York Universities) to increase the supply of qualified museum curators and directors. But these programs meet only part of the need.

Arts centers of which there are at present 100 new ones under construction, need sensitive and imaginative administrators. Our museums and galleries must be managed. Orchestras and artists need to be brought to public attention and their careers carefully planned. The new repertory theaters being established in various cities, the educational television stations, the extension activities of colleges and universities—all these are generating unparalleled opportunities for young people who want to devote their skill and talent to the cultural field.

To return to the main theme, it is clear that the interests, tastes, and even the basic concerns of Americans are changing. Americans today have had a higher level of education, can look forward to more stable and rewarding careers, and can expect greater economic security than any generation that preceded them. In this generation there seems to be a resultant waning of purely economic motivations. The climb to the top was thrilling for us but perhaps today's young men and women care more about taking in the view—or in finding an entirely different kind of mountain to climb. At least, that is what is suggested by the success of the Peace Corps. In this new generation, America seems to be reaching a stage of national development that transcends, in many important respects, the purely material achievements of earlier generations. New needs are emerging that cannot be satisfied by material things alone. These needs cannot be met without understanding ourselves and our world. The preeminent means to understanding them is humanistic study.

How, then, can Americans strengthen their understanding of the humanities and of human values?

Perhaps they might focus on the objective in the Albion Bulletin. They might devote themselves to continuing and strengthening their "familiarity with the major ideas that have molded history and which pervade present culture and its institutions." Such a focus will make much of each individual's experience more comprehensible and valuable. It will also bring greater order and appreciation into our whole cultural life. As

a people we will find ourselves able to pierce to the heart of many issues that seem confusing today. As individuals we will find that we can clarify and understand our own thoughts and emotions.

Let me give you a concrete example. Edward D. Myers recently conducted a study of how people at different stages of development vary in their thinking about one of these basic ideas of the humanities—freedom. He asked a group of elementary school children to write about freedom; he did the same with groups of high school and college students. Then he interviewed some college professors and professional men on the same subject and analyzed the papers and his notes from the interviews. Obviously the results are complex, but the trend runs generally as follows:

For elementary school children, the general response is "freedom is something we have. No one else has it." High-school students tend to say, "Freedom is something we have but the Russians don't." A bit more discriminating. College students go a step further, "Freedom entails responsibility." But the college faculty members and professionals are prone to say, "You can't really generalize about freedom. It is much too complex. You have to deal with it in specific situations." In effect, the professors threw in the towel on the complexity of thinking about freedom. To be sure, it is a difficult issue, but is this a valid reason to refuse to deal with it intellectually?

Let us look briefly at another key idea of the humanities that dominates our lives today: "Equality." Here we can draw from history, philosophy, literature, political science, anthropology, and other fields to develop a mature understanding. We might begin with Plato's "Republic," the classic Greek picture of a state based on the natural inequalities between men. For Plato, who assumed that men were unequal, the ideal state was one that organized men according to the true and most relevant order of inequality. Thus his utopia is realized when every man has been put in the place dictated by his nature. Aristotle, too, insisted that justice is proportional, and defended slavery on the basis of natural inequalities, in passages that were quoted widely in the American South before the Civil War.

Christianity injected a new idea of equality by changing the criteria of an individual's worth. Created in the image of God, each individual had an intrinsic worth despite any inequalities in his capacities. Thus spiritual equality superseded the Greek notion of natural inequality. This complete about-face was a chief turning point in Western history.

A further stage was reached when notions of political equality emerged during the enlightenment. This revolution against privilege emphasized a secular and activist equality that contrasted with the spiritual equality of the Middle Ages.

In the 20th century two concepts of equality took shape that still largely guide the world. In America the idea of equality of opportunity became a cardinal principle of social policy. In Russia the notion of economic equality was adopted from Marx and supposedly put into operation—though, as we now know, it quickly degenerated into another form of privileged hierarchy.

In our own country today we are on the verge of social cataclysm in some regions over this issue of equality. We have all seen the buttons distributed widely by civil rights groups—they consist merely of an equal sign. No one can understand the full historical significance of this movement without a firm grasp of the history of the idea of equality. Equally important are the insights contributed by philosophy, literature, psychology, sociology, economics, anthropology, and the other disciplines.

