

age in these activities make the demand for coins a never-ending cry, and the fulfillment of that demand a bottomless pit. The appetite with which these coins are devoured may be but one manifestation of our affluent society. We cannot ignore, however, that a significant portion of the Nation's economy turns on coins.

The Congress will have to come to grips with the 1965 realities of our coinage system. I believe that we will overcome the shortage that exists through continued unlimited production of all coins which are in short supply.

I also believe that Congress, through appropriate committees, should begin consideration of various measures which already have been introduced to discourage hoarding, using coins as collateral on bank loans, melting down the coins for their silver content, and other practices which seriously aggravate our monetary system.

Above all, let us never succumb to the voices which would urge us to abandon the use of silver from a time-honored coinage system which has stood the test of time, dating back to 1792. This folly would indeed deal a tragic and fatal blow to our coinage system, and would lead to hoarding and speculating on a magnitude which would make such practices today pale by comparison.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I applaud my western colleagues for the position they are taking in the Senate today on the minting of silver dollars.

I appreciated their sincerity when previously—for the believed benefit of their States' economies—they would wish the traditional silver dollar minted by the million.

They are equally sincere today in recognizing the practical difficulties, dangers, and disadvantages entailed in the minting program the Treasury might have had in mind in carrying out the expressed intent of the Congress.

We would be playing into the pockets of the hoarders—doing nothing to help commercial coinage circulation—and doing irreparable harm to industries dependent on the use of silver—and the bread and butter jobs dependent on those industries.

Today's discussion performs a tremendous service. It points up the silver question in a fashion that must be understood by all Americans—East and West, North and South.

There just is not enough silver being produced in the free world to meet all our silver needs.

The free world production is only 225 million ounces of silver. The industrial requirements are 300 million ounces. These are divided among such employing industries as silverware and jewelry, electronics, photographic film, batteries, missiles, and medical and dental requirements.

There is a 25-percent deficit between consumption and production. There is no new production left for silver coinage—and the present Treasury stocks must be safeguarded to protect our present coinage.

Present coinage requirements alone threaten to exhaust our Treasury stocks in 3 years.

The price of silver rises each year—but the price rise does not stimulate production. Since producers outside the United States account for 85 percent of the total free world production, they would derive the major benefit from increased silver prices.

I hope the western Senators will now take a good look at the worldwide and long-range problem that silver proposes.

Their local desires, and pride and purposes, have my sympathy and my respect—just as I respect their present realization that only the speculator could profit from a piecemeal treatment of the silver situation.

Again I applaud my western colleagues for their straightforward action and declarations today; and I am sure we can move together for the best interests of the American people—American industry and the American worker.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I join my western colleagues in commending them for the statements which they have made on silver, which I heartily endorse.

VIETNAM—SPEECH OF SENATOR HARRIS BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE OKLAHOMA BANKERS ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MAY 7, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a speech delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] before the State convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association, in Tulsa, Okla., on May 7, 1965.

I have studied the speech very carefully. It is addressed to the question of Vietnam. The Senator explores a series of myths which have tended to confuse the issues at stake in this grave situation.

His handling of those myths is so articulate that I am convinced that a reading of the speech by all Senators will benefit them, if they could share in the views the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed in his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH OF SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS, BEFORE THE STATE CONVENTION OF THE OKLAHOMA BANKERS ASSOCIATION IN TULSA, OKLA., MAY 7, 1965

I serve on the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, and, as a Member of the Senate of the United

States, have special responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs.

Though each of us, you and I, is deeply concerned about the Senate banking inquiry, the events now transpiring in southeast Asia and South Vietnam, and the actions of our Government there, may have far greater impact on our lives than all the banking inquiries put together.

So, I want to talk with you some about Vietnam. I support the President's policy there.

A respected Member of the Senate once made a speech on foreign policy called, old myths and new realities. I would like to plagiarize a little and on another subject, Vietnam, turn that title around to call these remarks new myths and old realities.

Many well-intentioned people, discussing the Vietnamese situation, have not been possessed of, or convinced of the facts there. Consequently, some new myths have gained currency in some sectors here at home and abroad.

Myth No. 1 is: "The United States has no business being involved in southeast Asia."

The reality is to the contrary. Since the French were forced out of Indonesia, and the Geneva Conference of 1954 divided it up into Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam, the Communists have made this area a principal arena of Communist aggression. The last Communist attempt to take over a free country by conventional military attack, Korea, failed.

Since then, the Communists have developed and are attempting to test the theory of what they call wars of national liberation, which in free-world terms means Communist aggression by terror and subversion, using local guerrillas to achieve external Communist ends. South Vietnam, particularly, and southeast Asia, generally, are the testing ground for this theory.

Control of southeast Asia has been the intent of many of history's major powers. It was for such control Japan started World War II. England fought a war for it. The Germans fought a war for it. The Dutch fought a war for it. The Portuguese fought a war for it. Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, has recently stated: "The hard fact is that it makes a difference who has southeast Asia, as to what kind of balance exists in the world." There are great resources there of rice, tin, oil, bauxite, and rubber. There are hordes of people there, entitled to be free, and there are seas and geographic areas essential to the independence of nations such as Japan.

China must not be allowed to achieve domination over this area without a struggle.

The United States is a major world power and must accept its responsibilities as such. Even in this space age, we cannot just say "stop the world and let me off." We cannot in this world of modern weapons, where there are no impregnable walls or defenses, put our hopes in a new isolationism and attempt to retreat to our own shores.

The reality, then, is that we do have business being involved in southeast Asia because our own peace and security are there involved, and preparedness and adequate, timely action in that area of the world are and will be required of us.

Myth No. 2: "South Vietnam is not important to the United States."

The reality is otherwise. Testing their new theory of "wars of liberation," the Communists have made South Vietnam the principal stage for their aggression. South Vietnam may be some 7,000 miles away, but it represents 15 million people to whom this country, under three Presidents, has made a solemn pledge of assistance in their continued struggle for freedom and independence.

True, this present type of warfare is against South Vietnam, but it is not restricted to that country alone. Should South Vietnam fall prey to communism, the impact of such a Communist victory in lesser developed countries of the free world would indeed be incalculable. New efforts of this type would be mounted, not only in other parts of southeast Asia, but in Africa and Latin America.

