

Whereas the liberty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in June 1940, notwithstanding solemn treaties and agreements of nonaggression; and

Whereas the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they had enjoyed for many centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over 20 percent of the Baltic population since June 1940; and

Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That we Americans of Baltic origin or descent reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the U.S. Congress to pass 1 of some 74 Senate or House Concurrent Resolutions, pending now before the Senate and House committees, requesting the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and to ask that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw from the Baltic States, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberian prisons and slave-labor camps and to conduct free elections in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania under the United Nations supervision.

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES, ROCHESTER, N.Y., CHAPTER,
 JOSEPH YUREKUS, *Chairman*,
 ALFRED NIXDOLS, *Cochairman*,
 ABEL PINTSON, *Cochairman*.

I have sponsored and supported a resolution in Congress, House Concurrent Resolution 290, calling for official condemnation, through the United Nations, of the Soviet enslavement of the Baltic. I request that the United States go on record now in firm support of the principles of human rights which are now being denied to the peoples of the Baltic Nations. The search for world peace will never be ended until the American principle of self-determination is recognized by all nations, and the Baltic Nations are finally freed and their oppressors duly punished.

FE VA *Adair*
PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO EXTEND BENEFITS TO VETERANS SERVING IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as well as other Members of the House of Representatives have been receiving an increasing amount of mail suggesting that servicemen who are exposed to the combat conditions currently existing in South Vietnam be entitled to the same benefits that were granted to World War II and Korean veterans. An analysis of the veteran's benefit program reveals that the survivors of men who were killed as a result of the action in Vietnam are already entitled to the same benefits as were the survivors of World

War II and the Korean conflict servicemen who were killed in that action. One possible exception, of course, is the National Service Life Insurance that was afforded to World War II servicemen and the serviceman's indemnity that was furnished Korean conflict veterans. At the time these two programs terminated, however, a new system of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors was established. The monthly payments created under this program were sufficient to replace the insurance or indemnity benefit which had been available.

Veterans who are injured or disabled as the result of action in Vietnam are similarly compensated in the same manner and to the same degree as were veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. Vocational rehabilitation and hospitalization for the treatment of service-connected disability is also available to this group. The following broad range of benefits available to veterans who serve in South Vietnam was prepared by the Veterans' Affairs Committee:

COMPENSATION

Service in South Vietnam is considered as extrahazardous service under conditions simulating war. For this reason a veteran suffering a service-connected disability while serving in South Vietnam is entitled to compensation at wartime rates ranging from \$30 per month for 10-percent disability to \$250 for total disability; and from \$340 to \$726 for more severely disabled.

Dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to the qualified survivors of servicemen now serving, whose death resulted from a service-connected disease or injury. The formula is \$120 per month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the person who served—payable to widows; other amounts payable to children and dependent parents.

SOCIAL SECURITY

All individuals serving after January 1, 1957, are covered on contributory basis. Examples of possible benefits under this program follow:

A man in pay grade E-3 (private, first class) with more than 2 years and less than 6 years' service, dies. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$128 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$113. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$62 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade E-6 (sergeant or petty officer), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$202 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$143. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$78 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

A man in pay grade O-3 (captain), with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for 8 years. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of \$264 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to \$191. It remains at this level until

the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of \$106 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

Disability payments are made to a veteran with sufficient coverage when total disability is found by social security standards and this benefit would be in addition to Veterans' Administration compensation.

HOSPITALIZATION

Medical care and treatment, inpatient and outpatient, for any service-connected disability. Inpatient medical care if discharged for a service-connected disability or entitled to compensation.

EDUCATION

A veteran of current service is entitled to vocational rehabilitation training if he has a compensable service-connected disability of 30 percent or more, or if less, can show clearly that he has a pronounced employment handicap resulting from a service-connected disability, and the Veterans' Administration determines a need for vocational rehabilitation.

War orphans' education assistance is payable (\$119 per month for full-time courses for 3 calendar years between ages 18 and 28) to a qualified beneficiary of a veteran whose death or total disability of a permanent nature is service incurred while serving in South Vietnam, based on the same criteria as is applied to a veteran of wartime service.

HOUSING

Assistance in the purchase of specially adapted housing through a grant of up to \$10,000 is available where the veteran has a service-connected disability entitling him to compensation for permanent and total disability due to loss or loss of use of both lower extremities or blindness plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

While serving and for 2 years thereafter, the premiums and interest on eligible commercial life insurance policies not exceeding \$10,000 on the life of the serviceman may be guaranteed by the Government under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. This same act provides protection in meeting financial obligations.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

This right is identical in coverage and purpose to that provided World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

INSURANCE

Available to veterans with service-connected disabilities. Application must be made within 1 year from date of determination of service connection.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Covered by a program similar to that provided for Federal civilian employees.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

This benefit ranges from a minimum of \$500 to a maximum of \$3,000 based on rank and is payable to widow, children, parents, brothers, or sisters.

BURIAL BENEFITS

Reimbursement for burial expenses is provided for in the case of any veteran of current service if he was in receipt of service-connected compensation at the time of his death or was discharged or retired for disability incurred in line of duty and the next of kin is entitled to a burial flag if the deceased veteran had served one enlistment or was discharged for a service-incurred disability. Any veteran whose last period of service terminated honorably is entitled to burial in a national cemetery and a headstone or grave marker.

It will be noted that educational benefits, home loan guarantees, and hospital-

ization for non-service-connected disabilities are not available to these veterans. It is my understanding that the omnibus housing bill now pending before this body contains provisions authorizing a liberal preference in housing under the Federal Housing Administration program. I am today introducing legislation that will authorize educational assistance on the same basis as that provided for World War II and Korean conflict veterans to any veteran who served for 10 or more days in Vietnam. Members will recall that the President recently designated Vietnam and certain waters adjacent thereto as combat areas for the purpose of income tax relief for persons serving therein. My bill establishes the same geographical boundaries and the same time limitations as the President's Executive order for entitlement. In summary, the bill will provide 1 1/2 days of education for each day of military service performed between January 1, 1964, and the date Vietnam is no longer designated as a combat area to any veteran who served at least 10 days in Vietnam during this period. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Diary column in the Washington Post disclosed June 8 that the Civil Service Commission's top-grade employees and officials have received invitations to the \$100-a-plate Democratic congressional dinner here in Washington on June 24.

The column comments:

Historically, employees and officials of the CSC have been bypassed by fundraisers of both major political parties. But it's different now.

The column further advises that these invitations were sent to their homes, and while no violations were involved "CSC people cannot help wondering who supplied the Democratic fundraisers with their names and addresses."

Previous Washington newspaper accounts over the last several weeks have divulged that political appointees in Federal jobs have been asked to illegally approach U.S. Government employees to buy tickets to this Democratic function.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than a little irony in all this. I have been badgering the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department for months to act on cases involving illegal political shakedown for campaign funds. The CSC has not acted, even though its investigation has been completed for 6 months. Now even its own employees are reaping the whirlwind.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has read over the last several years of the increasingly brazen efforts of politicians holding Federal jobs to bring their civil service subordinates to political heel cannot escape the feeling that the entire Federal workforce is tragically threatened. We have a fine and decent group of citizens pres-

ently in the public service. They have been free to carry out their responsibilities fairly and judiciously because they have been protected by Federal law from any political pressure from any political quarter.

Are we preparing now to turn these millions of dedicated public servants over to the evils of the spoils system? Are we going to sit back and watch while all the careful protections constructed in their behalf are ruthlessly destroyed by men seeking cold political power? Is there anyone so foolish as to think that political manipulation of the entire Federal work force will result in better government? In fairer, nonpartisan, and less costly administration?

Mr. Speaker, as a former Rural Electrification Administrator, I personally received complaints from Federal workers in the REA who were under pressure from politicians holding Federal jobs. These workers were asked to contribute parts of their salaries to expensive political dinner parties and other political fundraising functions. Provisions of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act clearly forbid this form of coercion, of course, and the penalties can entail fines and jail sentences.

Ever since these complaints were brought to me, I have sought justice for those subjected to these insidious shake-down attempts. I have been well aware how difficult it is to secure justice because too often civil service employees subjected to such intimidation fear speaking out, fear bringing charges. They fear jeopardizing their family's income through loss of jobs and they are reluctant to part with long-accumulated benefits. And so, with documentation finally at the Government's disposal, it is almost impossible to believe that no corrective action has yet been taken on these REA cases.

We can see now that failure to act is leading toward.

The time has come to ask this question: Are we going to have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Or are we going to have government of the politician, by the politician, and for the politician?

The choice may well be at hand.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the course of my subcommittee hearings on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act questions have been directed at the Department of Labor for written responses. Because I want to be absolutely fair to everyone interested in this major legislation, I promised that I would make public the responses of the Department insofar as this is possible. Some of the responses are so lengthy that they cannot be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but where this is the case, I shall cite the document which will be available to Members from the Department of Labor.

We have received several responses to date and I request permission to have them placed in the RECORD at this point. The responses include answers to questions raised with respect to the following seven points:

- First. Minimum wage in agriculture.
 - Second. The impact of increasing the present \$1.25 minimum wage.
 - Third. Effect of minimum wage on foreign competition.
 - Fourth. Comparative costs of overtime pay and new hires.
 - Fifth. The extent to which the proposed legislation would be affected by raising the \$250,000 enterprise test to \$500,000.
 - Sixth. The authority of the executive branch to require Government contractors to pay minimum wages in the absence of a statute.
 - Seventh. The effects of the first phase of the 1961 amendments on retail trade.
- The first response was to the question regarding the impact of a minimum wage in agriculture. In addition to the following tables, the Department submitted data pertinent to determining the scope and level of a minimum wage for hired farmworkers, entitled "Hired Farmworkers," dated January 1964, published by the U.S. Department of Labor.

1. MINIMUM WAGE IN AGRICULTURE

The most complete data relating to wages of hired farmworkers are for May 1963. In view of the relatively small change in farm wage rates since then, it is believed that the estimates based on these data are substantially the same today.

Tables 1 and 2 show the proportions of hired farmworkers in the United States and the South earning less than specified hourly wage rates and the increase in the hourly wage bill of employees which would result from raising the wages of workers earning less than the specified rates to those levels. Data are shown separately for all farms and for farms which use 300 or more man-days of hired farm labor in a peak quarter.

We are sending you a copy of the report on "Hired Farmworkers" prepared for the Congress in January 1964 in accordance with the requirements of section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

TABLE 1.—Hired farmworkers—Number of hired farmworkers earning less than specified wage rates, and increases in wage bill required to raise workers earning less than specified wage rates to those rates, United States, May 1963

Wage rate (cents per hour)	Workers earning less than specified rate		Percent increase in wage bill
	Number	Percent	
All farms			
20	604,000	23	14
25	546,000	20	7
30	615,000	23	7
35	716,000	28	8
40	765,000	30	13
45	814,000	32	14
50	867,000	34	17
55	922,000	36	21
60	980,000	38	25
65	991,000	39	28
70	1,020,000	40	30
75	1,217,000	47	35
80	1,302,000	50	37
85	1,363,000	53	40
90	1,387,000	54	42
95	1,428,000	56	45
Total number of workers	1,907,000		

June 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13119

ipal buildings' upper floors and in a skyscraper overlooking the East River at Wall Street. In these two sites are the offices of the department of water supply, gas and electricity, which operates the city water system, and the State-created board of water supply, which plans and builds the city's system. Last week, as the drought continued, engineers in both bodies were undergoing a basic revision of thinking for this reason:

New York is enduring the longest period of drought that has occurred in the three-and-a-half centuries since Henry Hudson went up the river.

EVIDENCE

This, at least, seems to be the evidence of records. New York's engineering records on rainfall, streamflow, and ground water go back only a century at the longest. Its social records, which might indicate unusual periods of weather, go back only a few centuries more. Apparently, there never has been a successful scientific effort at determining the recurrence of droughts over a good long time, like a millennium, by the study of such things as tree rings, pollen deposits, and geologic clues.

All water systems are built on records. Curves—"mass curves" they are called—are drawn of such things as rainfall, water consumption, and growth of population. Lines are drawn from peak to peak on the curve, bridging the valleys of past droughts, to discover how big the supply would have to be to keep from running dry in the worst drought that has ever occurred.

SAFE YIELD

The final result is a statement of capacity called by water engineers the safe yield. It is the key to all systems and the figure over which all the technical controversies about the city's present water plight will rage.

Members of the board of water supply freely concede events have proved that their safe yield figures was too high.

The worst drought of the past was a 2-year period in the thirties; this was long ago exceeded by the present 4-year drought. The board also points out, though, that the public couldn't have been asked to spend millions for reservoirs that couldn't be justified on the basis of experience.

New water systems are not only expensive but slow to develop. The average lapse from the time the idea is proposed until water runs through the mains is a quarter of a century.

New York's planners are faced, moreover, with a demand whose scale is rarely appreciated. The volume of water used by the city is more than one-twentieth of all the water supplied by municipal systems in the United States.

AWESOMENESS

The city consumes, day in and day out, a volume of water equal to more than half the mighty Hudson River as it flows now past the gaging station near Albany. Demand on such a scale precludes almost all of the hasty solutions to water shortages put forward in crises.

For a quick solution, the best possibility is the one that occurs at the end of "The Day New York Went Dry." In the book, the city is in terrible straits when—aw, you might as well buy the book and find out.

[From the New York Times, June 13]

REPORT FROM THE NATION—DROUGHT
PARCHED NORTHEAST

An Atlanta restaurant, advertising to New Yorkers in big black letters "all the water you can drink without request," brings home to them that, thanks to the drought, they must order water even when they aren't drinking bourbon.

New York fountains that use city water have been turned off. Watering lawn and gardens is restricted, use of private swimming

pools banned. And city dwellers have been exhorted by Water Commissioner Armand D'Angelo to reduce their water use by a third.

The drought extends far beyond New York, however. It stretches from southwestern Maine into Virginia. In severe or moderate form it covers two-thirds of New York, all of New Jersey, and half of Pennsylvania.

It's at its worst over the New York watershed in the Catskills and the Hudson Valley. That area, normally humid, has been in drought for 4 years, since the fall of 1961, according to Wayne C. Palmer, climatologist of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

The rain gages show that this drought, in intensity and duration, is the most severe in the region in 50 years. What caused it?

Apparently the prevailing pattern of upper-air currents has shifted more to the Northwest than normal, according to Mr. Palmer. That is, the air masses that move in the lower half of the troposphere—the lower 20,000 feet of the atmosphere—are coming from the Northwest rather than the West as they approach the east coast. As they approach the Appalachians traveling from West to East they tend to bulge into Canada.

The direction affects the motion. Normally, the airflow is upward. As air rises in the lower atmosphere it cools, its relative humidity increases and when it is cool enough it forms rain clouds.

But in the last 3 years the more northerly flow of the air currents has resulted in a phenomenon weathermen call subsidence, the air masses subsiding or sinking down toward earth.

Because the flow comes from a more northerly area, its temperature is lower. This flow halts warmer air masses, particularly in the ridge of air over the Appalachians.