The study of the great generative ideas carries one into many fields. It is an endless but constantly rewarding pursuit. The important thing is not to finish but to start. Let each person select the ideas which most intrigue or stimulate him. Perhaps the idea of God, or Justice, or education, or freedom, or equality. Let each person dip into what the great thinkers have said on this idea down through the ages. Let him trace its development through history, noting how it is reflected in contemporary literature, theater, movies, even television shows. He will find its reflection in the actions of people around him as well as in public actions and policies. He will discern consistent patterns emerging; he will see behind common misunderstandings. Then he will be able to apply what he has learned to his own life, to his appreciation of art and literature, to his response to public issues. Any American will find that his understanding of the basic ideas will give him a stability and power of mental functioning that few people readily attain without such discipline. In short, that continuing education in the humanities will go far to promote the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of our Nation.

Such growth has significance over and beyond each of us as individuals. If our civilization is moving into a phase in which questions of purpose will be paramount, then dealing with such questions will surely and swiftly become a prime duty of responsible citizens. The qualities of character and intellect which we have always tried to apply in our personal and family lives will be needed, more and more, in the public sphere as well. What August Heckscher has called the public happiness will become a concern of every one of us. The quality of our society, as measured by such standards as justice and beauty, will become a constant concern of the citizenry. The directions and goals we collectively pursue will be proper subjects for public debate—a tendency started a few years ago with the President's Report on National Goals. The state of the arts, of architecture, of music, and of philosophic thought, will engage the attention of more and more people. In short, we will move from a concern with necessities of life to a concern with ends, with purposes, with values—in short, with ideas. For this reason our continued growth toward maturity in dealing with ideas is not merely a personal matter, but an increasingly urgent demand of our society.

In his recent book on "Self-Renewal," the able president of the Carnegie Corp., said: "Instead of giving young people the impression that their task is to stand a dreary watch over the ancient values, we should be telling them the grim but bracing truth that it is their task to recreate those values continuously in their own behavior, facing the dilemmas and catastrophes of their own time. Instead of implying that the ideals we cherish are safely embalmed in the memory of old battles and ancestral deeds we should be telling them that each generation refights the crucial battles and either brings new vitality to the ideals or allows them to decay."

Both maturity in thinking and the vitality of ideas and ideals that have lived throughout centuries come through a reconsideration, a reappraisal and an adaptation to our times. This is the task of youth; this is the promise for the future.

Now the President has called upon us to lend our hands and our hearts to building the Great Society. This vision demands the reduction of the poverty, ignorance, and sickness which still blemish our affluent Nation. But it can and must mean something more. It must concern itself with the quality of American life, with our ideals, our ideas and with each of our personal lives.

In a real sense the cultivation of the humanities constitutes an integral part of

any vision of a new America. To know what is best in ourselves we must know the best that has been thought and felt throughout human history. We must listen attentively to those scholars and artists who deal most directly with the matters that touch each of us most deeply. As we work toward President Johnson's Great Society—which, as he says, "must begin with learning"—let us keep in mind what Wordsworth wrote in "The Prelude":

"There is one great society alone on earth:
The noble living and the noble dead."

NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT VOTES VIETNAM SUPPORT

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last month, the New Hampshire General Court adopted a resolution in support of our country's firm stand in southeast Asia. The legislature also expressed its gratitude on the part of the Granite State to the officers and men whose courage and professional skill is carrying out this policy. I concur with the resolution by the General Court of New Hampshire and offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union-Leader which includes the text of the resolution itself. I am proud of my State and the general court.

SO PROUDLY WE HAIL

Both houses of the New Hampshire Legislature deserve great praise for their unanimous passage of the following resolution:

"Whereas our Nation is engaged in military action in support of the people of Vietnam; and

"Whereas this support calls for difficult decisions and actions by the Commander in Chief and his military and political advisers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we, the members of the 1965 General Court of New Hampshire, express our approval of such firm and fair action as may be necessary to fulfill our responsibilities in southeast Asia; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our admiration and gratitude to the members of the Armed Forces and to those other American men and women who are facing dangers on our behalf; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Defense, and to Gen. William Childs Westmoreland."

As Senator English said, in speaking on behalf of the bill in the senate: "We must support our Government, for failure to do so may cost many lives and lead us into more and more serious situations."

Senator Paul Rinden said: "I am particularly interested, having been born and lived in south China for 10 years. I am impressed by President Johnson's stand there. I know that we shall have to face the Communists sooner or later. The question is whether it should start at Vietnam, Singapore, Australia or elsewhere. If we stand up to it now, we will be in a much better position to stop it than if we allow them to become more powerful."

Senator Louis Martel said: "It's high time that we Americans take a positive stand and face the atheist Communists throughout the world. We support any step that is taken by this administration or any party that takes a stand in this situation."

It would be a mighty encouraging thing if the other 49 States in the Union passed similar resolutions and sent them to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and to General Westmoreland.

Anyone knowing representatives in other States would do well to forward a copy of this paper to them and ask them to see that such resolutions are introduced into their own State legislatures.