The success of this type of warfare in South Vietnam would also immeasurably strengthen the world's most aggressive Communist power, Communist China, in its twin theses that aggression pays off and that the United States is but a "paper tiger."

If we break the pledge of three Presidents to South Vietnam, how can other Asian nations and their peoples count on us in the future?

We must not only study history but learn from it. President Johnson on April 28 said, "This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

How well we should remember the triumphant words of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, in September of 1938, when he returned to England after his Munich conference with Hitler and Mussolini. He said, "For the second time in history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace for our time. Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

I prefer, instead, the words of realism of Winston Churchill, which proved so true: "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Myth No. 3: "We will eventually lose, and Communist China will inevitably control Asia."

I will not accept that as reality, and there is no need to. Even the Communists wish they could count on this myth as a reality. Our actions have rudely jarred their firm belief that it is so.

China has not actually controlled this area for most of the past 1,000 years, and will not, if free nations remain firm. Unquestionably, our hardened actions are getting results—in the morale and will to resist on the part of the South Vietnamese—in greater respect for America's will to do what it says and follow its commitments. Indeed, there are reports of new tensions in Hanoi itself. Reports which commence to indicate that the North Vietnamese themselves have become more and more split due to the tighter pressure we have placed upon them and there are increased and more serious bickerings between Communist China and the Soviet Union.

There is no question that China will continue to be influential, and increasingly influential, in Asia, but even dominance need not and must not mean domination.

President Johnson has said in answer to the myth of China's inevitable victory in southeast Asia, "There is no end to that argument until all of the nations of Asia are swallowed up."

But, to the pessimists and defeatists, I would say that in the long view of history, people who demonstrate their determination to fight to achieve and to maintain their freedom, remain free. We shall honor our commitment to help South Vietnam defend itself. With the free world's great strength and with our equally great determination, we shall remain free.

While holding out his offer for "unconditional discussions," the President has nevertheless issued a clear warning against Communist aggression. He said, "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw either openly, or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Myth No. 4: "Vietnam is a civil war."

This is myth, not reality. Even Hanoi does not attempt to deny that it is actively supporting, assisting, and abetting the Vietcong in South Vietnam. Even they, when calling upon us to discuss peace terms with the National Liberation Front, which includes a few non-Communists as window dressing, but is overwhelmingly Communist-dominated and controlled, have stated that North Vietnam would have controlling numbers in any peace discussions. Most of the National Liberation Front leaders are residents in Hanoi.

Our intelligence information, statements of captured and defecting Vietcong members, clearly show the stepped-up and heavy infiltration of soldiers from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. As a matter of fact, in recent months Hanoi has begun to give direct radio signals, orders to units operating in South Vietnam, coordinating their numbers and concentration of targets.

Evidence shows that major regular army units from Hanoi are now operating in the south and that there has been wholesale importation of supplies and armaments brought in to the guerrillas. In recent battles, the Vietcong are found to be armed with weapons, 90 percent of which come from outside, mostly from China and Czechoslovakia and nearly 100 percent of the larger weapons from China. We stepped up our efforts in South Vietnam as the efforts of the North Vietnamese aggression were stepped up on the other side.

New though its tactics may be, the situation in Vietnam is not civil war, but outright aggression. As President Johnson has said, "The confused nature of this conflict cannot mask the fact that this is the new face of an old enemy. It is an attack by one country upon another. And the object of that attack is a friend to which we are pledged."

Myth No. 5: "South Vietnam is incapable of stable government."

First, let me say that there are truly nationalistic forces in South Vietnam who have not supported some or all of the governments there in recent time—young Turks in the military, some Catholic elements, some Buddhist elements, and some students. No one is happy with the "musical chair" approach which has been prevalent recently in South Vietnam's Government.

But let me say this: First of all, the only government the people of South Vietnam knew, before their own independent government was established, was that of France, which, at that time, was almost a model in its frequent changes for what has been taking place in the South Vietnamese Government. Furthermore, the South Vietnamese have had little chance for governmental stability. The Communists never intended to abide by the Geneva accord of 1954. They were supposed to pull back to the 17th parallel as the French left. Instead, they left arms caches, infiltrators, and guerrillas in the south, and took others to the north for training and eventual reentry. Immediately, they made plans for control of South Vietnam, which they felt was ready to fall like a ripe plum, but it has not been so. At first it was felt they would be successful in 6 months. Ten years have passed, and they have not been successful.

What chance for governmental stability is there in a country where local and national officials have been systematically murdered and kidnaped to the degree that, had such terroristic efforts been carried on in the United States in such proportion, it would have been the equivalent of killing 6,000 mayors and kidnaping 20,000 mayors here?

The people of South Vietnam seek freedom and independence. They have proved themselves courageous and hard working. Equally important, they are among the most persistent and determined people on the face of the earth. Any people which has

taken so many casualties and gone on fighting, deserves the respect of the entire world. They are at least entitled to have their borders sealed off and achieve self-determination without outside aggression. The Quat government, now in power, has lasted longer than most. Every day it lasts, its chances of continuing are greater. The people of South Vietnam want to govern themselves; they are fighting for that right and we must help them.

Myth No. 6: "The people of South Vietnam are in sympathy with the Communist Vietcong."

Our evidence is very much to the contrary. The South Vietnamese now have approximately 500,000—one-half million—of their people as regular troops, fighting in the field against the Vietcong. Does this sound like support for the Vietcong? During the last 5 years, the South Vietnamese forces have suffered nearly 80,000 military and civilian casualties in fighting the Vietcong. In relation to their population, this would be equivalent to more than 1 million casualties for the United States. Does this sound like support for the Vietcong?

Despite dissension in past governments, no South Vietnamese Government leader has ever advocated bringing representatives of the Vietcong into the government.

Morale is clearly increasing among the people of South Vietnam because of our help and planned escalation of hostilities, as is plainly indicated by a cross section of press accounts from that area. There are other indications of improved morale in the south. More and more weapons are being captured by the South Vietnamese. More and more defectors are leaving guerrilla forces to return to their home and families. In many places the efforts in the south on our side have now shifted from offensive to defensive. And, very importantly, in 1 week recently it was reported that 8,000 South Vietnamese volunteered for service in the South Vietnamese Army. Not long ago we would have been talking about South Vietnamese deserters, instead of volunteers.