What happens then is just the opposite of the direction of the churning motion needed to make rain. The cooler air masses sink down and are compressed by the ridge. The ridge warms them and dries the air, inhibiting precipitation. Normally, the upper air goes through a wringer that squeezes out moisture. Under subsidence they go through a process like a laundromat's drier.

The last time New York City's reservoirs were full—storing 478.5 billion gallons of water—was in 1961. Now, with the depletion period starting, they are 54.9-percent full—down to only 261.7 billion gallons.

Does this mean that New York could have a water famine in October? Yes, indeed, Water Commissioner D'Angelo holds. But they need not, he says. New Yorkers use about 78 gallons a person a day. If each New Yorker could cut his use to 25 to 30 gallons a day, Mr. D'Angelo estimates, the city will make out, without famine.

FE DR WH N. Javits

HEARINGS BY THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has just announced its intention to hold fact-finding hearings on the situation in the Dominican Republic. I welcome that announcement, for I have felt for some time—as others in the Congress and across the country have felt—that Congress should be a continuing party to the consideration of conflicts in which U.S. troops are taking part and other U.S. military action is undertaken. I believe that Congress should thus assert its interest and constitutional responsibilities in foreign policy.

But the United States is now involved militarily on two fronts: in the Dominican Republic and, heavily, in Vietnam. Congress, both as a whole and through

the appropriate committees, should, therefore, be factfinding, not on just one of these fronts, but on both.

I suggest the Foreign Relations Committee under take factfinding hearings on Vietnam, too. No less than hearings on the Dominican Republic, these would contribute enormously to a national understanding of the issues involved. Particularly at a time when the country seems to be about to embark on a major Asian ground war—which could entail the risk of greater U.S. casualties than at any time since the Korean war and which could escalate the Vietnam conflict onto a new and vastly more dangerous level—the holding of such hearings would be a service of inestimable value to the Nation.

Such factfinding hearings could form the basis for another resolution to bring up to date the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, in accordance with which the President is now acting, and which, as I have said many times before, is now getting out of date.

The Foreign Relations Committee could, like the United States, divide its forces for the present purpose into ad hoc committees on the Dominican Republic and on Vietnam. It could also explore the idea of joint hearings with the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Among the questions which need to be answered are these:

First. What new responsibilities are our forces assuming in Vietnam?

Second. What extension of the nature and the area of the conflict is contemplated?

Third. What outside help is the Vietcong getting, and what assistance is North Vietnam receiving from other Communist countries?

Fourth. What is the situation in South Vietnam as concerns the desire of its people and government to have us there, especially in view of the tremendous instability of the South Vietnamese Government?

Fifth. What is the situation in south-east Asia and other parts of Asia—in Thailand, in Burma, in Malaysia, in India, in Pakistan, in Japan, and the Philippines—concerns the desire to have us engaged in an escalated way in the Vietnam struggle?

Sixth. What help are we getting from our allies, such as those in the South-east Asia Treaty Organization, and what is the likelihood of our getting more help?

Seventh. What are the practical possibilities of regional or United Nations action to maintain peace in Vietnam?

Mr. President, the country needs the answers to these and other questions concerning Vietnam fully as much as it needs answers about the Dominican Republic. I urge the Foreign Relations Committee to follow its praiseworthy action regarding the Dominican Republic by taking similar action with respect to hearings on Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NAYS--58

Alton	Harris	Morton
Allott	Hart	Neison
Bass	Hill	Pastore
Bennett	Hruska	Pell
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Carlson	Kuchel	Saltmstall
Cass	Lausche	Scott
Chambers	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Manefield	Smith
Curtis	McCarthy	Stennis
Dirksen	McClellan	Symington
Dodd	McGovern	Talmadge
Douglas	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	Yarborough
Ervin	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	
Gore	Montoya	

NOT VOTING--16

Anderson	McNamara	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Moss	Simpson
Fong	Murphy	Thurmond
Hayden	Muskie	Tydings
Holland	Neuberger	
McGee	Pearson	

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret to digress a few minutes to speak on another subject, but since we have been preoccupied with taxes, it will not hurt to pay attention to another subject for a moment. In addition, the precedent established during the last 8 days of the consideration of the foreign aid bill makes it legitimate to change the subject for a few minutes.

I wish to say a few words about Vietnam.

It is clear to all reasonable Americans that a complete military victory in Vietnam, though theoretically attainable, can in fact be attained only at a cost far exceeding the requirements of our interest and our honor. It is equally clear that the unconditional withdrawal of American support from South Vietnam would have disastrous consequences, including but by no means confined to the victory of the Vietcong in South Vietnam. Our policy therefore 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.

I am opposed to an unconditional American withdrawal from South Vietnam because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peking and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power.

I am no less 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 strate-

gic 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 either massive Chinese military intervention in many vulnerable areas in southeast Asia or general nuclear war.

With the coming of the monsoons the Vietcong has undertaken expanded offensive action against the American-supported South Vietnamese Army. This new phase of the war has been going badly for our side and it is likely that the Vietcong offensive will be sustained until the end of the monsoons in October or November. As the ground war expands and as American involvement and American casualties increase, there will be mounting pressures for expansion of the war. For the reasons indicated, I believe that expansion of the war would be most unwise.

There have already been pressures from various sources for expanding the war. President Johnson has resisted these pressures with steadfastness and statesmanship and remains committed the goal of ending the war at the earliest possible time by negotiations without preconditions. In so doing, he is providing the leadership appropriate to a great nation.

The most striking characteristic of a great nation is not the mere possession of power but the wisdom and restraint and largeness of view with which power is exercised. A great nation is one which is capable of looking beyond its own view of the world, or recognizing that, however convinced it may be of the beneficence of its own role and aims, other nations may be equally persuaded of their benevolence and good intent. It is a mark of both greatness and maturity when a nation like the United States, without abandoning its convictions and commitments, is capable at the same time of acknowledging that there may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of its adversaries.

The United States has made repeated efforts over the last 4½ years to reach reasonable settlements in southeast Asia. Continuous talks have been held at the ambassadorial level with the Chinese Communists in Warsaw without any indication that the Chinese are prepared to accept any settlement in southeast Asia short of the complete withdrawal of the United States and the establishment of their own hegemony. In 1962 the United States adhered to the Geneva Agreement for the neutralization of Laos; thereafter the United States withdrew all of its military personnel while North Vietnam has continued to support the Pathet Lao militarily against the other Laotian factions. In 1964 and again in 1965, the United States responded favorably to proposals for conferences on the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia, clearly in the hope that such a conference would also provide an opportunity for informal discussions with the Communist powers on Vietnam; the Communist powers have thus far been unresponsive to this proposal.

In April 1965 the Secretary General of

the United Nations proposed to visit Peking and Hanoi in order to discuss Vietnam; Communist China replied that "the Vietnam question has nothing to do with the United Nations" and North Vietnam replied that "any approach tending to secure United Nations intervention in the Vietnam situation is inappropriate." On February 20 of this year the United Kingdom, with American encouragement, proposed to the Soviet Union that Britain and Russia, as cochairmen of the Geneva Conference, explore the possibilities of a Vietnam settlement with all the Geneva signatories; the Soviet Union declined to participate in such an effort. The British Government then proposed to send former Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker to explore the bases of a Vietnam settlement with interested countries; both Communist China and North Vietnam replied that Mr. Gordon Walker would not be welcome.

The clearest and strongest, but by no means the first, American indication of support for a negotiated settlement came in President Johnson's now famous Johns Hopkins speech of last April 7. In this speech the President stated explicitly and forcefully that the United States was prepared to enter unconditional discussions for the termination of the Vietnamese war; Hanoi and Peking, as we all know, rejected the President's offer out of hand. On April 8th, in reply to the appeal of 17 nonaligned nations—and I congratulate them for it—for a peaceful settlement through negotiations without preconditions, the United States reiterated its willingness to enter unconditional discussions; the United States further indicated that it was prepared to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam as soon as conditions were created in which the South Vietnamese people could determine their future without external interference. In reply to an Indian proposal for the cessation of hostilities and the policing of boundaries by an Afro-Asian force, the United States expressed interest and undertook discussions of the proposal with the Indian Government; Communist China and North Vietnam have rejected and denounced the Indian proposal.

The United States suspended bombing operations against North Vietnam from May 13 to May 17 in the clear hope that the other side would respond to previous offers of negotiations. My own feeling is that the period of suspension of bombing was too short, but it must also be noted that the suspension elicited no response whatever from Hanoi and Peking, who in fact denounced the suspension of bombing in harsh language. Finally, at the end of May the Canadian representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam went to Hanoi to discuss the reaction of North Vietnam to the pause in American bombing; on the basis of the Canadian representative's report, Canadian Foreign Minister Martin has concluded that North Vietnam and Communist China are not receptive to peace overtures at this time.

The United States has been patient and remains patient in its efforts to bring

about a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese war. It cannot be denied that there have been mistakes over the years in our policy in Vietnam, not the least of which was the encouragement given in the mid-1950's to President Ngo Dinh Diem to violate certain provisions of the Geneva accords of 1954. Even when past mistakes are admitted, the fact remains that over the past 4½ years the United States has consistently sought to negotiate compromise settlements on southeast Asia. I believe that President Kennedy and President Johnson have been wise in their restraint and patience, that indeed this patience has quite possibly averted a conflict that would be disastrous for both the Communist countries and for the United States and its associates. I believe that continued restraint and continued patience, even in the face of expanded Vietcong military activities, are essential to avert a catastrophe in southeast Asia.

It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement. It would be a mistake to match Communist intransigence with our own. In the months ahead we must try to do two things in South Vietnam: First we must sustain the South Vietnamese Army so as to persuade the Communists that Saigon cannot be crushed and that the United States will not be driven from South Vietnam by force; second, we must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory. For the time being it seems likely that the focus of our efforts will have to be on persuading the Communists that they cannot win a complete military victory; only when this has become clear is it likely they will respond to our proposals for unconditional negotiations.

The short-term outlook is by no means bright but neither is it without hope. It may well be, if we are resolute but also restrained in the conduct of the war, that when the current Vietcong offensive has run its course without decisive result the Communists will be disposed to take a different view of our standing proposal for unconditional negotiations. At such time as it becomes clear to all interested parties that neither side can expect to win a complete military victory, I would think it appropriate and desirable for the United States to reiterate forcefully and explicitly its willingness to negotiate a compromise peace and thereafter to join with other countries in mounting a large-scale program for the economic and social development of southeast Asia.

The possible terms of a settlement cannot now be foreseen or usefully speculated upon. As a general proposition, however, I think there may be much to be said for a return to the Geneva accords of 1954, not just in their essentials but in all their specifications. Should such a settlement be reached, it is to be hoped that both sides will recall the unrewarding consequences of their past violations of the 1954 agreements.

Looking beyond a possible settlement of the Vietnamese war, it may be that the major lesson of this tragic conflict will be a new appreciation of the power of nationalism in southeast Asia and, indeed, in all of the world's emerging nations. Generally, American foreign policy in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America has been successful and constructive insofar as American aims have coincided with the national aims of the peoples concerned. The tragedy of Vietnam is that for many reasons, including the intransigence of a colonial power and the initial failure of the United States to appreciate the consequences of that intransigence, the nationalist movement became associated with and largely subordinate to the Communist movement.

In the postwar era it has been demonstrated repeatedly that nationalism is a stronger force than communism and that the association of the two, which has created so many difficulties for the United States, is neither inevitable nor natural. In the past it has come about when, for one reason or another, the West has set itself in opposition to the national aspirations of the emerging peoples. It is to be hoped that we will not do so again; it is to be hoped that in the future the United States will leave no country in doubt as to its friendship and support for legitimate national aspirations. If we do this, I do not think that we will soon find ourselves in another conflict like the one in Vietnam.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me commend the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for much of his analysis of the situation as it is today in South Vietnam. I was impressed by his detailing of the efforts of this administration with respect to all the efforts that have been made looking toward negotiation.

I ask the Senator, because of his knowledge and experience in this field, if he has any suggestions as to what additional could be done by the administration at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I referred to what must be done "at this time" because of developments connected with the current Vietcong offensive. The Vietcong believe they have an advantage under the inclement weather conditions of the monsoon season. I do not believe they are in a mood to seek an end to the war at present. I am reconciled to the prospect that they will not respond to any proposal between now and the end of the monsoons in November or December. Therefore, I approve of the President's efforts now to strengthen South Vietnam and to maintain its security through that period.

However, if this becomes an indecisive war, as I think it will, it will become quite clear that neither side is going to win a great victory, in spite of the experience of Dien Bien, when the French had 250,000 of their own troops and 200,000 plus of the Vietnamese troops. We know what happened there after 7 years.

I know that 1 American is equal to 10 Frenchmen, but that is not literally true when we have modern weapons. That is merely individually true with reference to other matters.

I do not believe that either side would have a great victory. I believe that when this becomes evident, it will clarify the situation. Peiping will not want to do anything to end the war. They feel that they will benefit by it. However, the people at Hanoi and the Russians will have a different attitude.

I believe that is quite possible. I approve of the efforts of the ground forces in South Vietnam in order to secure what we have possession of, but I am not anxious to expand the conflict or in any way to escalate the war. I think that then it would get out of hand. I do not know where it would then stop.

I am hoping we can control the situation, pending conditions that would allow of negotiations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. As to Dien Bien, I would suggest there is little comparison. Studying that battle, the two major mistakes the French made were in believing that nothing over a 75 millimeter gun could be moved over the jungle trails and their underestimating the valor of the Vietcong. The French were poorly led by Navarre, and placed themselves in a position from which they had no avenue for retreat in the event they met with severe reverses. They were completely surrounded. They fought with great courage, but had no chance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that statement. I am not suggesting that there be an escalation. I think that we can contain them. The French put in 8 years fighting. They had 250,000 of their best troops, French troops, and in addition to that they had some 200,000 Vietnamese troops. The French are good fighters, as the Senator knows. However, this is a combination of jungle, weather, and people who have no idea of political organization. I do not want to go into all of that. However, this is a very difficult place in which to operate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it would appear that the chairman is pointing out to the American people that, especially since air support is much more difficult in the monsoon season, they should expect some reverses during the coming months. The Senator does not believe the war should be escalated, but believes we should remain in South Vietnam, through the monsoon season, after which things would be better from the standpoint of possible successful negotiations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct, so far as policy is concerned. The other part about the political effort that the administration has been making has, I think, been too little noticed in the press. There has been too little said about the real effort that we have made to end the war and too much said about the bombings. This creates a distorted view of policy. I do not believe that this has been done deliberately. However, the

nature of news is that bombings are newsworthy and peaceful efforts are not. I wanted to emphasize what we have tried to do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator and commend him for his statement listing all the various efforts this administration has made to get negotiations underway.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said. I know the influence that the Senator has on the establishment of policies and the efforts in which we take part. I agree with the Senator in his statement about the war and its escalation, and the desire and importance of continuing to seek negotiations.