It would not only assist President Johnson but it would impress our Communist enemies, who are apt to be misled by the raucous shoutings of the beatnik groups on our campuses into believing that they represent the true public opinion in the United States, where of course just the opposite is true.

As far as we know, this action by the New Hampshire Legislature is the first in the Nation, which is entirely as it should be. New Hampshire should always be first.

Proudly we hail our legislators for this constructive action.

Publisher.

BALTIC STATES: A TRIBUTE TO FREEDOM-LOVING PEOPLE

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering under Soviet tyranny. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The free world commemorates the loss of freedom of these three nations whose desire in their national existence was to live in peace and security. Geographically small and with limited power resources, the Baltic States fell within the sphere of Soviet influence when World War II broke out. The first breach of their independence occurred with the pacts of mutual assistance imposed upon the states by Moscow in the fall of 1939; the final and most total breach took place in the summer of 1940 when the three Baltic States, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, were invaded by the Red Army and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such as extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians were murdered by the Kremlin despots or died in exile in Soviet slave-labor camps and prisons in Siberia and other places of Communist Russia. At least 20 percent of the present population of Soviet-occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are not the Balts, but the Soviet colonists. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight. Bearing in mind that all of the murdered and deported people have been among the most educated, courageous, and industrious elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of

June 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3131

**Miss Velmarae Dunn, of Hammond, La.,
Supervisor of English and Speech at
Southeastern High School, Exemplifies
a Truly Great and Dedicated Person in
Our Teaching Profession and Typifies
Education in Its Highest Degree**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the finest ladies I have ever known in my life, and one of our best English teachers, Miss Velmarae Dunn of my hometown of Hammond, La.

At the end of a remarkably devoted career of teaching English and speech in both Hammond High School and Southeastern High in Hammond, La., Miss Velmarae Dunn, supervisor of English and speech at Southeastern High, will retire this month after 44 years of unselfish dedication to the students of Hammond.

Many years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and the privilege, myself, to be a student of Miss Dunn's in her English and speech classes in Hammond High. As I look back on my experiences in her classes and the many things she taught me, I realize now more than ever before the gift which this great lady bestowed upon me. She gave me an excellent and thorough grounding in English grammar, and instilled in me and so many of my fellow students, a great appreciation of literature which I have held dear to this day. Not only did she teach me the fundamentals of good and imaginative usage of the English language, but also Miss Dunn, by her own example, strengthened my character and fired my ambition to study harder in college and to pursue knowledge for its own sake all my life.

Miss Dunn also taught my two sons, James Hobson, Jr. "Hobby," and Benjamin "Benjy" Morrison, at Southeastern High School many years later. My two boys also had, Mr. Speaker, the fine exposure to this wonderful lady's devotion to her students and her energetic, imaginative mind. I know that they, too, have benefited from this experience with Miss Dunn.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite some of the highlights of this remarkable lady's career. Miss Dunn received both her B.A. and her M.A. degrees in English at the University of Oklahoma.

She returned to her hometown of Hammond, and began her teaching career at Hammond High School in 1921.

In 1927, while teaching at Hammond High, she sponsored and initiated a chapter of the National Honor Society.

In 1941, she assumed her present position at Southeastern High, and in 1951, she sponsored the installation of another chapter of the National Honor Society there.

Miss Dunn also, has helped install chapters at Ponchatoula High and Wardline Junior High.

At Southeastern, Miss Dunn is sponsor of the Scribbler's Club and Great Books Club.

In appreciation, students in the past have dedicated an annual to Miss Dunn, and this year are naming the new organization, of the Future Teachers of America, the Velmarae Dunn Chapter.

After retiring, Miss Dunn is anticipating teaching English during the summer session at SLC, as she has done in the several seasons of the past.

Also, she will have time to devote her time to community projects and hobbies, which include writing, good music, drama, reading, and bridge.

An Episcopalian, Miss Dunn is also a member of Phi Kappa Phi, Delta Kappa Gamma, Kappa Delta, Pi; Blue Violet; NEA; LEA; PTA; Language-Arts Club, American Association of University Women, and the National Council of Teachers of English.

For these reasons, and many more, I am very grateful to Miss Dunn for her exemplary contribution to my education, and I know I speak for all the people of Hammond area who themselves were students of Miss Dunn's or whose children benefited from this gracious lady's wisdom and devotion to her important duties in education. She has so justly earned the respect, appreciation, and commendation from all of our citizens for her outstanding career.