The South Vietnamese, by their own sacrifices, have so eloquently said that they do not support the Vietcong or want Communist domination, that this myth should not be given any responsible belief.

Myth No. 7: "The United States is going it alone in Vietnam."

This is not so. Thirty-three free world countries, including the United States, are providing, or have agreed to provide assistance to South Vietnam. A 2,000-man South Korean engineer battalion arrived in Saigon in mid-March. Last week, Australia announced it would soon dispatch an 800-man combat infantry battalion to South Vietnam. These two recent efforts are small in comparison to our own, more than 30,000 fighting men there, but they are most significant because they evidence a growing awareness by the people of Asia that this is basically their fight.

Many decry our efforts there and wish that the United Nations or some other multilateral organization might assume this heavy burden. I say: "Easier said than done."

There has been criticism of American efforts there without international organization approval. First, let me say that I was glad to see the approving action just last Wednesday by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and, second, let it be said that in the words of Senator GALE MCGEE of Wyoming:

"We have to live with our conscience. We have to do what we believe in our best judgment is right because it is right, not because we are trying to win a popularity poll with some of the governments of the globe. Those who are the most powerful in the world are rarely the most loved. We can never conduct our policies on the basis of trying to be loved by everyone or trying to be the

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11057

od guy. In the recent history of mankind the only force which has been able to keep international relations on a peaceful plain has been that of balance of power."

The United States is not going it alone, and I believe that others will continue to join us. But, until the aggression is stopped or until other resistance to aggression is assumed by additional nations or by some international organization, we must continue the great responsibility inherent in great power.

Myth No. 8: "The United States has violated the 1954 Geneva accord."

The reality is that the United States increased its personnel and weaponry and its planned escalation there only after confirmed Communist violations of the Geneva accord, and our increased efforts have been measured and responsive to the increased violations. We were and are in favor of United Nations-supervised elections and ultimate unification of the two countries, but the facts of life are that neither earlier, nor now, do conditions exist for really free elections in North Vietnam or immediate reunification.

Every agreement is a two-way street. Therefore, we have not and we should not be bound by restrictions while the other side is free to do as it pleases.

Myth No. 9: "The United States is concerned solely with military actions in Vietnam and is the real block to peaceful settlement."

The realities show there has been a long list of accomplishments in the economic sector of South Vietnam, that it was making steady progress toward economic soundness and that it was experiencing steady growth in its gross national product, prior to the increased efforts against it by North Vietnam.

The President has indicated his desire in no uncertain terms to turn our interests there toward peaceful pursuits, rather than toward war. He has made it clear over and over again, as he did in his speech at Johns Hopkins University, that we remain ready for "unconditional discussions." Yet, the Communist response has been decidedly negative thus far, although the offer remains open.

All that is necessary for peace to be restored and for our military efforts to be reduced is for the North Vietnamese to stop their aggression. Even Yugoslavia doesn't believe this myth and has indicated that Hanoi and Peking are being unrealistic in their demands.

So, finally, we come back to the reality that the Communists have not changed their goals, but only altered their strategy. We come back to the reality that this is old-style aggression, dressed up in new clothes. We come back to the reality that aggression feeds upon itself and spreads unless met and stopped when it starts. We come back to the reality that this is not a war over South Vietnam, but over the peace and security of southeast Asia and the world.

We come back to the reality that there is no dramatic way to bring things back to normality in one fell swoop, but that patience and perseverance are required. We come back to the reality that America's word, its commitment has been given and accepted and must be kept.

We come back to the reality that this should not be a debate by the "hawks" and "doves," those who seek war and those who seek peace, because all of us seek peace. But we must take to heart the history-taught reality that he who seeks peace, by taking risks now in order to assure that such peace will be just and lasting, is no less a peacemaker than he who asks for peace immediately with no safeguard that it may not have to be enforced or defended later at much greater price.

We come back to the reality that only increased pressure will stop this aggression

and only increased will and determination will preserve the freedom and independence of the countries of southeast Asia and the world.

The ultimate reality is that the goal of this country is and must remain, as Churchill set for his own people: "In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, good will."

(By unanimous consent granted subsequently, Mr. YARBOROUGH's following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD before the vote on cloture.)

GI BILL FAVORABLY REPORTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning the Labor and Public Welfare Committee favorably reported the cold war GI bill, S. 9, to the Senate. It is my hope that this body will not allow the cold war GI bill to languish on the Senate Calendar, as it did for more than a year during the 88th Congress, but will give the bill a fair and adequate consideration on the Senate floor.

This bill is cosponsored by 41 Senators, the most in its history, and it has accumulated a vast amount of support from all areas of this country. If we are to achieve the Great Society, it is essential that we do not discriminate against the 40 percent of our draft-eligible young men who defend this country. We cannot create pockets of poverty by neglecting these men and still expect this country to progress toward the Great Society.

The predecessors of the cold war GI bill, the World War II, and the Korean GI bill have proven to be two of the most successful pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress. Our choice is simple: We can either continue to neglect these men and impede our progress as a Nation, or we can provide them with the effective and just educational assistance they need, adding additional thrust to the success of this country.

I believe the latter course is the only wise position, and hope that this body will consider this proposal in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I recently received from Pfc. William Iver Lessley, of the U.S. Army, be printed at this point in the RECORD to emphasize the need for this bill.

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

APO NEW YORK, 09154,
March 13, 1965.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Recently, my attention was brought to the bill which you helped to sponsor that deals with the aid for the education of cold war veterans, while I was perusing a January 1965 issue of Harper's magazine. The bill, as explained in your article, proposes, in my opinion, a great good for the country. The fact that the total outlay for the program each year would only be a fraction of a percent of the whole defense program, combined with the convincing argument which shows that the money spent on the program would be more than paid back during the next two or three decades in higher taxes paid as a result of greater earning power through education, makes me believe that the bill, or one similar to it would, indeed, be a positive good for the Nation as a whole, and not a program that would just

favor a very small portion of the population. One must remember that money spent on education is nothing short of an investment in the future of the individual involved, and therefore an investment in the future of the Nation. In the long run, all citizens will benefit from the passing of the proposed bill for the assistance to the education of cold-war veterans.