It seems to me that one of the great difficulties which we face is that there is no desire on the other side to negotiate. I believe that we are very clear on that. However, when we do negotiate and go back to Geneva or some other forum, the great weakness, it seems to me, will be that there must be an effort made in any negotiations to protect any treaty or understanding that we reach. We have seen understandings break down so many times. We must have some way to make it very clear that any understanding we reach on the cessation of hostilities will be lived up to. That is the great difficulty which we face, which, perhaps, the Senator did not describe very fully in his speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not minimize the difficulties of reaching or enforcing an agreement. I know that they are very great. However, that would come at a much later date. I was trying to make the point, and the major point, that I do not want to expand this conflict into an all-out war, either of world-wide proportions or even as large as the war in Korea was. I do not think that the Korean war was beneficial to the world or to that country.

I do not believe that anyone with modern weapons could ever hope to come out of a war with any profit at all. Weapons are too destructive. We know that science has made modern war intolerable. War used to be a lot of fun for a lot of people. However, that is not the case any longer.

I believe that we ought to minimize the military, and stress the political and diplomatic, aspects of the situation. I cannot reconcile myself to the belief that the Russians are immune and unknowing about these.

They have not exercised a great influence yet. However, it is possible that they might. We are quite aware of what can be done. I have the feeling that the Chinese are goading us both in the hope that we will destroy each other.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that we have good evidence of the truth of that statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to destroy the Russian people. They are great people. They have been coming along and making great progress in many ways. I am almost

afraid to say this because the Chinese will blast them again as American lackeys, as they have before. However, the Senator has noticed what the Chinese have said about the Russians in the last few days. The same thing has happened in the case of the Yugoslavs and the Rumanians. The Rumanians came over and made friendly gestures and wanted to trade. Our Government accepted the gestures and was willing to trade. A most unfortunate circumstance then occurred. After Firstone had almost completed negotiations for the construction of synthetic rubber plants in Rumania, some sort of patriotic association bluffed them out with the threat of a boycott. How can we run a country when a group of youngsters can thwart the policy of the Government? This is a terrible situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we must be optimistic and support the President. We must hope that any negotiations that are carried out will be lived up to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that the Senator agrees with my statement. People who take one side or the other in a situation receive less criticism than one who tries to go down the middle. But a middle view is the best I can offer.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas on a very constructive and helpful analysis of the situation. While I disagree with the policy of our past and present administrations in getting our Nation involved militarily in South Vietnam, I find myself in agreement with much that the Senator has said. I believe that he is most wise in urging that the war not be escalated further and avoid making it a major war. I believe that he is most wise in referring to the need of going back to the Geneva Agreements which provided for a reunified North and South Vietnam after supervised elections. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has rendered a service in pointing to one of the errors which the United States committed when we encouraged Ngo Dinh Diem to break those agreements and refuse to have the elections. The United States and South Vietnam were not the only ones to break agreements, but we did break them, and that is not generally admitted in official pronouncements.

We are inheriting the consequences of our past mistakes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. That is one reason that it is so difficult to find an honorable and satisfactory solution of the Vietnam dilemma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator has helped this discussion immeasurably by his exposition this afternoon.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do

not want to interrupt the extraordinarily brilliant speech of the Senator from Arkansas, which should be carefully considered by the American public. He has steered a wise course between the two extremes. We will resist Communist aggression but we do not wish to escalate the war as to lead to a nuclear holocaust.

But since the excise tax cut is underway, I hope I may be pardoned if I present an amendment which will not cost the taxpayer a penny or cost the Government a penny, but which will make uniform the time when taxes on tires are paid by manufacturers with integrated sales establishments and by independent retailers.

So I sent the amendment to the desk and ask that it be considered, that its reading be dispensed with, and then I will take only about 3 minutes to state the gist of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with and it will be printed in the Record.

The amendment offered by Mr. Douglas is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. —. DUAL DISTRIBUTION IN TIRES.—(a) Section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on tires and inner tubes) is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as (c) and (d) and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR MANUFACTURERS WHO SELL AT RETAIL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, if the manufacturer, producer, or importer of any tire or inner tube delivers such tire or tube to a retail store or retail outlet of such manufacturer, producer, or importer, he shall be liable for tax under subsection (a) in respect of such tire or tube in the same manner as if it had been sold at the time it was delivered to such retail store or outlet. This subsection shall not apply to an article in respect of which tax has been imposed by subsection (a). Subsection (a) shall not apply to an article in respect of which tax has been imposed by this subsection."

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 30 days after the date on which this Act is enacted.

"Sec. 2. Section 4236 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to floor stocks taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(a) TAX ON CERTAIN TIRES AND TUBES.—On any tire or inner tube which, on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 20 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, is held at a retail store or retail outlet of the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such tire or tube, he shall be liable for tax under section 4071(a) in the same manner as if such tire or inner tube had been sold by him on such first day. This subsection shall not apply to an article in respect of which tax has been imposed by section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Such section 4071 shall not apply to an article in respect of which tax has been imposed by this subsection."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amend-

ital City of Washington there swept a calvacade of hundreds of motorcars.

With no music—with no fanfare—under police escort the procession moved rapidly and yet almost noiselessly along.

It was an hour when churchgoers from the multitude of churches nestling on and near the avenue were pouring out from the services of Trinity Sunday.

Foot traffic and all other traffic halted as the motorcade passed. All eyes were turned on the procession. Each car flashed its headlights in the noonday sun. This was in the tradition of the funeral cortege. In a sense it did mark a death.

It marked the death of the independence of the Baltic States—the conquest by communism of the brave people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

June 15, 1965, is the 25th anniversary of the death of legitimate government in those states as 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania—and 2 days later into Latvia and Estonia.

Each car in that Sunday procession in Washington carried insignia to memorialize the rape of freedom on the Baltic States. Every passenger in every car was dedicated to making sure that the free world would not forget. Neither by them—nor by us—should the freedom-loving peoples of their homelands be forgotten.

There were banners and floats in that Sunday procession. As the eye followed and read—they told a continuous and complete story of the savage onslaught of that June of 1940—the terror, murder, and mass deportation. Giant photographs of the trains bearing a free people to slavery—and worse—moved into one's vision, and into one's heart.

That parade taught more than one lesson. The people who rode those cars are our fellow Americans—with blood ties to those tortured lands. They are our neighbors who have prospered through our common freedoms—but they are unhappy because people of their own flesh and blood and character and courage are cruelly enslaved against all the laws of God and man.

There was a lesson for the people on the sidelines—fresh from religious services in the churches of their choice. We could shudder at the contrast between the liberties of America and the lash of the Soviet domination.

And we could breathe another prayer for our freedoms—and we could feel uneasy in conscience—for the soul of America cannot slumber while our global doctrine of self determination is routed by the utter inhumanities of communism.

We are inspired by the undying courage of Lithuania and its neighbors whose will to freedom has never been vanquished. It is more alive than ever today.

Through all the troubles that beset the world on this June day of 1965 nevertheless we see a tide of truth and freedom arising above the horizon. The will to freedom burns high in hearts that never surrender.

The American conscience is committed to the liberties of little people everywhere—and we take the occasion of this anniversary to confirm the peoples of

the Baltic States in their birthright of freedom under the law and the Lord.

We know only too well the fate that awaits us if we retreat from what is right. We know the price of peace is power—eternal vigilance—preparedness and perseverance.

We salute the lovers of liberty in the Baltic States—and we thank them for their lesson and their example.

May their courage never fail them.
May our conscience never desert them.
Let us never forget.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when I was a boy, my grandfather, A. G. Willis of Culpeper County, Va., for whom I am named, used to say:

The tendency of everything is to be more so.

Unfortunately, that maxim is being fully proved in South Vietnam.

The bitterness in that country between the Catholics and the Buddhists is becoming more so; the instability of any civilian government is becoming more so. The determination of the Communists to destroy South Vietnam is becoming more so, and last, but unfortunately not least, our commitment to that unfortunate mess in the jungles of southeast Asia, where France suffered 290,000 casualties before admitting defeat is becoming more so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was interested when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon told me at breakfast this morning that a crowd of over 18,000 in Madison Square Garden in New York City recently cheered to the rafters his proposal that the proper solution of the unjustified Communist aggression against South Vietnam be referred to the United Nations.

I realize that Red China and Hanoi have in the past rebuffed efforts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to act as a mediator, but I feel we would have nothing to lose by taking the issue of North Vietnam's aggression to the U.N., since our own efforts to start a peace negotiation have not succeeded. If the Communists vetoed U.N. action the world would know where to place the blame.

By a happy coincidence, a U.N. appeal would be in full keeping with observations on the general subject of international intervention made over a hundred years ago by a distinguished British economist and statesman named John Stuart Mill. In an essay entitled "A Few Words on Nonintervention," Mill said:

The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record excerpts from that John Stuart Mill essay, first published in 1859.

There being no objection, the excerpts

were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There seems to be no little need that the whole doctrine of nonintervention with foreign nations should be reconsidered. If it can be said to have as yet been considered as a really moral question at all. . . . Whoever attempts this, will be led to recognize more than one fundamental distinction, not yet by any means familiar to the public mind, and in general quite lost sight of by those who write in strains of indignant morality on the subject . . .

There is no difference of opinion among honest people . . . on the wickedness of commencing an aggressive war for any interest of our own, except when necessary to avert from ourselves an obviously impending wrong. The disputed question is that of interfering in the regulation of another country's internal concerns; the question of whether a nation is justified in taking part, on either side, in the civil wars or party contests of another; and chiefly, whether it may justifiably aid the people of another country in struggling for liberty . . .

It can seldom . . . —I will not go so far as to say never—be either judicious or right, in a country which has a free government, to assist, otherwise than by the moral support of its opinion, the endeavors of another to extort the same blessing from its native rulers. We must except, of course, any case in which such assistance is a measure of legitimate self-defense. If (a contingency by no means unlikely to occur) this country, on account of its freedom, which is a standing reproach to despotism everywhere, and an encouragement to throw it off, should find itself menaced with attack by a coalition of continental despots, it ought to consider the popular party in every nation of the Continent as its natural ally . . .

But the case of a people struggling against a foreign yoke, or against a native tyranny upheld by foreign arms, illustrates the reasons for non-intervention in an opposite way; for in this case the reasons themselves do not exist. . . . To assist a people thus kept down, is not to disturb the balance of forces on which the permanent maintenance of freedom in a country depends, but to redress that balance when it is already unsafe and violently disturbed. The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent. . . .

VIETNAM CHRONOLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has been a sad week for South Vietnam and for the United States. Both the military and political events which have transpired portend a long and difficult summer.

The Government in Saigon has once again fallen. The latest change only serves to underscore the fact that the more things change the more they remain the same. It would be my hope that this latest reconstitution of the Government would stop the regional, religious, and other feuds which impair the purposes of the conflict and the decisiveness of its conduct.

According to the best count which I have been able to find, this represents the 19th coup or attempted coup or other change or attempted change in the Viet-

June 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13093

ital City of Washington there swept a calvacade of hundreds of motorcars.

With no music—with no fanfare—under police escort the procession moved rapidly and yet almost noiselessly along.

It was an hour when churchgoers from the multitude of churches nestling on and near the avenue were pouring out from the services of Trinity Sunday.

Foot traffic and all other traffic halted as the motorcade passed. All eyes were turned on the procession. Each car flashed its headlights in the noonday sun. This was in the tradition of the funeral cortege. In a sense it did mark a death.

It marked the death of the independence of the Baltic States—the conquest by communism of the brave people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

June 15, 1965, is the 25th anniversary of the death of legitimate government in those states as 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania—and 2 days later into Latvia and Estonia.

Each car in that Sunday procession in Washington carried insignia to memorialize the rape of freedom on the Baltic States. Every passenger in every car was dedicated to making sure that the free world would not forget. Neither by them—nor by us—should the freedom-loving peoples of their homelands be forgotten.

There were banners and floats in that Sunday procession. As the eye followed and read—they told a continuous and complete story of the savage onslaught of that June of 1940—the terror, murder, and mass' deportation. Giant photographs of the trains bearing a free people to slavery—and worse—moved into one's vision, and into one's heart.

That parade taught more than one lesson. The people who rode those cars are our fellow Americans—with blood ties to those tortured lands. They are our neighbors who have prospered through our common freedoms—but they are unhappy because people of their own flesh and blood and character and courage are cruelly enslaved against all the laws of God and man.

There was a lesson for the people on the sidelines—fresh from religious services in the churches of their choice. We could shudder at the contrast between the liberties of America and the lash of the Soviet domination.

And we could breathe another prayer for our freedoms—and we could feel uneasy in conscience—for the soul of America cannot slumber while our global doctrine of self determination is routed by the utter inhumanities of communism.

We are inspired by the undying courage of Lithuania and its neighbors whose will to freedom has never been vanquished. It is more alive than ever today.

Through all the troubles that beset the world on this June day of 1965 nevertheless we see a tide of truth and freedom arising above the horizon. The will to freedom burns high in hearts that never surrender.

The American conscience is committed to the liberties of little people everywhere—and we take the occasion of this anniversary to confirm the peoples of

the Baltic States in their birthright of freedom under the law and the Lord.

We know only too well the fate that awaits us if we retreat from what is right. We know the price of peace is power—eternal vigilance—preparedness and perseverance.

We salute the lovers of liberty in the Baltic States—and we thank them for their lesson and their example.

May their courage never fail them.

May our conscience never desert them.

Let us never forget.

FE ~~VA~~ Robertson
SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when I was a boy, my grandfather, A. G. Willis of Culpeper County, Va., for whom I am named, used to say:

The tendency of everything is to be more so.

Unfortunately, that maxim is being fully proved in South Vietnam.

The bitterness in that country between the Catholics and the Buddhists is becoming more so; the instability of any civilian government is becoming more so. The determination of the Communists to destroy South Vietnam is becoming more so, and last, but unfortunately not least, our commitment to that unfortunate mess in the jungles of southeast Asia, where France suffered 290,000 casualties before admitting defeat is becoming more so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was interested when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon told me at breakfast this morning that a crowd of over 18,000 in Madison Square Garden in New York City recently cheered to the rafters his proposal that the proper solution of the unjustified Communist aggression against South Vietnam be referred to the United Nations.

I realize that Red China and Hanoi have in the past rebuffed efforts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to act as a mediator, but I feel we would have nothing to lose by taking the issue of North Vietnam's aggression to the U.N., since our own efforts to start a peace negotiation have not succeeded. If the Communists vetoed U.N. action the world would know where to place the blame.

By a happy coincidence, a U.N. appeal would be in full keeping with observations on the general subject of international intervention made over a hundred years ago by a distinguished British economist and statesman named John Stuart Mill. In an essay entitled "A Few Words on Nonintervention," Mill said:

The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from that John Stuart Mill essay, first published in 1859.