FE VN Morris
**Endorsement of President Johnson's
Policy on Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is with a considerable amount of pride and pleasure that I herewith submit a resolution recently adopted by the student council of the University of New Mexico, pledging the full support of the students at this fine university to the actions now being taken by President Lyndon B. Johnson during the struggle in Vietnam:

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States is of vital concern to the students of the University of New Mexico; and

Whereas the present situation in Vietnam is of great significance to the students of the University of New Mexico as members of the world community: Be it

Resolved by the Student Council of the University of New Mexico, That the Student Council of the University of New Mexico pledges its support to the actions being taken by President Johnson in Vietnam.

JIM BRANCE, Jr.
Student Body President.

This resolution seems to me to be of singular importance, representing as it

does the opinion of the student body in one of this Nation's finest universities. Additional respect must be paid to this fine resolution with the realization that several thousand of our university students know full well that by assisting the South Vietnamese Government in their fierce struggle against a combination of forces, including the communistic North Vietnamese Government, Red China, and the Soviet Union, this Nation has committed its full power and resources to the defense of freedom and the rights and privileges of freemen everywhere. It is good to see that this representative group of young American men and women fully realize that our fight in Vietnam is not merely a token resistance in a remote spot somewhere in southeast Asia but that it is, in fact, a full scale operation which they consider a front-line battle for the preservation, not alone of our American way of life, but of the basic principles of human decency, self-government, and absolute freedom from tyranny, oppression and subjugation to a reign of terror.

FE VN Reuss
**Wisconsin Democrats' and Republicans'
Views on Vietnam: Use the United Nations;
or "More Significant Targets" in
North Vietnam**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin's Democrats and Republicans continue the debate on our policy in southeastern Asia.

This week the Wisconsin State Democratic convention, assembled at Green Bay, adopted the following resolution on foreign affairs, stressing the need for a United Nations presence in southeast Asia:

International trouble spots such as Vietnam represent complex problems that are not only military, but social, political, and economic as well. American policy must reflect an adequate balance between the basic tenets of international diplomacy: The constant readiness to negotiate; the wise and prudent use of power; and the willingness to employ economic strength to help construct stable societies.

It is our fervent hope that peace in southeast Asia can be secured by completely unconditional negotiations about Vietnam with all actual parties to the conflict and we endorse efforts of the Johnson administration directed to this end. We urge that the United Nations be enlisted in this cause, and we ask that the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development.

To further consolidate the peoples of the free world, we urge the further lowering of tariff barriers, and the continuance of foreign aid where it contributes to economic and political advancement of developing peoples. We applaud the Peace Corps success as a people-to-people program of international understanding.

If we and the world are to find a peaceful and secure future, we must seek it in partnership with other nations. We must strengthen our regional alliances and adopt them to changing needs.

We continue our vigorous support of the United Nations as mankind's greatest hope for peace.

The results of our actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic illustrate the limitations on our power as a single nation to create a world in which all men may prosper in peace and freedom.

Recognition of these limitations—that even the world's most powerful nation cannot do everything everywhere—is not isolationism, as the Goldwaterites would have you believe.

We Democrats in the Midwest fought the old isolationism of the 1930's. We came out strong against the notion that America should do nothing, though the civilized world might be collapsing around us.

Now in the 1960's let us never adopt the idea that America should do everything, all by itself, in a new isolationism.

The internationalism of the 1960's must be based not on isolated, individual actions in international politics, but on concerted actions of coalitions of free nations.

We must rehabilitate the United Nations by settling the assessments question, and put it back on its feet. We must strengthen the Organization of American States. We must use them for peacekeeping, for conducting free elections, for sponsoring economic aid, wherever we can—and that includes Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We must invoke them not as a last resort, but from the first and as a matter of usual policy.

It is the Goldwaterite viewpoint that contends that the American people and their representatives have no right to debate the great issues of foreign policy, that debate weakens our country's position.

Thomas Jefferson defined us Democrats as "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish, and consider them as most honest and safe."

Well, we are the Democrats. And since we have confidence in the people, public debate can only strengthen our policy in its common sense and breadth of support.

I'm proud, therefore, that Democrats in both the House and Senate have been asking the important questions about our foreign policies and exploring, constructively, the alternatives that may be available.

Building world peace in freedom resembles building the Great Society at home. It takes the contributions and efforts of many men and nations working together, each with the same goal, each contributing his special talents and his wisdom on how the goal may be achieved. That is the America we love, the America that in Abraham Lincoln's thrilling phrase, can be "not the terror of the world, but the encourager of the world."

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who is chairman of the Republican conference in the House of Representatives, issued a formal statement on Vietnam policy in which he said:

We may be dangerously close to ending any Republican support of our present Vietnam policy.