The very fact that most of the first-term men in the services of the Nation are not involved in a career, but, rather, interrupting a career, or delaying the start of one for the sake of their country—for the protection of the country they love—seems to me to qualify them for a little extra consideration by their countrymen. When a man gives 6 months, 2 years, 3 years, or more of his life to insure the safety and security of his country and loved ones, is it too much to ask of those for whom he has served so well, for so long, for so little—is it too much to ask of those who owe so much—is it too much to ask of those people such a relatively small donation to help the men who have defended the Nation that they love and have served so well? Is it too much to ask this small deed so that they (the cold-war veterans) may further their own education and become more responsible citizens who would be not only willing, but able to help further develop and improve the country and society that they have served and protected by way of their time in the military service? My answer, as I am sure would agree with yours, to these questions is an emphatic no. The men in the services who have given up so much for their country deserve a helping hand from those whom they have served. It only seems fair.

Although I am not a citizen of Texas, my wholehearted support, both as a serviceman and as a citizen of the United States of America, is with you in your efforts to make this bill to aid in the education of cold-war veterans into law. Good luck in your difficult task.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM IVER LESSLEY,
Private, First Class, U.S. Army.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment No. 124, which is now pending, be printed as amended, and modified up until this hour.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

IEWS OF RALEIGH, N.C., WOMAN'S CLUB MAKE GOOD SENSE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, many people who, like myself, believe strongly that all qualified citizens should be able to register and vote without regard to race or color, nevertheless have strong reservations about the pending voting rights bill. Many of its provisions have a disturbing potential for creating menacing problems out of all proportion to the token contribution they might make toward eliminating racial discrimination in the administration of voting laws.

Perhaps the provision which has been most severely criticized in this respect is the provision prohibiting certain States from requiring passage of a literacy test as a precondition for voting. I recently received a letter from the board of directors of the Raleigh, N.C., Woman's Club, raising objections to that provision which make good sense and which merit careful consideration by all of us.

I know that we are all familiar with the fine work of America's federated clubwomen in the area of teaching adult illiterates to read and write. The Raleigh clubwomen have been very active in this area and have been quite effective in convincing many illiterate adults that the ability to read and write is a fundamental skill without which living in this day and age is made much more difficult and infinitely less rewarding. The efforts of these dedicated women and of other similar groups have helped countless uneducated adults to acquire the invaluable gift of literacy and, as a byproduct, to take a giant stride toward escaping from the cycle of poverty and dependence in which many of these adults find themselves trapped.

The experience of the Raleigh Woman's Club has indicated that one of the most effective means of persuading illiterate adults to undertake the task of learning to read and write is to impress upon them the need to acquire that skill in order to satisfy the literacy requirements for such basic activities as voting and obtaining a driver's license. The Raleigh clubwomen make the compelling point that passage of the voting bill with its literacy-test prohibition would have the inevitable effect of removing the most meaningful incentive of many of those uneducated adults who most need to acquire the fundamental skill of literacy.

The second objection raised by these ladies, Mr. President, is that proscription of the literacy requirement deprives the States of their most effective means of insuring an independent and intelligent exercise of the franchise. Surely, an educated electorate is an indispensable element of our democratic form of government. Admittedly, literacy and intelligence are not synonymous, and some illiterate people may be more intelligent voters than some literate ones. Nevertheless, in our society where newspapers, magazines, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate myriad and complex political issues, a State might legitimately presume that only those persons who are literate are qualified to exercise the franchise.

The Raleigh clubwomen have long recognized the need for an educated electorate, as have clubwomen everywhere. These ladies have worked and studied to inform themselves on the issues and to stir up similar interests in others. They have learned firsthand that knowing how to vote intelligently is an ambitious goal for an educated and alert person and a well-nigh impossible one for an illiterate person. As the Raleigh clubwomen so aptly note, a simple, objective, and fairly administered literacy requirement for voting would appear to be a greater protection of the strength of our

democratic government than a system which grants the right of suffrage to the illiterate and uninformed who are unable to exercise the right intelligently and who are more susceptible to influence and control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent letter from the chairman of the education department of the Raleigh Woman's Club printed in the RECORD.

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

NORTH CAROLINA FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS, RALEIGH WOMAN'S CLUB,

Raleigh, N.C., April 27, 1965.

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: The board of directors of the Raleigh Woman's Club is concerned about the possible passage of a voting rights law which would exclude literacy as a voting requirement and has asked me to express their views to you.

First, there has been a great deal of time and money put forth by federated club women in America to teach adult illiterates in accordance with our conviction that the ability to read and write is a fundamental tool for living in this day and age. We have joined with others who have been seeking methods of breaking the "cycle of poverty" by providing a new opportunity to throw off old ways of dependency and unemployment. It seems to us that removing the literacy requirement from such activities as voting and obtaining a driver's license is to remove the incentive for many of the people who need this basic skill the most and is a denial of one of the initial premises of all anti-poverty activity.

Second, one of the major points of emphasis for clubwomen in the area of legislation and citizenship has been the need for an educated electorate. It is not enough, we have said, to simply "get out and vote." The strength of a democracy lies in the voter knowing how and why he is voting in every election from dogcatcher to president. This is an ambitious goal for an alert and intelligent group and an impossible one for the uneducated. A uniformly drawn, uniformly administered code of requirements for the right to vote is a greater protection of the rights of the individual than an unrestricted system which allows the votes of the uninformed to be controlled by bosses, precinct wardens, or others whose methods are not above suspicion.

I hope that the depth of our concern is evident here. I realize that voting rights in general have become voting rights of the Negro in particular but we are disturbed that in trying to rectify the errors in this regard we will establish a potentially more menacing situation.