There being no objection, the excerpts

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There seems to be no little need that the whole doctrine of noninterference with foreign nations should be reconsidered, if it can be said to have as yet been considered as a really moral question at all. * * * Whoever attempts this, will be led to recognize more than one fundamental distinction, not yet by any means familiar to the public mind, and in general quite lost sight of by those who write in strains of indignant morality on the subject * * *

There is no difference of opinion among honest people * * * on the wickedness of commencing an aggressive war for any interest of our own, except when necessary to avert from ourselves an obviously impending wrong. The disputed question is that of interfering in the regulation of another country's internal concerns; the question of whether a nation is justified in taking part, on either side, in the civil wars or party contests of another; and chiefly, whether it may justifiably aid the people of another country in struggling for liberty * * *

It can seldom * * *—I will not go so far as to say never—be either judicious or right, in a country which has a free government, to assist, otherwise than by the moral support of its opinion, the endeavors of another to extort the same blessing from its native rulers. We must except, of course, any case in which such assistance is a measure of legitimate self-defense. If (a contingency by no means unlikely to occur) this country, on account of its freedom, which is a standing reproach to despotism everywhere, and an encouragement to throw it off, should find itself menaced with attack by a coalition of continental despots, it ought to consider the popular party in every nation of the Continent as its natural ally * * *

But the case of a people struggling against a foreign yoke, or against a native tyranny upheld by foreign arms, illustrates the reasons for non-intervention in an opposite way; for in this case the reasons themselves do not exist. * * * To assist a people thus kept down, is not to disturb the balance of forces on which the permanent maintenance of freedom in a country depends, but to redress that balance when it is already unfairly and violently disturbed. The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent. * * *

FE ~~VA~~ Mansfield
VIETNAM CHRONOLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has been a sad week for South Vietnam and for the United States. Both the military and political events which have transpired portend a long and difficult summer.

The Government in Saigon has once again fallen. The latest change only serves to underscore the fact that the more things change the more they remain the same. It would be my hope that this latest reconstitution of the Government would stop the regional, religious, and other feuds which impair the purposes of the conflict and the decisiveness of its conduct.

According to the best count which I have been able to find, this represents the 19th coup or attempted coup or other change or attempted change in the Viet-

namese Government in which the people of Vietnam have had little if anything to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list, published in the New York Times of June 13, 1965, of the changes or attempted changes in the Saigon government since the deplorable assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

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

[New York Times, June 13, 1965]

SHIFTS IN VIETNAM SINCE 1963 COUP

YEAR 1963

November 1-2: Military junta led by Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh deposed and executed President Ngo Dinh Diem, the country's controversial and autocratic leader since 1954.

YEAR 1964

January 30: Gen. Duong Van Minh, head of the military junta that ousted President Diem, was deposed in a swift bloodless coup d'état led by Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh.

August 16: General Khanh, by now a lieutenant general, was named President by the Military Revolutionary Council, which promulgated a constitution giving him wide emergency powers. The move touched off rioting by Buddhist groups.

August 27: The Revolutionary Council named a triumvirate to head the government, with Generals Khanh and Minh, and Tran Thien Khiem in charge.

August 29: General Khanh resigned; Dr. Nguyen Xuan Oanh became Acting Premier.

September 5: General Khanh returned as Premier.

September 13: A bloodless coup led by Brig. Gen. Lam Van Phat was foiled by a group of young generals who became known as the Young Turks. They were loyal to General Khanh.

October 30: Saigon's mayor, Tran Van Huong, was appointed Premier, restoring a facade of civilian government.

December 20: The Young Turk generals dissolved the High National Council, a 17-man group serving as provisional legislature.

YEAR 1965

January 9: The armed forces announced the restoration of full power to the civilian government of Mr. Huong.

January 27: Premier Huong was deposed; Dr. Oanh became Acting Premier.

February 16: Dr. Phan Huy Quat, a former Foreign Minister, replaced Dr. Oanh as Premier, but General Khanh retained actual power. A 20-man advisory legislative council was named.

February 19: Col. Pham Ngoc Thao and a group of military men staged a coup, charging that General Khanh was a dictator.

February 20: General Khanh reasserted control as his troops returned to city.

February 21: Military leaders who had backed General Khanh now voted "no confidence" in him, and soon afterward he was sent abroad as an ambassador at large. Dr. Quat and Chief of State Phan Khac Suu remained in office under military control.

May 6: The Armed Forces Council returned "full power" to Dr. Quat's civilian government, announcing that it had "shown that it can be trusted."

May 21: Dr. Quat announced that a pro-Communist coup against his government had been crushed.

May 27: Roman Catholic charges of religious discrimination and Dr. Suu's refusal to approve Premier Quat's proposed cabinet changes touched off a political crisis.

June 9: Dr. Quat asked South Vietnamese military leaders to mediate the dispute with Dr. Suu.

June 12: A government spokesman announced that Dr. Quat had decided to "hand back the reins of government to the military."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think it is evident, with this latest transition, that the practice is getting to be a habit, and a most unfortunate habit. In view of the comments of an anonymous spokesman in greeting the change with "cautious optimism," I think it is desirable to include also at this point a chronology of statements and comments on policy going back to 1959 which appeared in several newspapers—this one from the Baltimore Sun of June 6 and 11, 1965. It is another example of the kind of journalism which has made a most constructive contribution to the understanding of the American people in this perplexing situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of statements and comments on policy published in the Baltimore Sun of June 6 and 11, 1965.

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

VIET POLICY TURNS TRACED

NEW YORK, June 10.—The tide of the war in Vietnam has taken many political and military turns. Here is a chronology of statements by U.S. officials and of the war's escalation:

YEAR 1959

April 4: President Eisenhower, at Gettysburg College convocation: "Strategical, South Vietnam capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for freedom. Military as well as economic help is currently needed in Vietnam."

YEAR 1960

May 5: U.S. defense authorities say United States is replacing about 350 civilians in South Vietnam with military personnel and by the end of the year the total is expected to reach 685.

YEAR 1961

May 5: President Kennedy, at a news conference.

Question: "There have been reports that you would be prepared to send American forces into South Vietnam if that becomes necessary to prevent Communist domination of that country."

Answer: "What we're going to do to assist Vietnam to obtain its independence is a matter still under consideration."

May 12: Vice President Johnson, on a visit to South Vietnam: "If we furnish support they will furnish manpower."

May 13: President Kennedy orders 100 specially trained jungle fighters to Vietnam, amid reports the United States plans to increase its officers and men there to total 1,650.

October 15: Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, President Kennedy's military adviser, en route to Vietnam: "Nobody wants to send American troops anywhere."

October 31: Communist North Vietnam warns the United States that the dispatch of U.S. troops to South Vietnam could have "disastrous consequences."

YEAR 1962

February 9: The United States officially admits to only 685 military advisers in South Vietnam, but reports in Washington put the total near 4,000.

March 9: U.S. officials in Washington say

American pilots are engaged in combat missions with South Vietnamese pilots but only to train them.

April 21: Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, returning from a conference to Pacific commanders: "The South Vietnamese face a long war, not of months but of years."

October 9: Gen. Paul D. Harkins, U.S. commander in Vietnam: "The Vietcong has been slowed down and there is growing effectiveness against insurgents."

YEAR 1963

January 26: Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, reports there are 12,000 U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam, mostly helicopter troops and advisers to the South Vietnam Army.

January 14: The State Department, commenting on reports that American officers would be given command over South Vietnamese troops: "The Vietnamese are fighting and directing their own war."

January 30: Adm. Harry D. Felt, commander of U.S. military forces in the Pacific, predicts victory in 3 years over the Communist guerrillas.

February 28: Secretary McNamara says U.S. pilots in South Vietnam are under instructions to fire only when necessary in the interest of their own safety.

July 25: Washington reports the number of U.S. military advisers in Vietnam has reached 14,000.

October 22: Secretary McNamara and General Taylor, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, back from a Saigon visit, report to President Kennedy the end of the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 and that 1,000 American personnel probably can be withdrawn by the end of the year.

December 1: More than 1,000 U.S. servicemen stationed in South Vietnam prepare to leave for home. The United States has now close to 17,000 military advisers and men in Vietnam.

YEAR 1964

January 1: President Johnson, in New Year's message to South Vietnam's military chief: "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory."

February 1: President Johnson says of neutralization policy advanced by President de Gaulle of France: "I see no sentiment favoring neutralization of South Vietnam alone, and I think the course we are following is the most advisable one for freedom at this point."

February 18: Secretary McNamara tells congressional committee the war in South Vietnam can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves and the United States will pull out most troops by 1965 even if the anti-Communist drive falters there. He says: "I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam. It is a counterterrorism war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of."

COUNSEL AND TRAINING

February 29: President Johnson tells a news conference "this country must rely on the South Vietnamese" to defend themselves and emphasizes that the U.S. support policy is limited to "furnishing advice, counsel, and training to the South Vietnam Army."

March 8: Secretary McNamara says: "There is no question of the United States abandoning Vietnam. We shall stay for as long as it takes."

June 1: President Johnson calls for more countries to support the war effort in South Vietnam. The United States now maintains about 16,000 military men there.

June 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13095

June 22: General Harkins says it would be "worth risking war with China to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover."

June 22: Secretary McNamara: "We are prepared for any eventuality in southeast Asia."

August 2: Three North Vietnamese PT boats attack U.S. destroyer *Maddox* in Gulf of Tonkin.

August 5: U.S. warplanes on orders of President Johnson strike at Communist supply facilities in North Vietnam. President says: "We still seek no wider war."

October 1: General Taylor reports the Communists "are militarily further from success than ever and their men must know it."

December 24: The Pentagon says approximately 22,000 American military men are now serving in South Vietnam.

YEAR 1965

February 7: White House statement: "United States and South Vietnamese air elements were directed to launch joint retaliatory attacks against barracks and staging areas in the southern area of North Vietnam which intelligence has shown to be actively used by Hanoi for training and infiltration of Vietcong personnel into South Vietnam." The President directed "the orderly withdrawal of American dependents from South Vietnam."

February 8: President Johnson says the United States will meet any threat and pay any price "to make certain that freedom shall not perish from this earth."

March 3: The State Department says the United States is engaged in "collective defense against armed aggressions" in Vietnam but is not in a state of war with Communist Vietnam.

March 4: Dean Rusk, Secretary of State: "American troops in South Vietnam could come home tomorrow if the aggressors would go back north and stay at home."

SPEECH IN BALTIMORE

March 6: Two battalions of U.S. Marines are enroute to Vietnam, bringing the total U.S. forces there to about 27,000.

April 17: President Johnson, in major speech in Baltimore: "Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective. In recent months attacks on South Vietnam were stepped up. Thus it became necessary for us to increase our response and to make attacks by air. This is not a change of purpose. It is a change in what we believe the purpose requires."

"We do this in order to slow down aggression."

"We will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. We remain ready for unconditional discussions."

In advance of settlement, Johnson proposed \$1 billion of American aid for southeast Asia.

April 17: Secretary Rusk, commenting on suggestions to end air strikes on North Vietnam: "It would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends who bear the brunt of battle."

April 17: President Johnson, in an Easter-time statement: "We are ready to begin discussions next week, tomorrow or tonight. I regret the necessities of war have compelled us to bomb North Vietnam."

April 26: Secretary McNamara says heavy Communist casualties in South Vietnam have forced North Vietnam to start sending Regular Army units into battle there.

May 22: Six other countries have sent between 4,000 and 5,000 men to Vietnam and U.S. strength rises to about 48,000.

June 5: Robert J. McCloskey, State Department spokesman, in a statement: "American troops have been sent to South Vietnam recently with the mission of pro-

tecting key installations there. In establishing and patrolling their defense perimeters, they come into contact with the Vietcong and at times are fired upon. Our troops engage in combat in these and similar circumstances."

"But let me emphasize that the Vietnamese Government forces are carrying the brunt of combat operations. Those U.S. forces assigned as advisers to the armed forces of Vietnam remain in that capacity."

COMBAT SUPPORT

June 8: McCloskey says U.S. military command in South Vietnam has been authorized to send American troops into combat alongside Vietnamese forces if such "combat support" is requested by South Vietnam. "I'm sure," he says, "it's been made clear in Saigon by American military commanders that American forces would be available for combat support together with Vietnamese forces as and when necessary."

June 9: George E. Reedy, Presidential press secretary, in statement: "There has been no change in the mission of U.S. ground combat units in Vietnam in recent days or weeks."

The primary mission of these troops is to secure and safeguard important military installations like the air base at Da Nang. If help is requested by the appropriate Vietnamese commander, General (William C.) Westmoreland also has authority within the assigned mission to employ these troops in support of Vietnamese forces faced with aggressive attack when other effective reserves are not available and when, in his judgment, the general military situation urgently requires it."

June 9: About 2,500 U.S. combat engineers arrive in South Vietnam, raising U.S. military commitment there to about 53,500.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

FIXING OF FEES PAYABLE TO PATENT OFFICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 289, H.R. 4185. The consideration of this bill has been cleared with the minority.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4185) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, 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 which had been reported from the Committee on

the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "cases", to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$65"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "cases", to strike out "\$75" and insert "\$100"; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$65"; in line 23, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "\$25" and insert "\$50"; on page 6, line 7, after the word "period.", to insert "In calculating the amount of a remaining balance, charges for a page or less may be disregarded."; in line 18, after the word "issue", to strike out "and maintenance"; after line 19, to strike out:

Sec. 6. Title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section after section 154:

"§ 155. Maintenance fees

"(a) During the term of a patent, other than for a design, the following fees shall be due:

"(1) a first maintenance fee on or before the fifth anniversary of the issue date of the patent;

"(2) a second maintenance fee on or before the ninth anniversary of the issue date of the patent; and

"(3) a third maintenance fee on or before the thirteenth anniversary of the issue date of the patent.

In the case of a reissue patent the times specified herein shall run from the date of the original patent.

"(b) A grace period of six months will be allowed in which to pay any maintenance fee, provided it is accompanied by the fee prescribed for delayed payment. When a response is not received to the notice provided by subsection (e) of this section, a subsequent notice shall be sent approximately sixty days after the due date of any maintenance fee.

"(c) The first and second maintenance fees may be deferred in accordance with subsection (f) of this section.

"(d) A patent will terminate on the due date for any maintenance fee unless, as provided for in this section, the fee due (including any fees previously deferred) is paid or a statement in accordance with subsection (f) of this section requesting deferment is filed. Such termination or lapsing shall be without prejudice to rights existing under any other patent.

"(e) Notice of the requirement for the payment of the maintenance fees and the filing of statements in compliance with this section shall be attached to or be embodied in the patent. Approximately thirty days before a maintenance fee is due, the Commissioner shall send an initial notice thereof to the patentee and all other parties having an interest of record at the addresses last furnished to the Patent Office. Irrespective of any other provision of this section, a maintenance fee may be paid within thirty days after the date of such initial notice.

"(f) Any inventor to whom a patent issued (or his heirs) and who owns the patent may within six months of the fifth anniversary of the issue date of the patent by a statement to the Commissioner request deferment of the first maintenance fee if the gross benefit received by the inventor or any other party having or having had any interest in the subject matter of the patent, from, under, or by virtue of the patent or from the manufacture, use, or sale of the invention, was less in value than the amount of the fee, and the statement so specifies. The fee shall thereupon be deferred until the time the second maintenance fee is due and shall be paid in addition to the second maintenance fee.