James Reston, in the New York Times of June 16, 1965, described the statement as follows:

In a formal statement, he has criticized the administration for seeking a negotiated settlement, for failing to aim at total victory in Vietnam, and for using large numbers of American troops for limited ends rather than using the bombers against military targets around Haiphong.

"If our objective is a negotiated settlement," Representative LAIRD says, "it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

"One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam."

Representative LAIRD does not explain how we are going to achieve his dual objectives of limiting American casualties and "driving the Communists out of South Vietnam," but since there is a lot of support for this policy at the Pentagon, and he is addressing a clever political argument to a very political President, his case is worth analysis.

It is based on the assumption that the only trouble with our bombing campaign is that there has not been enough of it, that it will "protect American lives" if only we bomb the populous supply areas in the north within the range of the North Vietnamese fighting aircraft.

President Johnson is staying away from these precisely because he believes raiding Haiphong and Hanoi will kill a lot of civilians, produce a major invasion of the south by North Vietnamese forces and thus tip the power balance against the Americans as well as the South Vietnamese.

The issue is worth debating.

Recreation for City People Included in Imaginative Program of the Rural Community Development Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Community Development Service is considering an imaginative program to help make possible the private development of a new type of recreation area which would be a cross between a public park and the increasingly popular "hobby farm."

This program, which was outlined today by Rural Community Development Service Administrator Robert G. Lewis, is attractive because it ties together existing Federal programs in a package designed to benefit city people while strengthening sagging rural economies.

The concept of recreational land-use projects aided by the regular services of the Department of Agriculture and cropland conversion payments is one element of the program of the Service to make sure that rural people have an equal opportunity to benefit from the Federal programs enacted for all Americans.

Lewis described the Service's program in an enlightening speech to the REA annual field conference in St. Louis, Mo. The text of his speech follows:

THE NEW HORIZONS FOR RURAL AMERICA
(By Robert G. Lewis, Administrator, Rural Community Development Service)

President Johnson, in his message to Congress on February 4, 1965, pledged energetic action to insure that full equality of oppor-

tunity is made available to all the people who live in rural America. In the same message, the President announced the formation of the Rural Community Development Service, with the President's charge to carry out that pledge.

Today's economy in the United States is in the course of the longest period of continuous prosperity in our history. Month after month, new records are being set in the volume of wealth being produced. Most Americans are enjoying the highest standard of living in their lives, and look forward with confidence to continuing progress.

But there are millions of Americans—one-fifth of our people—who have not shared in the abundance that has been granted to most of us.

Rural America contains nearly one-half of these people who do not share in our prosperity. They live among the 30 percent of our total population who live on farms, in the open countryside, and in small towns under 2,500 population. Forty-seven percent of the Nation's poverty exists in these rural communities.

Very few farm families earn returns on their investment and from their skills and labor comparable to the returns received in other sectors of the economy.

Gross farm income reached an alltime high in 1964. Net farm income was higher last year than in 1963, and it has been higher in each of the past 4 years than in 1960.

Yet the disposable income per person of the farm population in 1964 was only about 60 percent of the average received by the nonfarm population.

Fewer than 400,000 farmers earn a wage for their labor comparable to that of a skilled industrial wage earner, \$2.46 per hour; and as much as 5-percent return on their investment.

There are between 2 and 3 million farmers who receive less than a 5-percent return on their investment and the national minimum hourly wage of \$1.25 per hour. In 1960, there were 1,600,000 farm families living in outright poverty, with family incomes below \$3,000 per year.

Not all of the rural poor people are farmers. Three-fourths of the people who live in rural America neither live nor work on farms. They include former coal miners in Appalachia, Illinois, and Iowa; timber workers and iron and copper miners in the Upper Great Lakes region; and many others in every rural county in every State in the Nation. In 1960, there were 2,800,000 rural non-farm families living in poverty.

Let me illustrate the opportunity gap between urban and rural areas by reference to a single field of Federal activity—housing. The proportion of substandard and deteriorating housing is twice as high in rural America as in our metropolitan areas. Almost half the people who live in bad housing in this country are rural people, although they comprise only 30 percent of the population. Yet, despite this heavy concentration of need in the rural areas, the Federal Government since 1950 through the Federal Housing Administration insurance programs alone has helped to build more than 3 dozen new houses in the cities and their suburbs for each single one that has been built with the assistance of the Farmers Home Administration in rural communities.

Or consider the manpower development and training program, administered by the Department of Labor. Its purpose is to provide specific and intensive training in job skills. Certainly such a program is needed urgently in rural areas—where regular educational opportunities all too often have been far below par.

The RCDS staff has just completed a series of representative spot checks on the actual training programs conducted under the manpower development and training program.