Sincerely yours,

KATHERINE H. HOLOMAN,
Education Department Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, an editorial in the June 5, 1965, edition of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "A Plea for a Responsible Vote," criticizes the voting rights bill on the same grounds as the Raleigh Woman's Club; namely, that, in prohibiting literacy tests altogether, the bill goes much too far. Noting that 18 States, including New York, require proof of literacy as a precondition for voting—on the theory that an illiterate voter is apt to be an ill-informed voter—the editorial concludes

with this statement which we all would do well to keep in mind:

Clearly the ability to read does not guarantee the ability to vote intelligently, but it is a good beginning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

A PLEA FOR A RESPONSIBLE VOTE

Legislation to protect the voting rights of every American citizen is long overdue. However, in its zeal to correct the wrongs of the past, the administration may have gone too far with the bill it has recommended. The new law, which would affect those States with a history of discrimination against Negro voters, contains a provision that would invalidate literacy tests in the States to which it applies. It is obvious that several southern States have used unreasonable tests for the sole purpose of disfranchising the Negro. We agree that such tests should be abolished. But should we abandon literacy tests? We don't think so. On the theory that an illiterate voter is an ill-informed voter, 18 States, including New York, require proof that the prospective voter can read and write. Clearly, the ability to read does not guarantee the ability to vote intelligently, but it is a good beginning.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I expect to offer several amendments quickly and will ask for the yeas and nays on them at the appropriate time.

I believe that the Senate could facilitate its work if, after a vote on the cloture motion, regardless of how it eventuates, Senators would remain in the Chamber to complete action on my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order.

Does the Senator from North Carolina yield further time?

Mr. ERVIN. Does any Senator wish time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire to yield time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1564, to be inserted in the appropriate place in the bill, and ask that it be considered as having been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and considered as having been read.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

ferences, it was agreed that the DLGN should remain in the program.

The Senate recedes.

Air Force (Aircraft)

The House deleted \$5 million from the industrial facilities portion of the Air Force aircraft program. Subsequent to this cut the Department of Defense furnished information not made available to the committee at the time of its original consideration of this program. The Department of Defense in its later furnished information stated that an attempt is being made "to achieve lower procurement costs through a continuing program of updating Government owned equipment which has become technologically obsolete. We encourage the services to budget 5 percent of the value of their active inventory for this purpose—representing turnover of equipment only every 20 years. In the fiscal year 1966 budget the Air Force request of \$27.5 million for this purpose is equal to only 3.5 percent of the inventory value. Reduction of this request will hamper our efforts to reduce procurement costs through modernization of our production techniques."

On the basis of this additional information, the House conferees agreed that the \$5 million should be returned to the program.

The House recedes.

Air Force (Missiles)

In its consideration of the Air Force missile program, the House Committee cut \$25 million from the missile support equipment and facilities program. Additional information subsequently furnished by the Department of Defense indicates that this cut could generate problems within the missile program of the Department of Defense and the conferees agreed that it should be returned.

The House recedes.

Research, development, test and evaluation

The bill passed by the Senate reduced the requested research and development budget by \$44 million, all of which was to be taken from the military sciences budget activity. The Senate then added to the amount requested \$32 million, to be applied only for the development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA), for a net addition to the budget of \$38 million.

The bill as it passed the House reduced the research and development budget by \$121.3 million. The House added \$7 million to the amount requested for the advanced manned strategic aircraft. Thus, the action by the House reflected a net reduction of \$114.3 million to the total amount requested for research, development, test and evaluation.

The bill passed by the House contained restrictive language for the \$150 million authorized for the manned orbiting laboratory (MOL). This restrictive language was accepted by the Senate in conference.

Both bills included restrictive language for the amounts added for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft. In conference the Senate receded and accepted the House language which added only \$7 million above the amount requested. The total amount of new obligational authority, \$22 million, is available only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft. Both the House and the Senate continue to support the development of a follow-on manned bomber. However, the conference committee agreed that the additional \$22 million in new obligational authority is about the maximum that could be expended wisely and effectively during the coming year on the basis of the program approved by the Department of Defense to date.

The House reduced specific program elements in arriving at the recommended re-

ductions. However, it recognized that in a rapidly changing environment the military services must be allowed the flexibility to cope with changing conditions and requirements. Therefore, it was recommended that the reductions could be taken in program areas other than those indicated and could be on the basis of military priorities of each department.

Army

The House reduced the amount requested for Army research, development, test, and evaluation by \$31.6 million. The Senate reduced \$8.5 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House reduction. Thus, the amount authorized for Army R.D.T. & E. is \$1,406,400,000.

Navy

The House reduced the amount requested for Navy research development, test and evaluation by \$33.4 million. The Senate reduced \$10 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, the amount authorized for Navy R.D.T. & E. is \$1,439,200,000.

Air Force

The House reduced \$50.9 million from the amount requested and then added on \$7 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, for a net reduction of \$43.9 million. The Senate reduced the amount requested by \$8.5 million and then added on \$2 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, the amount authorized for the Air Force R.D.T. & E. is \$3,103,900,000.

Defense agencies

The House reduced the amount requested for research, development, test and evaluation by the Defense agencies by \$5.4 million. The Senate reduced \$17 million from the amount requested. The Senate recedes and accepts the House version. Thus, \$495,000,000 is authorized for research, development, test and evaluation for Defense agencies.

TITLE III

The House added six new sections to the bill. Each of them is described and the rationale explained below:

Section 301. Repeal of tonnage: The Vinson-Trammell Act and subsequent acts created tonnage which now is in excess of 3,300,000 tons. From every practical standpoint, the enactment of section 412(b) has rendered existing tonnage authorizations meaningless. Bookkeeping on this tonnage is expensive.

Section 302. Alternate ship provision: Section 301, in addition to repealing outstanding tonnage also repealed the alternate ship provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act. It is considered desirable that this provision be preserved.

The Vinson-Trammell Act applied only to "warships." Since that act, escort vessels have become an important part of the Navy. The House committee, therefore, in re-enacting the alternate ship provision modified it slightly to include "warships and escort vessels." In this year's bill alone the change will embrace 10 destroyer escorts at a price of \$279.1 million.

Section 303. 65/35: Today at least 35 percent of all conversion, alteration and repair of naval ships must, under Appropriations Committee language, be performed in private shipyards. This section would eliminate this requirement.

The Navy and the Secretary of Defense strongly support this new section.

The Secretary of the Navy in a letter to the committee stated, among other things, that: "Cost studies show that there is no economy in contracting out conversion, alteration, and repair work (CAR) to private yards. In fact, annual savings can be achieved under present cost differentials by increasing the amount of conversion, alteration, and repair work assigned to naval ship-

yards. If all factors involved in these assignments were to permit an increase from the current statutory level of 65 percent to a somewhat higher level, it is estimated that an annual savings of several million dollars could be achieved. This results from the fact that the naval shipyards which must be maintained for strategic and operational reasons have a high fixed overhead cost which continues regardless of workload assigned."