"Any inventor to whom a patent issued (or his heirs) and who owns the patent may within six months of the ninth anniversary

of the issue date of the patent by a statement to the Commissioner request deferment of the second maintenance fee (and further deferment of the first maintenance fee if such fee has been deferred) if the gross benefit received by the inventor or any other party having or having had any interest in the subject matter of the patent during the preceding four years, from, under, or by virtue of the patent or from the manufacture, use, or sale of the invention, was less in value than the amount of the second fee, and the statement so specifies. The second fee, or the first and second fees, as the case may be, shall thereupon be deferred until the time the third maintenance fee is due and shall be paid in addition to the third maintenance fee and with the same result if not paid. No deferment of any of the fees beyond the thirteenth anniversary of the issue date of the patent shall be permitted and the patent will terminate at the end of the thirteenth anniversary of the issue date unless all maintenance fees are paid in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(g) An applicant or his assignee may elect, on or before the time of payment of the sum specified in the notice of allowance provided in section 151 of this chapter, to pay a fee of \$75 and such payment shall constitute a complete satisfaction of the maintenance fees provided for in this section."

At the top of page 10, to strike out:

Sec. 7. The analysis of chapter 14 of title 35, United States Code, immediately preceding section 151, is amended to read as follows:

- "151. Issue of patent.
- "152. Issue of patent to assignee.
- "153. How issued.
- "154. Contents and term of patent.
- "155. Maintenance of fees."

After line 3, to strike out:

Sec. 8. Subsection (a) of section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is further amended by adding the following:

- "12. For maintaining a patent (other than for a design) in force:
 - "a. beyond the fifth anniversary of the issue date of the patent, \$50;
 - "b. beyond the ninth anniversary of the issue date of the patent, \$100; and
 - "c. beyond the thirteenth anniversary of the issue date of the patent, \$150.
- "13. For delayed payment of maintenance fee, \$25."

After line 14, to insert:

Sec. 6. The analysis of chapter 14 of title 35, United States Code, immediately preceding section 151, is amended in the first item thereof by striking out the words "Time of issue of patent" and inserting in lieu thereof "Issue of patent".

At the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "9" to "7"; on page 11, line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "sections 4, 6, and 8" and "section 4"; at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "10" to "8"; at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "11" to "9"; and on page 12, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "12" to "10".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill 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. 301), 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 H.R. 4185, as amended, is to increase the fees payable to the Patent Office so that a reasonable part of Patent Office costs may be recovered. The bill also seeks to expedite the prosecution of patent applications and thus make new technology available to the public at an earlier date.

The fees payable to the Patent Office are determined by statute and have not revised since 1932. The income of the Patent Office has declined during this period from 90 percent recovery of costs down to an estimated recovery of 28.3 percent during the present fiscal year. If the fees provided for in this bill are approved, when these fees become fully effective, the Patent Office would then be recovering approximately 74 percent of its costs.

AMENDMENTS TO UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 303, H.R. 7762. This bill, also, has been cleared with the minority.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7762) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

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

There being no objection, the bill 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. 315), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill is intended to correct three technical deficiencies in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1964, Public Law 88-647.

EXPLANATION

Public Law 88-647 made several changes in the laws controlling the ROTC programs. Among these changes was authority for the Army and the Air Force to provide scholarship assistance to students in the 4-year ROTC program that is virtually the same as the so-called Holloway program successfully operated by the Navy for many years. The new authority provided that students receiving scholarship assistance must accept a Reserve status and agree to perform active duty as enlisted members if they fail to complete the course satisfactorily or if they decline to accept a commission when offered. The legislation approved last year did not contain a savings provision; however, for the Navy's Holloway plan students who had entered the program before the requirement for service as enlisted members if they fail to complete training or to accept a commission was approved. The first purpose of this bill is to exclude the midshipmen who were appointed before the effective date of Public Law 88-647 from the enlistment requirement.

Another purpose of the ROTC legislation enacted last year was to authorize a 2-year

senior ROTC program that was intended to attract transfer students from junior colleges without ROTC units and students at 4-year colleges who have not had the basic course of the senior ROTC program. Before a student can be accepted in the new 2-year senior ROTC program, he must successfully complete a 6- to 8-week period of summer military training. The 1964 act authorized pay for applicants for the 2-year ROTC but it did not include a provision authorizing travel allowances to and from the summer military training. This omission was unintended and H.R. 7762 would provide authority for payment of these necessary travel allowances.

In the ROTC Act of 1965 the payments to ROTC students that had previously been designated as "subsistence pay" were changed to "retainer pay." The change in terminology was not intended to alter the nature or the purpose of the payment, which was to help students defray the cost of subsistence while in school and pursuing the ROTC program. Because of the change in terminology, however it is possible that the recipients might incur income tax liability for the payments. Consequently, to avoid such liability this bill reverts to the old designation of "subsistence allowance" wherever the term "retainer pay" appeared in the ROTC legislation of 1964.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 304, H.R. 214. This third bill, likewise, has been cleared with the minority.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 214) to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code.

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

There being no objection, the bill 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. 316), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments, and (2) repeal the authority for mustering-out payments on July 1, 1966.

EXPLANATION

Section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, provides, with certain exceptions, that members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty during the Korean conflict and were discharged or released from active duty under honorable conditions are eligible for mustering-out payments in the amount of \$100, \$200, or \$300, depending on the length and type of service. Claims for this pay must have been filed before July 17, 1959. A small group of officers who became members of Regular components after having first been members of the Army or the Air Force without specification of component had their entitlement of mustering-out pay established only as a result of a Court of Claims decision

ital City of Washington there swept a cavalcade of hundreds of motorcars.

With no music—with no fanfare—under police escort the procession moved rapidly and yet almost noiselessly along.

It was an hour when churchgoers from the multitude of churches nestling on and near the avenue were pouring out from the services of Trinity Sunday.

Foot traffic and all other traffic halted as the motorcade passed. All eyes were turned on the procession. Each car flashed its headlights in the noonday sun. This was in the tradition of the funeral cortege. In a sense it did mark a death.

It marked the death of the independence of the Baltic States—the conquest by communism of the brave people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

June 15, 1965, is the 25th anniversary of the death of legitimate government in those states as 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania—and 2 days later into Latvia and Estonia.

Each car in that Sunday procession in Washington carried insignia to memorialize the rape of freedom on the Baltic States. Every passenger in every car was dedicated to making sure that the free world would not forget. Neither by them—nor by us—should the freedom-loving peoples of their homelands be forgotten.

There were banners and floats in that Sunday procession. As the eye followed and read—they told a continuous and complete story of the savage onslaught of that June of 1940—the terror, murder, and mass deportation. Giant photographs of the trains bearing a free people to slavery—and worse—moved into one's vision, and into one's heart.

That parade taught more than one lesson. The people who rode those cars are our fellow Americans—with blood ties to those tortured lands. They are our neighbors who have prospered through our common freedoms—but they are unhappy because people of their own flesh and blood and character and courage are cruelly enslaved against all the laws of God and man.

There was a lesson for the people on the sidelines—fresh from religious services in the churches of their choice. We could shudder at the contrast between the liberties of America and the lash of the Soviet domination.

And we could breathe another prayer for our freedoms—and we could feel uneasy in conscience—for the soul of America cannot slumber while our global doctrine of self determination is routed by the utter inhumanities of communism.

We are inspired by the undying courage of Lithuania and its neighbors whose will to freedom has never been vanquished. It is more alive than ever today.

Through all the troubles that beset the world on this June day of 1965 nevertheless we see a tide of truth and freedom arising above the horizon. The will to freedom burns high in hearts that never surrender.

The American conscience is committed to the liberties of little people everywhere—and we take the occasion of this anniversary to confirm the peoples of

the Baltic States in their birthright of freedom under the law and the Lord.

We know only too well the fate that awaits us if we retreat from what is right. We know the price of peace is power—eternal vigilance—preparedness and perseverance.

We salute the lovers of liberty in the Baltic States—and we thank them for their lesson and their example.

May their courage never fall them.

May our conscience never desert them.

Let us never forget.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when I was a boy, my grandfather, A. G. Willis of Culpeper County, Va., for whom I am named, used to say:

The tendency of everything is to be more so.

Unfortunately, that maxim is being fully proved in South Vietnam.

The bitterness in that country between the Catholics and the Buddhists is becoming more so; the instability of any civilian government is becoming more so. The determination of the Communists to destroy South Vietnam is becoming more so, and last, but unfortunately not least, our commitment to that unfortunate mess in the jungles of southeast Asia, where France suffered 290,000 casualties before admitting defeat is becoming more so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was interested when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon told me at breakfast this morning that a crowd of over 18,000 in Madison Square Garden in New York City recently cheered to the rafters his proposal that the proper solution of the unjustified Communist aggression against South Vietnam be referred to the United Nations.

I realize that Red China and Hanoi have in the past rebuffed efforts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to act as a mediator, but I feel we would have nothing to lose by taking the issue of North Vietnam's aggression to the U.N., since our own efforts to start a peace negotiation have not succeeded. If the Communists vetoed U.N. action the world would know where to place the blame.

By a happy coincidence, a U.N. appeal would be in full keeping with observations on the general subject of international intervention made over a hundred years ago by a distinguished British economist and statesman named John Stuart Mill. In an essay entitled "A Few Words on Nonintervention," Mill said:

The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record excerpts from that John Stuart Mill essay, first published in 1859.

There being no objection, the excerpts

were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There seems to be no little need that the whole doctrine of noninterference with foreign nations should be reconsidered. If it can be said to have as yet been considered as a really moral question at all. . . . Whoever attempts this, will be led to recognize more than one fundamental distinction, not yet by any means familiar to the public mind, and in general quite lost sight of by those who write in strains of indignant morality on the subject. . . .

There is no difference of opinion among honest people . . . on the wickedness of commencing an aggressive war for any interest of our own, except when necessary to avert from ourselves an obviously impending wrong. The disputed question is that of interfering in the regulation of another country's internal concerns; the question of whether a nation is justified in taking part, on either side, in the civil wars or party contests of another; and chiefly, whether it may justifiably aid the people of another country in struggling for liberty. . . .

It can seldom . . . —I will not go so far as to say never—be either judicious or right, to assist, otherwise than by the moral support of its opinion, the endeavors of another to extort the same blessing from its native rulers. We must except, of course, any case in which such assistance is a measure of legitimate self-defense. If (a contingency by no means unlikely to occur) this country, on account of its freedom, which is a standing reproach to despotism everywhere, and an encouragement to throw it off, should find itself menaced with attack by a coalition of continental despots, it ought to consider the popular party in every nation of the Continent as its natural ally. . . .

But the case of a people struggling against a foreign yoke, or against a native tyranny upheld by foreign arms, illustrates the reasons for non-intervention in an opposite way; for in this case the reasons themselves do not exist. . . . To assist a people thus kept down, is not to disturb the balance of forces on which the permanent maintenance of freedom in a country depends, but to redress that balance when it is already unfairly and violently disturbed. The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent. . . .

VIETNAM CHRONOLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has been a sad week for South Vietnam and for the United States. Both the military and political events which have transpired portend a long and difficult summer.

The Government in Saigon has once again fallen. The latest change only serves to underscore the fact that the more things change the more they remain the same. It would be my hope that this latest reconstitution of the Government would stop the regional, religious, and other feuds which impair the purposes of the conflict and the despatchness of its conduct.

According to the best count which I have been able to find, this represents the 19th coup or attempted coup of either change or attempted change in the Viet-

June 15, 1965

ital City of Washington there swept a calvacade of hundreds of motorcars.

With no music—with no fanfare—under police escort the procession moved rapidly and yet almost noiselessly along.

It was an hour when churchgoers from the multitude of churches nestling on and near the avenue were pouring out from the services of Trinity Sunday.

Foot traffic and all other traffic halted as the motorcade passed. All eyes were turned on the procession. Each car flashed its headlights in the noonday sun. This was in the tradition of the funeral cortege. In a sense it did mark a death.

It marked the death of the independence of the Baltic States—the conquest by communism of the brave people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

June 15, 1965, is the 25th anniversary of the death of legitimate government in those states as 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania—and 2 days later into Latvia and Estonia.

Each car in that Sunday procession in Washington carried insignia to memorialize the rape of freedom on the Baltic States. Every passenger in every car was dedicated to making sure that the free world would not forget. Neither by them—nor by us—should the freedom-loving peoples of their homelands be forgotten.

There were banners and floats in that Sunday procession. As the eye followed and read—they told a continuous and complete story of the savage onslaught of that June of 1940—the terror, murder, and mass deportation. Giant photographs of the trains bearing a free people to slavery—and worse—moved into one's vision, and into one's heart.

That parade taught more than one lesson. The people who rode those cars are our fellow Americans—with blood ties to those tortured lands. They are our neighbors who have prospered through our common freedoms—but they are unhappy because people of their own flesh and blood and character and courage are cruelly enslaved against all the laws of God and man.

There was a lesson for the people on the sidelines—fresh from religious services in the churches of their choice. We could shudder at the contrast between the liberties of America and the lash of the Soviet domination.

And we could breathe another prayer for our freedoms—and we could feel uneasy in conscience—for the soul of America cannot slumber while our global doctrine of self determination is routed by the utter inhumanities of communism.

We are inspired by the undying courage of Lithuania and its neighbors whose will to freedom has never been vanquished. It is more alive than ever today.

Through all the troubles that beset the world on this June day of 1965 nevertheless we see a tide of truth and freedom arising above the horizon. The will to freedom burns high in hearts that never surrender.

The American conscience is committed to the liberties of little people everywhere—and we take the occasion of this anniversary to confirm the peoples of

the Baltic States in their birthright of freedom under the law and the Lord.

We know only too well the fate that awaits us if we retreat from what is right. We know the price of peace is power—eternal vigilance—preparedness and perseverance.

We salute the lovers of liberty in the Baltic States—and we thank them for their lesson and their example.

May their courage never fail them.

May our conscience never desert them.

Let us never forget.

FE

VA Robertson
SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when I was a boy, my grandfather, A. G. Willis of Culpeper County, Va., for whom I am named, used to say:

The tendency of everything is to be more so.

Unfortunately, that maxim is being fully proved in South Vietnam.

The bitterness in that country between the Catholics and the Buddhists is becoming more so; the instability of any civilian government is becoming more so. The determination of the Communists to destroy South Vietnam is becoming more so, and last, but unfortunately not least, our commitment to that unfortunate mess in the jungles of southeast Asia, where France suffered 290,000 casualties before admitting defeat is becoming more so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was interested when the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon told me at breakfast this morning that a crowd of over 18,000 in Madison Square Garden in New York City recently cheered to the rafters his proposal that the proper solution of the unjustified Communist aggression against South Vietnam be referred to the United Nations.

I realize that Red China and Hanoi have in the past rebuffed efforts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to act as a mediator, but I feel we would have nothing to lose by taking the issue of North Vietnam's aggression to the U.N., since our own efforts to start a peace negotiation have not succeeded. If the Communists vetoed U.N. action the world would know where to place the blame.

By a happy coincidence, a U.N. appeal would be in full keeping with observations on the general subject of international intervention made over a hundred years ago by a distinguished British economist and statesman named John Stuart Mill. In an essay entitled "A Few Words on Nonintervention," Mill said:

The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from that John Stuart Mill essay, first published in 1859.