Section 304. Inclusion of tracked combat vehicles in 412(b): This section will require procurement authorization for "tracked vehicles" in addition to aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. For fiscal year 1966 about \$200 million would have been involved.

Section 305. Emergency fund: Each year Congress makes available to the Department of Defense an Emergency Fund for Research and Development. It has varied between \$125 and \$150 million. The House committee believes that this emergency fund should be authorized in the same fashion as all other funds for research and development.

Section 306. Changing name of MATS: The House committee believes that MATS is too important to be designated as a "service". Military Airlift Command is both descriptive of its true function and provides a recognition of its vital missions. The cost of making this change is estimated at \$173,800. This change in name is to be effective as of January 1, 1966.

The Senate recedes with respect to these six new sections.

SUMMARY

The bill as presented to the Congress by the President totaled \$15,297,200,000 (of which \$6,558,800,000 was for research, development, test, and evaluation). The bill as it passed the House totaled \$15,303,400,000 (of which \$6,444,500,000 was for R.D.T. & E.). The bill as it passed the Senate totaled \$15,283,800,000 (of which \$6,596,800,000 was for R.D.T. & E.).

The bill as agreed to in conference totals \$15,402,800,000 (of which \$6,444,500,000 is for R.D.T. & E.).

The agreement arrived at by the conferees is \$99,400,000 more than the bill as it passed the House, \$119,000,000 more than the bill as it passed the Senate, and is \$105,600,000 above the bill as it was presented to the Congress by the President.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
 PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
 F. EDW. HEBERT,
 MELVIN PRICE,
 O. C. FISHER,
 PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
 WILLIAM H. BATES,
 LESLIE C. ARENDS,
 ALVIN E. O'KONSKY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night, May 29, to file a report on H.R. 7105, the Export Control Act, including minority and supplemental views.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make certain changes in the remarks of mine which appear on pages 10110 and 10114 of the Record for May 13, 1965.

May 25, 1965

14158

On page 10110, column 3, line 24, "January 29" should read "January 25."

On page 10114, column 3, the second line from the bottom, the words "Mr. STRATTON" should be inserted at the beginning of the line, since these remarks and those that follow on the subsequent pages are my remarks, not the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE.]

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time for this purpose because I do want to announce some additions to the program. In the first place, we go on as previously announced with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill tomorrow.

Following that we shall take up S. 800. There will be a rule on this bill waiving points of order on the conference report on that bill, which is the Armed Services Procurement Act. We hope, if we finish the appropriation bill and the conference report that we may take up H.R. 5883, which is the bonding bill scheduled for Thursday. If we can complete those we will expedite the handling of the business for the week.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and while I have the time, in order that Members of the House may be advised, it is our hope that we will finish the legislative program on Thursday, that we will meet without legislative business on Friday for the purpose of adjourning over until Tuesday, as Monday is a legal holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

U.S. POLICY ON THE SIDE OF DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as a severe critic of earlier U.S. positions in the Dominican Republic, I want to commend President Johnson for the current policy which places U.S. power and authority on the side of democratic constitutional processes. In the long run we have no other choice because of our be-

lief in the right of people to govern themselves. Yet too often in the short run we yield to other considerations and fail to act decisively when free government is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States had made its intention to support restoration of constitutional processes in the Dominican Republic explicit at the outset, much of the criticism directed toward our Government would have been avoided. It is, nevertheless, a tribute to the wisdom and understanding of our President that U.S. policy is clearly emerging on the side of the people of the Dominican Republic and their right to govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we need to make this support of self-government a long-term commitment. Such a commitment will require a reexamination of some of the current ideas about intervention held within the OAS and elsewhere.

Yet such a commitment is essential if we are to preserve democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere and ultimately throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a report published in today's issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

WASHINGTON SHIFTS DOMINICAN POLICY (By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—One of the historic turning points in the foreign policy of the United States may well have been passed in the past few days. The United States now is acting to check communism through the forces of popular, democratic government instead of through military reaction.

Although the change of course has come in the Dominican Republic, it is likely to have a profound effect on the much more important case of Vietnam, where a similar problem exists.

Up until some time last week, President Johnson and his advisers were backing the military junta in Santo Domingo, while claiming to be impartial.

The best friends of the United States in Latin America—those statesmen who represent the forces of constitutional democracy as against fascism of the right or communism of the left—were urgently and even passionately advising him behind the scenes that this was a profound mistake.

POSITION CHANGED

The President then changed his position. His advisers then began the formation of the prospective Guzman government from men who represent the constitutional tradition and were agreed to by former President Bosch.

In so doing, it seems likely that President Johnson has emerged from his own "Bay of Pigs." If his present decision holds, if his advisers are able to carry through with the Guzman government they have nearly completed, a period of talking democracy and acting through a foreign military dictatorship to crush it will have ended.

It is considered not too late to recover the rapidly fading respect of the progressive forces in Latin America and elsewhere in the free world. Indeed the dramatic turn of events is likely actually to enhance the American position.

CREDIBILITY RESCUED

From Washington, it also appears that something much more important now is possible. For the credibility of the United States and of President Johnson, when he promised to withdraw from Vietnam as soon as free government was secure, had been severely damaged.

It seemed for a while that American policy in Vietnam might find its graveyard or its

vindication in the Dominican Republic, where the issue was more sharply defined for the whole world to see. The direction now has become one of vindication.

There has never been any question here of relaxing the guard against Communist infiltration, either in the Caribbean or in southeast Asia. That remains the first aim of the U.S. policy.

The question was whether a predominantly military action, such as stiffening American military action in Vietnam and using the guns of the Dominican Army to restore order, was enough in itself to check communism without also building a strong middle-ground government and encouraging it to make the reforms which would ease the revolutionary pressures that feed communism.

RISKS COMPARED

In Vietnam the makings of such a government exist, but it has not been a prime object of U.S. policy. President Johnson has looked chiefly to military measures to achieve his purpose. In the Caribbean the ingredients of such a non-Communist government were actually being liquidated by the forces of the military junta.

To the more military minded advisers in Washington the risks of this course seemed less than the risks of working with popular reform governments which seemed vulnerable to the maneuvers of Communists and of radicals who are willing to work with Communists.

There are highly placed political advisers to the President, however, who took the opposite line.

KEY EVENTS

Though in the minority, they have argued that communism feeds on economic unrest, plus the unpopularity of so-called strong-arm regimes—or on weak though well-meaning governments (like that of Saigon) which are unable to bring about economic and political reform.

These advisers have insisted that communism can best be thwarted by the maximum emphasis on the kind of people's government that the United States believes in.

Events now appear to have brought the President around to this view.

The events included the mounting criticism of the friends of the United States in the free world, the action of the Dominican military junta in discrediting itself, and a swinging of the pendulum in argument within the highest echelons of the Government here.

It now remains to be seen whether the President can stay on the new course and what its influence on the restraint of communism and the support of the free world will be.

THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the senior Senator, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, recently traveled to Reed College in Portland, Oreg., where he debated with the very able senior Senator from that State, WAYNE MORSE. The topic which they debated was one which merits the concern of all Americans—the policy of the United States in Vietnam. Because of the timeliness of this topic, I extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in order to bring this debate to the attention of my colleagues:

May 25, 1965

11159

DEBATE BETWEEN THE HONORABLE WILLIAM PROXMIRE AND THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE, AT THE CONFERENCE ON AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM, SPONSORED BY THE REED COLLEGE PUBLIC AFFAIRS BOARD

Senator MORSE. To understand my position on foreign policy during my 20 years of service in the U.S. Senate, one must recognize that I am a disciple of Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. Senator Vandenberg was, at one time, the leading isolationist in the Senate. He became, in my opinion, the leading internationalist and the greatest expert on foreign policy in the Senate. He left with us a tenet, "There is no hope for permanent peace until all nations, not just some, not just those we like, but until all the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of international justice through law." Every issue that threatens the peace of the world would be submitted to such a system for a final and binding decision, to be enforced by some international organization such as the United Nations.

This is referred to as the call for a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of military force. The major premise of my position on Vietnam is that we should have insisted upon a substitution of the rule of law for the jungle law of unilateral American action in southeast Asia, for we are acting outside the framework of international law. We have walked out on one of the greatest opportunities available to try to lead mankind to a lawful settlement of this threat of peace * * *. Those [lawful] procedures could have been used through a series of agencies. I urged that we try to do it through SEATO. I urged that we try to do it through a reconvening of a 14-Nations Conference, going back to the Geneva Accord Conference of 1954.

When it became obvious that we had passed by any chance of using those agencies for the substitution of the rule of law for unilateral American military action in southeast Asia, I pleaded to take the matter to the United Nations. I have asked for nothing more than Franklin Roosevelt asked for 20 years ago at Teheran and Cairo, when he proposed the establishment of an international trusteeship for all of Indochina. Roosevelt pointed out that there could not be any peace in Asia if the powers were going to resort to a balance of power theory and were going to use military power for the maintenance of peace. He recognized that no longer will war produce peace; all a war will do is produce more war, with an interim period between wars that some people mistakenly call peace. Great Britain blocked Roosevelt at Teheran and Cairo, Great Britain thought it could still hold its colonial possessions in Asia. France, too, thought it might hold its colonies. But Roosevelt answered Great Britain by pointing out that France had milked Indochina for years and Great Britain had no hope of maintaining colonies in that part of the world much longer. Even then, colonialism in Asia was dead, and a new colonialism in Asia, in my judgment, has no possible hope of success, even a form of American colonialism in southeast Asia.

We got into Vietnam in large part because John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, thought France should stay in Indochina, and we poured \$1½ billion into France, hoping to keep France in Indochina. But then Dienbienphu occurred. Dulles went to London, and he tried to persuade Churchill and Anthony Eden to commit British troops to help France in Indochina, in return for which he would commit American troops. Then they were to go across the channel and make the offer to France, hoping that this would keep France in the war in Indochina. Churchill turned him down.

Following that, we had the Geneva accord of 1954. France made it clear she was pulling out of Indochina. The Geneva accord of 1954 was consummated, but the United States did not sign it, and the United States succeeded, and I speak advisedly, in getting its first puppet government in South Vietnam, the Diem government, not to sign the accord. We have never signed the Geneva accord of 1954, yet we keep saying through our spokesmen, that one of the reasons we are carrying on military action in South Vietnam is because North Vietnam has been violating the Geneva accord. She has—and so has Red China, and so have the Pathet Lao and Laos. I think there is some evidence that on occasion Cambodia has, too, but that has been no justification for American violation of the Geneva accord.

Articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva accord prohibit, by specific language, the United States or any other country from sending into South Vietnam a single soldier, a single tank, a single jetplane, a single bit of military aid. The International Control Commission, consisting of the Indian representative as chairman, a Canadian representative, and a Polish representative, has found the United States and South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, in violation of the Geneva accord time and time again.

If we were going to keep faith with our belief in substituting a rule of law for the jungle law of military might, we should have laid this matter immediately before either a reconvened Geneva Conference (and, interestingly, the Geneva accord makes provision for such a reconvening) or before the United Nations. I would have preferred the latter, for I think others should have asked for a reconvening of the Geneva accord * * * the signatories should have asked for it, and not a nonsignatory. The Geneva accord established Laos and Cambodia; then it drew a line in Vietnam at the 17th parallel to develop what we refer to as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. But, the Geneva accord did not set up separate governments to the north and to the south of the parallel. That is a false assumption that is contained in much of the discussion on the Vietnam crisis.

In the northern part of the country, Ho Chi Minh, a Communist leader during World War II, was an ally of the United States as commander of the guerrilla forces in the war against Japan. The first leader of the government in the south was the French puppet, Bao Dai. It soon became clear that he no longer was going to be acceptable to the Vietnamese who had gone south and to the Vietnamese who were already in the south * * * Ngo Dinh Diem, a Vietnamese who had lived and who had been trained in the United States, became the first leader endorsed by the United States to be placed in charge of not a free government, but a police-state government in South Vietnam.

The governments in South Vietnam have been police-state governments just as the government in North Vietnam has been an enslaved government of communism. These have been military dictatorships; there is much talk about supporting freedom in South Vietnam * * * there has never been any political freedom in South Vietnam as we know it. It has been a totalitarian government of a military policy type from the very beginning.