There being no objection, the excerpts

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There seems to be no little need that the whole doctrine of noninterference with foreign nations should be reconsidered, if it can be said to have as yet been considered as a really moral question at all. * * * Whoever attempts this, will be led to recognize more than one fundamental distinction, not yet by any means familiar to the public mind, and in general quite lost sight of by those who write in strains of indignant morality on the subject * * *

There is no difference of opinion among honest people * * * on the wickedness of commencing an aggressive war for any interest of our own, except when necessary to avert from ourselves an obviously impending wrong. The disputed question is that of interfering in the regulation of another country's internal concerns; the question of whether a nation is justified in taking part, on either side, in the civil wars or party contests of another; and chiefly, whether it may justifiably aid the people of another country in struggling for liberty * * *

It can seldom * * *—I will not go so far as to say never—be either judicious or right, in a country which has a free government, to assist, otherwise than by the moral support of its opinion, the endeavors of another to extort the same blessing from its native rulers. We must except, of course, any case in which such assistance is a measure of legitimate self-defense. If (a contingency by no means unlikely to occur) this country, on account of its freedom, which is a standing reproach to despotism everywhere, and an encouragement to throw it off, should find itself menaced with attack by a coalition of continental despots, it ought to consider the popular party in every nation of the Continent as its natural ally * * *

But the case of a people struggling against a foreign yoke, or against a native tyranny upheld by foreign arms, illustrates the reasons for non-intervention in an opposite way; for in this case the reasons themselves do not exist. * * * To assist a people thus kept down, is not to disturb the balance of forces on which the permanent maintenance of freedom in a country depends, but to redress that balance when it is already unfairly and violently disturbed. The doctrine of nonintervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent. * * *

FE

VA Mansfield
VIETNAM CHRONOLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has been a sad week for South Vietnam and for the United States. Both the military and political events which have transpired portend a long and difficult summer.

The Government in Saigon has once again fallen. The latest change only serves to underscore the fact that the more things change the more they remain the same. It would be my hope that this latest reconstitution of the Government would stop the regional, religious, and other feuds which impair the purposes of the conflict and the decisiveness of its conduct.

According to the best count which I have been able to find, this represents the 19th coup or attempted coup or other change or attempted change in the Viet-

namese Government in which the people of Vietnam have had little if anything to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list, published in the New York Times of June 13, 1965, of the changes or attempted changes in the Saigon government since the deplorable assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

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

[New York Times, June 13, 1965]

SHIFTS IN VIETNAM SINCE 1963 COUP

YEAR 1963

November 1-2: Military junta led by Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh deposed and executed President Ngo Dinh Diem, the country's controversial and autocratic leader since 1954.

YEAR 1964

January 30: Gen. Duong Van Minh, head of the military junta that ousted President Diem, was deposed in a swift bloodless coup d'état led by Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh.

August 16: General Khanh, by now a lieutenant general, was named President by the Military Revolutionary Council, which promulgated a constitution giving him wide emergency powers. The move touched off rioting by Buddhist groups.

August 27: The Revolutionary Council named a triumvirate to head the government, with Generals Khanh and Minh, and Tran Thien Khiem in charge.

August 29: General Khanh resigned; Dr. Nguyen Xuan Oanh became Acting Premier.

September 5: General Khanh returned as Premier.

September 13: A bloodless coup led by Brig. Gen. Lam Van Phat was foiled by a group of young generals who became known as the Young Turks. They were loyal to General Khanh.

October 30: Saigon's mayor, Tran Van Huong, was appointed Premier, restoring a facade of civilian government.

December 20: The Young Turk generals dissolved the High National Council, a 17-man group serving as provisional legislature.

YEAR 1965

January 9: The armed forces announced the restoration of full power to the civilian government of Mr. Huong.

January 27: Premier Huong was deposed; Dr. Oanh became Acting Premier.

February 16: Dr. Phan Huy Quat, a former Foreign Minister, replaced Dr. Oanh as Premier, but General Khanh retained actual power. A 20-man advisory legislative council was named.

February 19: Col. Pham Ngoc Thao and a group of military men staged a coup, charging that General Khanh was a dictator.

February 20: General Khanh reasserted control as his troops returned to city.

February 21: Military leaders who had backed General Khanh now voted "no confidence" in him, and soon afterward he was sent abroad as an ambassador at large. Dr. Quat and Chief of State Phan Khac Suu remained in office under military control.

May 6: The Armed Forces Council returned "full power" to Dr. Quat's civilian government, announcing that it had "shown that it can be trusted."

May 21: Dr. Quat announced that a pro-Communist coup against his government had been crushed.

May 27: Roman Catholic charges of religious discrimination and Dr. Suu's refusal to approve Premier Quat's proposed cabinet changes touched off a political crisis.

June 9: Dr. Quat asked South Vietnamese military leaders to mediate the dispute with Dr. Suu.

June 12: A government spokesman announced that Dr. Quat had decided to "hand back the reins of government to the military."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think it is evident, with this latest transition, that the practice is getting to be a habit, and a most unfortunate habit. In view of the comments of an anonymous spokesman in greeting the change with "cautious optimism," I think it is desirable to include also at this point a chronology of statements and comments on policy going back to 1959 which appeared in several newspapers—this one from the Baltimore Sun of June 6 and 11, 1965. It is another example of the kind of journalism which has made a most constructive contribution to the understanding of the American people in this perplexing situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of statements and comments on policy published in the Baltimore Sun of June 6 and 11, 1965.

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

VIET POLICY TURNS TRACED

NEW YORK, June 10.—The tide of the war in Vietnam has taken many political and military turns. Here is a chronology of statements by U.S. officials and of the war's escalation:

YEAR 1959

April 4: President Eisenhower, at Gettysburg College convocation: "Strategical, South Vietnam capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for freedom. Military as well as economic help is currently needed in Vietnam."

YEAR 1960

May 5: U.S. defense authorities say United States is replacing about 350 civilians in South Vietnam with military personnel and by the end of the year the total is expected to reach 685.

YEAR 1961

May 5: President Kennedy, at a news conference.

Question: "There have been reports that you would be prepared to send American forces into South Vietnam if that becomes necessary to prevent Communist domination of that country."

Answer: "What we're going to do to assist Vietnam to obtain its independence is a matter still under consideration."

May 12: Vice President Johnson, on a visit to South Vietnam: "If we furnish support they will furnish manpower."

May 13: President Kennedy orders 100 specially trained jungle fighters to Vietnam, amid reports the United States plans to increase its officers and men there to total 1,650.

October 15: Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, President Kennedy's military adviser, en route to Vietnam: "Nobody wants to send American troops anywhere."

October 31: Communist North Vietnam warns the United States that the dispatch of U.S. troops to South Vietnam could have "disastrous consequences."

YEAR 1962

February 9: The United States officially admits to only 685 military advisers in South Vietnam, but reports in Washington put the total near 4,000.

March 9: U.S. officials in Washington say

American pilots are engaged in combat missions with South Vietnamese pilots but only to train them.

April 21: Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, returning from a conference to Pacific commanders: "The South Vietnamese face a long war, not of months but of years."

October 9: Gen. Paul D. Harkins, U.S. commander in Vietnam: "The Vietcong has been slowed down and there is growing effectiveness against insurgents."

YEAR 1963

January 26: Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army Chief of Staff, reports there are 12,000 U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam, mostly helicopter troops and advisers to the South Vietnam Army.

January 14: The State Department, commenting on reports that American officers would be given command over South Vietnamese troops: "The Vietnamese are fighting and directing their own war."

January 30: Adm. Harry D. Felt, commander of U.S. military forces in the Pacific, predicts victory in 3 years over the Communist guerrillas.

February 28: Secretary McNamara says U.S. pilots in South Vietnam are under instructions to fire only when necessary in the interest of their own safety.

July 25: Washington reports the number of U.S. military advisers in Vietnam has reached 14,000.

October 22: Secretary McNamara and General Taylor, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, back from a Saigon visit, report to President Kennedy the end of the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965 and that 1,000 American personnel probably can be withdrawn by the end of the year.

December 1: More than 1,000 U.S. servicemen stationed in South Vietnam prepare to leave for home. The United States has now close to 17,000 military advisers and men in Vietnam.

YEAR 1964

January 1: President Johnson, in New Year's message to South Vietnam's military chief: "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory."

February 1: President Johnson says of neutralization policy advanced by President de Gaulle of France: "I see no sentiment favoring neutralization of South Vietnam alone, and I think the course we are following is the most advisable one for freedom at this point."

February 18: Secretary McNamara tells congressional committee the war in South Vietnam can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves and the United States will pull out most troops by 1965 even if the anti-Communist drive falters there. He says: "I don't believe that we as a nation should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam. It is a counter guerrilla war, it is a war that can only be won by the Vietnamese themselves. Our responsibility is not to substitute ourselves for the Vietnamese, but to train them to carry on the operations that they themselves are capable of."

COUNSEL AND TRAINING

February 29: President Johnson tells a news conference "this country must rely on the South Vietnamese" to defend themselves and emphasizes that the U.S. support policy is limited to "furnishing advice, counsel, and training to the South Vietnam Army."

March 8: Secretary McNamara says: "There is no question of the United States abandoning Vietnam. We shall stay for as long as it takes."

June 1: President Johnson calls for more countries to support the war effort in South Vietnam. The United States now maintains about 16,000 military men there.

sure nor supersede the duty we owe to the House and to our constituents.

American political parties function within a framework of separated but not unrelated institutions and they do, as Woodrow Wilson noted, "hold the things thus disconnected and dispersed together and give some coherence to the action of political forces." But they must not, if our legislature is to avoid the fate of other legislative bodies, hold things together so tightly that Congress becomes a mere appendage of the executive branch. A certain amount of tension between the branches reflects the articulation of the diverse interests which exist in the American political system, a system that is quite different from Great Britain's and hence needs its own method of expressing itself.

Some political scientists, most notably James MacGregor Burns of Williams College who recently made his quadrennial plea to the President to restructure the American party system, argue that democracy is deadlocked in America because the parties are not cohesive, tightly organized, and rationally controlled organizations. But others, such as Austin Ranney of the University of Wisconsin, argue that the American people were exposed to the arguments in favor of "responsible" parties long before Burns and his associates grew impatient with diffused power, and that the people have remained unmoved by the appeal to change. As A. Lawrence Lowell pointed out many decades ago, "responsible" parties are ideal for a people who do not mind unlimited majority rule, but for the United States where the rights of the minority are every bit as sacred as the will of the majority our perplexing but popular parties are quite suitable. Indeed, democracy would really be deadlocked if the visions set forth by Burns ever materialized.

Against this background I suggest that the real question is not whether Congress will be more liberal this year than it has been in the past. The President will probably get a few more pieces of liberal legislation this year. The fundamental problem concerns the very nature of Congress itself: is it going to be a deliberative body, which involves much more than simply saying "no" to the President or holding up controversial legislation, or is it going to stifle the voice of the Republican minority and shirk its duty in the name of a misguided conception of party responsibility.

Indications so far are not very heartening. When the House considered changing its rules, for example, it did so under the 1-hour rule (controlled completely by the majority party) which severely constrained the debate and precluded all amendments. The proposed changes had not even been made available in written form to the Members of the House at the time of the debate so there was no opportunity to look beneath the general language to see whether the specific proposals carry out the objectives.

Some bills, including most of the major legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee, are considered under closed rules which deny to both the majority and minority the right to propose amendments, discuss them, and let the House work its will.

Minority views are not permitted in House-Senate conference reports even though some of the issues and points of contention may not crystallize until the conference stage of the process.

Other examples could be cited, almost ad infinitum, but the basic point is clear: the majority of the House should have an opportunity to work its will but only after the minority has had a fair chance to assert its views, and there has been a meaningful discussion of the issues. Nothing short of this is fair. Indeed, anything less than full debate means that Congress is being derelict in its duty, both to itself as a legislative

institution and to the people whom it represents.

The Republican Members of Congress constitute the loyal opposition whose job it is to review critically the policy proposals of the majority, make a case for any amendments which may improve legislation, and formulate alternative policies to be debated and judged in the Congress. In spite of the defects in the rules governing deliberation, is the Republican party equipped to perform these functions?

This is what the recent changes in House Republican leadership were all about. Republican programs conceived, and formulated, must be better presented if the party is to perform its role as the loyal opposition. More important, Republican policies, carefully thought through and ably articulated, must continue to be developed if the party is to remain something more than the loyal opposition and if the two party system is to endure. Becoming the majority party depends upon our ability to be an effective loyal opposition, our sensitivity to the needs of the time, and our creativity. The process of reconstruction is underway and with hard work and unselfish effort it will be completed. Nothing short of this will suffice.

WHY NOT HAVE HEARINGS ON VIETNAM?

(Mr. ROBISON (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. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. commitment to the people and government of South Vietnam remains unchanged. However, recent events make it obvious that the President is ready to commit the United States to a much deeper involvement in the continuing conflict that threatens to engulf that tragic nation than most of us have been realistic enough to anticipate.

The latest indication of this was the reluctant and round-about confirmation by the White House of the fact that at least some of the U.S. forces now in South Vietnam have been authorized—when requested by the Vietnamese military commanders—to assume a direct role in combat.

White House spokesmen went to some lengths in an effort to leave the impression that this would not represent any major change in U.S. policy—and, perhaps, for the time being at least, it does not. Nevertheless, I think we must accept the fact that the war in Vietnam has entered upon a new, and probably crucial, phase. Our military forces there have more than doubled since March, and there are evidently accurate reports that it will soon be necessary for us to still further and substantially increase the supply of men and war materials now streaming into South Vietnam if we are to successfully preserve through the long summer months the precarious military and political balance now existing there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of proper concern to every American. It is also, I believe, of special concern to those of us who serve in this body and who have strongly supported the President in the steps he has taken thus far in an effort to honor our commitment in South Vietnam, but who have grown increasingly troubled by the strong tendency on the

part of this Congress to leave the conduct of our foreign policy—in Vietnam and elsewhere—wholly, and practically without question, in the hands of the President.

I am not at all sure that this is in accordance with our responsibility; nor am I sure that this is wise.

I am well aware of the questions that can be raised under our Constitution with respect to the part that Congress may properly play in helping to shape foreign policy. Prof. E. S. Corwin once described those provisions of our Constitution which are pertinent to this point as "an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy."

With the passage of time it is true that that struggle has been quite generally resolved in favor of the Presidency, an Office which has, in the words of the Supreme Court, "the very delicate, plenary and exclusive power as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations."

Perhaps this would have been the inevitable result, anyway, in the kind of age in which we now live—an age in which it is difficult to contemplate the spectacle of a Congress attempting to legislate a declaration of war while the Capitol was under nuclear attack.

Still, in the present situation, there are voices, some of which must be acknowledged as coming from critics of the President, who urge upon Congress the necessity for now examining into the nature of the course we have so evidently embarked upon in southeast Asia.

For instance, the New York Times in recent editorials, said:

The country deserves answers . . . It has been taken into a ground war by Presidential decision, when there is no emergency that would seem to rule out congressional debate. The duty now is for reassurance from the White House that the Nation will be informed on where it is being led and that Congress will be consulted before another furious upward whirl is taken on the escalation spiral.

And again:

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

Similar expressions have been heard from other quarters. In the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), recently urged the President—

not to permit this new level of U.S. participation in the ground struggle to occur without obtaining the kind of mandate from Congress and from the people which, alone, can make such a policy feasible without grave divisions in the country.

My purpose here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not to debate our Vietnam policy—whatever it may be. I think that must perforce be left to those of us whose committee assignments or whose special responsibilities make them more qualified to do so than I.

My purpose, instead, is to ask my colleagues if they do not agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body, and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the other body, should now reconsider the possible usefulness of

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180027-1
 full-scale hearings on Vietnam at the present time.

I say "full scale" in the sense that such hearings—if they are to serve the purpose I envision—should include not just the anticipated administration witnesses in support of its policy, but should also provide a forum for the presentation of the views and the suggestions of broadly selected representatives of those other persons, outside the administration, who have had constructive criticism to offer concerning that policy. In view of the rapidly changing nature of the scene in southeast Asia, it would be essential that any such hearings move along as expeditiously as possible, so they might well be joint hearings, with the committees determining whether or not they should be open or closed.

At the conclusion of such hearings, it is possible that the committees might determine to report to Congress, for appropriate action, another joint resolution—similar to that of August 10, 1964, to which the President so often refers—but updated to reflect the changed circumstances stemming from the continuing intransigence and the escalation of the conflict by those who refuse to end their acts of aggression against South Vietnam, or to join with us in seeking the basis for an honorable and just settlement of that conflict.

Perhaps it may now be said by some of my colleagues that this course of action is unnecessary in view of the recent and near-unanimous congressional approval of the President's request for an additional \$700 million appropriation with which to carry on our support of the South Vietnamese in their struggle for freedom. However, in response to that I think it must be said that, even in this brief period of time, the situation we now face in Vietnam is drastically different, and the prospects for the immediate future considerably more grim.

For it has by now become apparent that whatever hopes we had of making progress toward some sort of an acceptable political solution of the conflict, by the methods thus far applied, have at least had to be postponed through the long summer months that lie ahead, and that the President has therefore had forced upon him the necessity to review his policies and reconsider at least our short-term objectives.

Congress may well have only a supporting role to play in that kind of review and reconsideration—but it ought to play that role rather than sit idly by, content to subsequently criticize the President, perhaps, as President Truman was criticized, if the course on which we have seemingly embarked turns out to be a long-drawn-out and costly ground war similar to that in which we were involved in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the country stands strongly united behind the President—though the people we represent have many unanswered questions and deep, unspoken concern about what lies along the road ahead.

As my colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS, put it, in those remarks of his to which I earlier referred:

Once again I say the Congress will undoubtedly support the President. But, just

as he could not forgo the salutary announcement of U.S. willingness to negotiate—although he felt he had said it many times before—so he cannot forgo the salutary effect of a congressional debate and action on this new and crucial U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I, too, am convinced that Congress will again indicate its support of the President—and, thus, the popular support of the President—in the new and dangerous circumstances in which we find ourselves.

And I, too, am convinced that this would be a salutary thing, for the kind of full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional debate I am suggesting would be a far cry from that sporadic type of "debate"—and I have put quotation marks around the word on purpose—now going on concerning Vietnam in the other body, and of infinitely more value than the kind of Vietnam "debate"—once again in quote marks—now going on in the syndicated columns and on the editorial pages of our newspapers, and which can do little more than add to such public confusion and uncertainty as exists over what is happening in Vietnam.

By comparison, too, to that congressional approval of the President's appropriation request, on which action was taken with unusual haste and an absolute minimum of committee consideration and floor debate, I think that the sharply focused, true debate that such full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional action would engender would not only be of great value to the American people but to our allies, as well, who need added reassurance that the American people do, indeed, understand the full dimensions of the challenge and willingly accept the risks inherent in the present situation we face in Vietnam.

And I further suggest that, in the same way, such a debate and subsequent congressional action in support of the President would also help to sweep away any remaining tendency on the part of those who are the aggressors in South Vietnam to miscalculate the depth of American resolution.

Finally, as one who has faithfully supported the President in the delicate and difficult course he has been following to bring this conflict to an honorable solution, I suggest that such a debate could also be of great value to him for, though his course may be both right and necessary, he may well begin to find in the weeks and months ahead as the going gets even rougher that the American people have not been psychologically prepared to accept the sacrifice and risk that course involves.

For, Mr. Speaker, it would be at that critical point that any semblance of wavering, any evidence of disunity on the part of the American people over what must be done in South Vietnam, would be most dangerous to our cause.

By comparison, whatever risks may be involved for the President in agreeing to such hearings and debate—and I know full well that without his consent they will not take place—would be minor; whatever distraction, inconsequential.

One can well appreciate the President's annoyance with some of his critics—his feelings that it should not be

necessary for him to continually explain and defend his policies. However, always before in the history of our Nation when a President put his full trust in the strength and resolution of an informed citizenry—always before when a President who believed himself to be right patiently gave even his sharpest critics the hearing they sought—the American people have given that President the full measure of their support in return.

I am confident that they will do so again—and I am equally confident that this Congress is ready and anxious to play its proper part in helping to bring this about.

(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'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SHRIVER (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. SHRIVER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today with regret and sorrow in my heart. I wish to place before this House the facts of a situation which make all civilized men react with anger, disgust and almost disbelief at a system which would allow crimes against humanity to be performed by their followers. I speak of the atrocities being committed in Vietnam, today, by the Communist Vietcong.

We as a nation are committed to uphold the dignity and worth of the human being. Criminal acts have been committed in Vietnam, by the Communists, which do violence to the basic principles of our civilization. This policy of organized terror, brutality and assassination inspire horror and revulsion in any civilized mind. We as God-fearing and civilized Americans cannot allow these atrocities to go unchallenged or distorted from their true meaning by Communist propaganda.

The issue I bring before this House involves the honor and dignity of the great Vietnamese people, our own fighting men now in Vietnam and the integrity of U.S. policy in Vietnam. It is a subject which we in all honor cannot let rest and which we cannot avoid. It is not a pretty story. It is one of unspeakable moral degradation by an enemy and of atrocities almost beyond comprehen-

full-scale hearings on Vietnam at the present time.

I say "full scale" in the sense that such hearings—if they are to serve the purpose I envision—should include not just the anticipated administration witnesses in support of its policy, but should also provide a forum for the presentation of the views and the suggestions of broadly selected representatives of those other persons, outside the administration, who have had constructive criticism to offer concerning that policy. In view of the rapidly changing nature of the scene in southeast Asia, it would be essential that any such hearings move along as expeditiously as possible, so they might well be joint hearings, with the committees determining whether or not they should be open or closed.

At the conclusion of such hearings, it is possible that the committees might determine to report to Congress, for appropriate action, another joint resolution—similar to that of August 10, 1964, to which the President so often refers—but updated to reflect the changed circumstances stemming from the continuing intransigence and the escalation of the conflict by those who refuse to end their acts of aggression against South Vietnam, or to join with us in seeking the basis for an honorable and just settlement of that conflict.

Perhaps it may now be said by some of my colleagues that this course of action is unnecessary in view of the recent and near-unanimous congressional approval of the President's request for an additional \$700 million appropriation with which to carry on our support of the South Vietnamese in their struggle for freedom. However, in response to that I think it must be said that, even in this brief period of time, the situation we now face in Vietnam is drastically different, and the prospects for the immediate future considerably more grim.

For it has by now become apparent that whatever hopes we had of making progress toward some sort of an acceptable political solution of the conflict, by the methods thus far applied, have at least had to be postponed through the long summer months that lie ahead, and that the President has therefore had forced upon him the necessity to review his policies and reconsider at least our short-term objectives.

Congress may well have only a supporting role to play in that kind of review and reconsideration—but it ought to play that role rather than sit idly by, content to subsequently criticize the President, perhaps, as President Truman was criticized, if the course on which we have seemingly embarked turns out to be a long-drawn-out and costly ground war similar to that in which we were involved in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the country stands strongly united behind the President—though the people we represent have many unanswered questions and deep, unspoken concern about what lies along the road ahead.

As my colleague from New York, Senator JAVIRS, put it, in those remarks of his to which I earlier referred:

Once again I say the Congress will undoubtedly support the President. But, just

as he could not forgo the salutary announcement of U.S. willingness to negotiate—although he felt he had said it many times before—so he cannot forgo the salutary effect of a congressional debate and action on this new and crucial U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I, too, am convinced that Congress will again indicate its support of the President—and, thus, the popular support of the President—in the new and dangerous circumstances in which we find ourselves.

And I, too, am convinced that this would be a salutary thing, for the kind of full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional debate I am suggesting would be a far cry from that sporadic type of "debate"—and I have put quotation marks around the word on purpose—now going on concerning Vietnam in the other body, and of infinitely more value than the kind of Vietnam "debate"—once again in quote marks—now going on in the syndicated columns and on the editorial pages of our newspapers, and which can do little more than add to such public confusion and uncertainty as exists over what is happening in Vietnam.

By comparison, too, to that congressional approval of the President's appropriation request, on which action was taken with unusual haste and an absolute minimum of committee consideration and floor debate, I think that the sharply focused, true debate that such full-scale hearings and subsequent congressional action would engender would not only be of great value to the American people but to our allies, as well, who need added reassurance that the American people do, indeed, understand the full dimensions of the challenge and willingly accept the risks inherent in the present situation we face in Vietnam.

And I further suggest that, in the same way, such a debate and subsequent congressional action in support of the President would also help to sweep away any remaining tendency on the part of those who are the aggressors in South Vietnam to miscalculate the depth of American resolution.

Finally, as one who has faithfully supported the President in the delicate and difficult course he has been following to bring this conflict to an honorable solution, I suggest that such a debate could also be of great value to him for, though his course may be both right and necessary, he may well begin to find in the weeks and months ahead as the going gets even rougher that the American people have not been psychologically prepared to accept the sacrifice and risk that course involves.

For, Mr. Speaker, it would be at that critical point that any semblance of wavering, any evidence of disunity on the part of the American people over what must be done in South Vietnam, would be most dangerous to our cause.

By comparison, whatever risks may be involved for the President in agreeing to such hearings and debate—and I know full well that without his consent they will not take place—would be minor; whatever distraction, inconsequential.

One can well appreciate the President's annoyance with some of his critics—his feelings that it should not be

necessary for him to continually explain and defend his policies. However, always before in the history of our Nation when a President put his full trust in the strength and resolution of an informed citizenry—always before when a President who believed himself to be right patiently gave even his sharpest critics the hearing they sought—the American people have given that President the full measure of their support in return.

I am confident that they will do so again—and I am equally confident that this Congress is ready and anxious to play its proper part in helping to bring this about.

(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'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

(Mr. SHRIVER (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. SHRIVER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

COMMUNIST ATROCITIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today with regret and sorrow in my heart. I wish to place before this House the facts of a situation which make all civilized men react with anger, disgust and almost disbelief at a system which would allow crimes against humanity to be performed by their followers. I speak of the atrocities being committed in Vietnam, today, by the Communist Vietcong.

We as a nation are committed to uphold the dignity and worth of the human being. Criminal acts have been committed in Vietnam, by the Communists, which do violence to the basic principles of our civilization. This policy of organized terror, brutality and assassination inspire horror and revulsion in any civilized mind. We as God-fearing and civilized Americans cannot allow these atrocities to go unchallenged or distorted from their true meaning by Communist propaganda.

The issue I bring before this House involves the honor and dignity of the great Vietnamese people, our own fighting men now in Vietnam and the integrity of U.S. policy in Vietnam. It is a subject which we in all honor cannot let rest and which we cannot avoid. It is not a pretty story. It is one of unspeakable moral degradation by an enemy and of atrocities almost beyond comprehen-

sion performed by this same enemy on the people of Vietnam and on our own soldiers. It concerns the activities of a Communist system which has shown no respect for the human person dead or alive, a system, the sole purpose of which is the progress of communism by any effective means, no matter how evil.

I trust that no Members in this Congress will tend to dismiss this story as without significance. Some may say that war is always the source and cause of brutal acts and those in Vietnam are no different. Such a view can only be one of despair, fear, or ignorance, without knowledge of the true facts. We have read in history of the frightful acts of Hitler, Stalin, and Ivan the Terrible, but this does not forgive Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, or Brezhnev.

The sins of the past are no excuse for those of the present. We are the custodians of the present and of mankind's future while we live. The atrocities I will speak of today are those that go beyond the terrible demands of war. In our age, if we are to call ourselves civilized, an individual human life and an individual body are as sacred in war as in peace. We have been taught to respect the dead even in death. Adversely, the Communists as a conscious act of their policy, maim, torture, and mutilate, the living as well as the dead.

This record of atrocities in South Vietnam deserves our attention. Again in our lifetime we witness a frightening abandonment of respect for the laws and standards of humane and civilized conduct. We have lived through Stalin's bloody purges, Khrushchev's butchery, Hitler's gas chambers, atrocities against U.N. forces in Korea and now Communist atrocities in South Vietnam. I for one cannot get hardened to, or accept, such acts of horror and terror. The covenants or solemn agreements entered into by responsible nations signing the Geneva Convention which bind all belligerents in war have again been tossed aside by the Communist aggressor in South Vietnam.

The conduct of the aggressor is not the result of personal cruelty by isolated individuals or of Vietcong who, without authorization, express their ideological sadism, but a conscious act of Communist policy. The pattern proves that these atrocities are deliberate. They reflect a system which consciously and actively rejects, subverts and destroys decent standards of conduct and the entire structure of humane values. This system denies that men are created in the image of God. They believe man is no more than an animal, and should be treated as such. This is the same system which displays by its acts, as Stalin said in words and deeds, "Terror is the supreme argument of any power."

President Johnson is being criticized in some circles for his firm stand in Vietnam. However, very little is being heard from these same outspoken critics on the terrible atrocities committed by the Communists.

In a news conference on April 27, 1965, President Johnson said:

I do sometimes wonder how some people can be so concerned with our bombing a cold

bridge of steel and concrete in North Vietnam, but never open their mouth about a bomb being placed in our Embassy in South Vietnam.

I agree with this practical observation and feel that these same people who scream so loud for free speech and the right to present both sides of the picture, when it suits their purpose, should begin to learn and speak the truth about events in Vietnam. Hardly a word is spoken of the war that the Communists are conducting on women and children in South Vietnam.

In the same press conference of April 27, 1965, President Johnson also said:

As long as aggression continues, and as long as they bomb our sports arenas, and our theaters, and our embassies and kill our women and children and the Vietnamese soldiers . . . we think that we are justified in trying to slow down that operation and make them realize that it is very costly, and that their aggression should cease.

Secretary Rusk in a news conference on March 24, 1965, made the following statement:

It is a mean, dirty, struggle, carried out without regard to ordinary norms of conduct by the Vietcong.

Those who are concerned about tear gas, I would hope would be concerned about the fact that during 1964 over 400 civilian officials were killed, and over a thousand were kidnaped in South Vietnam . . . village chiefs, schoolteachers, public health officers. Among other civilians, 1300 were killed, over 8,000 were kidnaped, but entire villages have been kidnaped and burned to the ground, when families of those who were in the armed forces were kidnaped and held hostage.

American soldiers are not immune to this savagery. U.S. servicemen and Government agents have been found dead after being tortured and shot to death. Shockingly reminiscent of the atrocities committed by the Chinese and North Korean Communists during the Korean war, American servicemen have been discovered with their hands tied behind their backs and shot in the back of the head. Their bodies were not given a decent burial, but thrown in jungle underbrush by their Vietcong captors.

South Vietnamese working for the U.S. military forces have been found floating in rivers and swamps with their arms, heads, and legs cut off. The Communist butchers use these methods to dissuade others from defending freedom in their homeland.

In another case the Communists used poison to kill more than 100 anti-Communist tribesmen fighting against them, and who had been captured in battle.

The atrocities recorded by U.S. authorities include the "beheading of village chiefs" and the "the cutting off of arms and legs of innocent women and children" whose fathers and husbands are serving in the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. The same inhumane treatment is applied to the families of those who refuse to desert to the Vietcong.

In a summary from a pamphlet printed in Saigon, July 1964, the following is extracted:

First. Summary of cases of victims of Vietcong terrorists acts during 1963:

Persons assassinated:	
Civil population	1, 850
Local officials	415
Civil servants	100
Persons injured	5, 275
Persons kidnaped	7, 903
Total	17, 710

Second. Communist atrocities and acts of terrorism in South Vietnam:

Vietcong terrorists, masquerading under the guise of the so-called front for the liberation of the south, continue their deliberate and indiscriminate attacks on the defenseless civil population and on institutions of social service. These criminal acts occur daily and result in serious damage to public and private property as well as cause a great number of deaths among innocent victims, including many women and children. Some specific instances are:

Acts of terrorism:

The assassination of Mr. Tran-phuoc-Thanh, a civilian official by a band of armed Vietcong on the night of October 7, 1963, at Khanh-Hoi hamlet (Kien-Hoa Province). A written sentence of death was pinned to the victim's body.

The assassination by some 20 Vietcong of Mr. Ngo-Tien, aged 58, a councillor of Phu-Hai hamlet (Thua-Thien Province) at about 8 p.m. on January 19, 1964, 400 yards from his house. A bill of Communist indictment was also discovered on the victim's body.

The assassination of Mrs. Hoang-thi-Con and her 9-year-old daughter Truong-thi-Loi on the night of March 17-18, 1964, at Beach-Loc hamlet in the Trung-Luong district of Quang-Tri Province (demilitarized zone). The Vietcong had hacked the victims to death with knives.

Mr. Nguyen-Phuoc-Dang from Phu-Thuan village in the Binh-Dai district of Kien-Hoa Province was decapitated by the Vietcong on the night of October 1-2, 1963. A written sentence of death was likewise pinned to the victim's body.

Acts of sabotage:

On April 27, 1963, the UNESCO Basic Education Center at Tan-An in Long-An Province was attacked.

On April 21, 1964, the maternity clinic of Long-Hoa Village in Long-An Province was destroyed and the medical supplies plundered.

On May 3, 1964, a civilian bus was blown up by a mine on the road between Nhon-Hoa in Kien-Tuong Province. Fourteen persons, among them 3 children, were killed and 11 persons including 4 children were injured.

On March 22, 1964, a bus operated by the Hiep-Huu Co., hit an electrically detonated Vietcong mine on the road between Tan-Tru and Long-An. A total of 22 passengers were killed, among whom were 1 pregnant woman and 6 children between the ages of 3 and 5.

So thorough is the Vietcong terror planning that no part of the social structure is passed by. A report by the World Confederation of Organizations of Teaching Professions compiled the following statistics:

During 1962, 636 schools were destroyed, 260 teachers were kidnaped, and 80 were killed. This tactic of destruction of the educational system by elimination of the educators is continuing in an accelerated form today.

As in Korea, the Communists are now making reckless and wholesale violations of the provisions of the Geneva Conven-

June 15, 1965

tion. The Vietcong have clearly and flagrantly violated the following articles of the convention:

First. Article 13: Prisoners must at all times be humanely treated.

Second. Article 16: Prisoners must be treated without regard for political or other such factors.

Third. Article 130: The death of any prisoner, his identity and the location of his grave, must be reported to neutral authorities.

Fourth. Article 130: That willful killing or torture of prisoners, among other things, shall be considered grave breaches of the Convention.

The Communists' propaganda emanating from Moscow, Peking, or Hanoi, all claim that they are reaching the perfection of our civilization and adhere to the principles of the Geneva Convention. If this is to be taken at face value by their followers and only savages commit atrocities, then these same followers must face the reality that the facts indicate a common dedication to wholesale brutality is part of the Communist system. It, therefore, can only be concluded that the violations occur on such a scale as to indicate that they reflect a conscious policy of Communist governments and their so-called perfect civilization.

No Communist has ever disavowed or is allowed to disavow Marx or Lenin. Their teachings on conscience and morality are consistent with their activities in South Vietnam. Karl Marx said:

Social existence of men; that is, the economic class to which they belong, determines their consciousness.

As to morality, Lenin said:

We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all fables about morality; at the basis of Communist morality lies the struggle for the consolidation and consummation of communism.

Modern interpretations of Lenin's teachings on morality are as follows:

The basis of Communist morality, Lenin taught, is the struggle for strengthening and achieving communism. For the Soviet people everything is moral that serves the victory of the Communist order.

This is a clear indication that the Communists reject universally accepted moral values.

The forces against which we fight today in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic all owe allegiance to a single political movement known as world communism.

That the atrocities being committed is due to a conscious policy is suggested by the following facts which follow the same pattern as we knew it in Korea:

Mass executions of civilians which include women and children, carried out under the authority of the North Vietnamese political officers and security agents.

Prisoners are subjected to political jargon, preaching hatred and violence, prior to being executed in cold blood.

In addition, we cannot ignore the following facts: That the top officials in the North Vietnamese Army and Gov-

ernment were largely trained in the Soviet Union and Communist China.

That Communist Chinese cadres and advisers are directing the operation.

That Soviet Russian troops in the thousands are present in North Vietnam. They are headed by Lieutenant General Sherbakov, Russian Ambassador to North Vietnam. This Russian is a guerrilla warfare expert. He headed Russian partisan units in the Ukraine during World War II. He recently left from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. There he headed the National Liberation Movement Branch. He has earned the nickname, "The Assassin."

These facts indicate a common dedication to a system which encourages and practices brutality and terror as a basic instrument of policy. These acts are perpetrated by an authority which has a close bond with the Soviet Union and Communist China. Their actions reveal a vast, systematic and deliberate assault upon universally accepted standards of conduct and morality. They are criminal activities which offend civilized conscience and attack those basic tenets which we consider essential to freedom and the survival of all civilization.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for an objective, systematic exposure of Communist atrocities in Vietnam. The American people are entitled to have the full facts on these atrocities so that they may be completely aware of the nature of Communist aggression in Vietnam. In my judgment Congress is the proper arm of Government to undertake this objective and systematic exposure of truth.

To that end I have written a letter to the able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, urging him through his committee to undertake this inquiry. A copy of my letter to Chairman RIVERS dated June 8, 1965, and copy of the letter of response by Chairman RIVERS follows:

JUNE 8, 1965.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While the United States is committed to defense of human dignity and freedom in Vietnam, a situation has come to my attention that makes civilized men react with anger, disgust, and almost disbelief at the extent and manner of atrocities being committed by the Communists in Vietnam.

It is my hope that your committee will make a full and complete study and investigation of atrocities committed by the Communists in South Vietnam, particularly with respect to: (1) atrocities committed against U.S. military and civilian personnel in Vietnam and Laos; (2) atrocities committed against Vietnamese military and civilian personnel; (3) the policies and practices of the Communists to determine whether or not this practice is an instrument of conscious policy; (4) whether these terroristic policies are also being applied to other countries and people of the world as a deliberate technique to further Communist expansion.

I am convinced that an investigation of this type will go a long way toward tipping the scale of justice and truth in our favor and thus bring more solid support for Presi-

dent Johnson's firm stand in Vietnam. Knowing your strong feelings about getting the truth before our people, I have brought this matter to your attention because I am confident you will take the required action.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Washington, D.C., June 16, 1965.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: I appreciate very much your letter of June 8, 1965, concerning the atrocities that have been committed by the Communists in South Vietnam.

As you may know, we have a special subcommittee that left for South Vietnam on Thursday, June 10, and I hope that they will receive full information with respect to some of the points raised in your letter.

In the meantime, I am writing to the Secretary of the Defense and asking the Department to be prepared to brief the full committee concerning these atrocities that have been committed by the Vietcong in South Vietnam. I agree that a full disclosure of these facts might do much to bring about more solid support for President Johnson's stand in South Vietnam.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to my very able and distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who has fought longer and harder against communism in all of its phases than my distinguished friend from Ohio. He has never let up in his attack upon that which is a menace to freedom.

Will the gentleman inform me, the Communists who are fighting in Asia now, are they respecting any of the rules of war?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would say no, they certainly are not conforming to the Articles of the Geneva Convention which I have just outlined.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I remember as a boy reading American history, and it would make one's blood run cold, about the early days of America when the Indians would come in and find some of the settlers, their wives and children, scalp them and kill them. Am I to understand that that is about what is happening over in Asia today?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The atrocities being committed by the Communists in South Vietnam are much more horrible than those that were committed by the persons to whom the gentleman has just referred.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I saw a photograph, I think it was today or yesterday in one of the Washington newspapers of a soldier crying; he had just found that his wife and his children had been killed, murdered, while he was off fighting. Did the gentleman happen to see that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I did not see that particular one, but I have seen many similar photographs.

There was one, particularly, in the recent issue of Time magazine, showing a man lying on the ground with his head decapitated about 5 or 6 inches from his neck, which represents a typical example of the terrorism and atrocities which are being, unfortunately, committed by the Communist Vietcong.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I take it that all that the gentleman has told us in his talk today is well documented—the incidents which the gentleman has given of these atrocities in his talk today, all of that has been well proven?

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no question about it; yes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course the only thing that we Americans are interested in is peace—peace with security, peace with honor, peace with freedom. But until we reach that objective certainly we must keep our eyes open and we must not hide from our countrymen and from ourselves the atrocities that are being committed by the enemy which we are fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio on his remarks today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much for his contribution. I share with all the Members of the House the high esteem for our colleague whose knowledge of and experience in world affairs stands as a bulwark of strength in the House.

TO CONSERVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE, WE SHOULD ASK THE UNITED NATIONS TO CALL A CONFERENCE AND UNDERTAKE AN ACTION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Concurrent Resolution 440 expressing the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of State shall take steps to convene an international conference under the United Nations to further the worldwide conservation of wildlife.

I am pleased to state that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH, will soon introduce a similar resolution for an international wildlife conservation conference in the other body.

Such a conference is greatly needed to help revoke the sentence of doom that man has pronounced on some 250 species of animals and birds. Some of the most famous and interesting creatures the world has produced during millions of years of evolution will be wiped out in our lifetimes, unless we act to save them.

Man—

Said Mark Twain—
is the only animal that blushes or needs to.

Surely, we cannot look at the list of the 200 creatures already exterminated by man or the names of those earmarked

for destruction without a sense of sorrow and shame.

MANY FAMOUS ANIMALS ARE THREATENED

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has recently published lists of rare mammals and rare birds. A relative handful among these rare creatures are safe because small but adequate breeding stocks are under continuing protection.

But the others are threatened with obliteration. There are many familiar names on the list: the orangutan, the mountain gorilla, the blue whale—the world's largest animal—the polar bear, the giant panda, several species of tiger, several species of rhinoceros, the pigmy hippo, and many more. Last July, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed 50 birds and mammals in the United States that are threatened with extinction. The whooping crane and the ivory-billed woodpecker, the grizzly bear, and the bighorn sheep were among those on the list.

But it is in Africa, known throughout history for the marvelous abundance and variety of its wildlife, that the threat is most acute.

Even animals which now exist by the thousands are doomed if man continues his present practices. Fabulous abundance by itself will not suffice to save a species. Great flights of passenger pigeons once darkened the sky over America. Yet by 1907, the last free passenger pigeon had been shot and 7 years later the last forlorn survivor of a species that had numbered in the billions expired in a Cincinnati zoo.

A similar fate seems in store for the leopard. The demand for leopard skins to supply the fad for leopard skin coats has brought a hoard of profit-seeking poachers into Africa. The leopard is ominously reduced in numbers and may be wiped out in a few years unless something is done to stop the slaughter. According to recent reports, the leopard population in Kenya is so low that Kenya has been importing leopard skins from Bechuanaland to allow sales to tourists.

Many of the famous animals of Africa which still roam the continent in huge herds are on the slippery downhill to oblivion.

These animals can be saved, as we in the United States showed when we came to our senses at the last moment and rescued the American buffalo. In 1900, only 541 buffalo were left of the millions that had lived on our Western Plains. Under a system of protection, substantial herds have again built up.

CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS ARE WORKING TO SAVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE

A valiant and dedicated band of private citizens and organizations is working to save endangered species and to promote sound wildlife conservation practices throughout the world.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is one of the leading organizations in this effort. Its membership includes the Governments of Belgium, Cambodia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, the Federal Republic of Germany,

Italy, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malagasy Republic, Malaya, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Senegal, the Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Zambia, Venezuela, and South Vietnam, and more than 240 organizations throughout the world.

A small professional staff collects and distributes information on wildlife preservation. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources Survival Service Commission catalogs threatened species in its red book. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources studies have been the basis for action to save wild animals native to the Middle East and southern Asia and have led to the foundation of a group to preserve the remarkable animals of the Galapagos Islands.

With aid from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has made country-by-country surveys of the status of nature protection in many parts of the world. In eight general assemblies of its members, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has focused attention on important world conservation needs.

The World Wildlife Fund, International is the sponsoring organization for national fundraising groups in six countries: the United States, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria.

Among the projects to which the World Wildlife Fund has contributed are the establishment of the Charles Darwin Research Foundation to preserve the giant tortoise, the penguin, the flightless cormorant, the flamingo, and the fur seal; an expedition to take into captivity a breeding stock of the Arabian oryx, a type of antelope; purchase of part of the famous Marismas at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Spain to save the most important marshland wilderness in Europe; and the return of 28 Hawaiian geese, bred by the Wildfowl Trust in England, to a national park on Maui Island from which they disappeared some years ago.

The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation of Washington has devoted itself to the training of Africans in conservation and wildlife management. It has paid for the education of a number of African students studying conservation in American colleges and universities. Perez Malande Olindo, the first graduate in this scholarship program, has returned to his native Kenya and assumed the post of Deputy Director of Kenya National Parks. The foundation started and is supporting the first school in Africa to train middle and top level African conservationists, the College of African Wildlife Management at Mweka, Tanzania. The success of the college at Mweka has led to plans for a similar institution in West Africa.

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations has set up an office of wildlife management in Rome. It will provide limited technical assistance to developing countries in the