The Geneva accord has a provision that deals with the matter of the type of government that was to be established by the people of North and South Vietnam, since it was not contemplated when the Geneva accord was signed that there should be a permanent partition of Vietnam into North and South. That was to be left to the people to decide in the election to be held in 1956.

The election was not held. Why? Because the United States of America blocked the election. The United States of America goes down in history as the Nation responsible for the fact that this section of the Geneva accord was never carried out * * * President Eisenhower, in his book, points out our position in regard to that election and said that our intelligence reports showed that if the election was held, Ho Chi Minh would receive 80 percent of the vote in South Vietnam, as well as an overwhelming majority in North Vietnam. Many authorities on South Vietnam would tell you that if an election was held tomorrow in South Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh would receive a large majority of the vote. He is still the most popular figure in all of Vietnam. * * *

Let me give you a statistic or two about the problem that confronts us in South Vietnam. The population is about 15 million, in round numbers, with 500,000 to 750,000 military personnel. How much money has been poured into that military establishment, including the one and one-quarter to France? Six and one-half billion dollars, not including the cost of our own military personnel. What is the top figure given to us by the administration as to the Vietcong military establishment? Between 25,000 to 35,000, the hard-core probably 20,000. Who now controls better than 75 percent of the land area of South Vietnam? The Vietcong—not the forces of the government.

I have a little difficulty understanding why it is necessary to have 28,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam to put down 25,000 to 35,000 Vietcong, with a military establishment of the South Vietnamese Government of at least 500,000. * * *

This brings me to the white paper. There is not anything in the white paper * * * except mention of one ship in which they found about 100 tons of weapons, that has not been known to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the administration for 3 years. The white paper bears out what the administration witnesses testified to before our committee within 3 years before its issuance. The record of that committee is replete with testimony that bears out these conclusions: about 80 to 90 percent of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese and not North Vietnamese; about 80 to 90 percent of the weapons are captured American weapons and not North Vietnamese, Russian, or Chinese weapons. The white paper is so full of holes in regard to its allegations that student after student has torn it apart (When I refer to students, I refer to authorities on Asia.) In fact, all one need do is read the account of our recognized authorities on Asia, such as Hans Morgenthau, at the University of Chicago, such as Commager, of Amherst, such as these great academic leaders who, as I have said on the floor of the Senate, have forgotten more about Asia than Rusk and McNamara and Taylor and the Bundys and Alexis Johnson will ever know. I would that my President would obtain at least the counter-advice of these recognized authorities on Asia.

Let me point out that Cambodia, the Vietcong, North Vietnam, Burma, Indonesia do not happen to be pro-Chinese. And, in my judgment, they are Communist governments—most of them. What we are doing is driving these Communists of a different stripe right into the arms of Red China. For example, Ho Chi Minh was kept in prison for a year in China. Ho Chi Minh is Russian-oriented, and Russian trained; Ho Chi Minh is a Russian Communist. The great danger is that we are, by our course of action, going to move these countries into the orbit of Red China.

We are violating article after article of the United Nations Charter. So are other coun-

11160

tries. There are the commitments required under articles 33, 34, 35, and 51, and other articles of the charter, that place upon us the solemn responsibility of taking threats to the peace of the world to the United Nations for U.N. determination. Why have we not done it? Of course, I am greatly disappointed that others have not done it, too. My plea is that if we continue this unilateral military course of action, we run the great risk of taking mankind to the brink of a third holocaust. That is why you find me pleading in the Senate for us to try to get other countries to come on in with us, to try to carry out the objective of Roosevelt 20 years ago at Cairo and Teheran. I have been pleading for the United Nations to try to set up a trusteeship in South Vietnam for as many years as it may take to make it possible for them to develop a free society. * * *

When I put the question to the Secretary of State in the Foreign Relations Committee, "Why don't you go to the United Nations?" he said, "I do not think it will work." "But will you know until you try?" He replied, "Senator Moise, don't you think Russia would probably beat it and put it in the Security Council?" And my answer was, "Yes, I think so. I cannot be sure, but I think so. But I want to put Russia on the spot. I want to show who it is who is unwilling to use the peaceful procedures by way of the rule of law provided for in the United Nations Charter. But, Mr. Secretary, don't stop with the sections on the Security Council. If Russia follows that course of action, and she might not, then you still can take it to the General Assembly. * * *"

I believe if brought before the General Assembly, a minimum of 85 nations would back up the sending in of a peacekeeping force. You say, "Mr. Senator, do you have any precedent at all?" I want to mention three: does anyone really think that there would not have been a major war years ago in the Middle East if the United Nations' peacekeeping force had not occupied the Gaza strip? Do you really think there would not have been a major war in Africa if the United Nations had not taken the action in the Congo? My last precedent is in Cyprus. Of course the United States and Great Britain got kicked in to the United Nations over Cyprus * * * 10 days before France and Russia showed their hands on the Cyprus issue, I made a major speech in the U.S. Senate calling for a change of American policy and urging that the United States support the United Nation's jurisdiction over Cyprus. At that time the United States and Great Britain were trying to have the Cyprus issue brought under NATO and of course NATO did not have a scintilla of basis for being placed in charge of Cyprus. But the United Nations did. We did not know at the time that Russia and France were busily at work. The State Department apparently did not know it either, but that is nothing new for the State Department; they have that kind of intelligence. They did not know, as we subsequently discovered, that France and Russia were at work around the world and they presented us with an accomplished fact that a huge number of nations were joining them in asking for United Nations jurisdiction. Then, to the everlasting credit of our Government, we changed our course and the U.N. went into Cyprus. I do not know whether it is going to be able to prevent a war or not, but it has so far.

That is the way you build up a system of international law, as every lawyer knows, precedent by precedent, instance by instance.

I think that bilateral negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam are now impossible. We have gone past that time, and now must have multilateral negotiations. A third force, consisting of non-participants, must be brought into the picture, a third force based upon a resolution of the United Nations taking jurisdiction

that says to the United States and South Vietnam on the one hand, and to the Communist groups on the other hand, "We beg you to now come to an international conference table, in which the other nations not at war will help find a settlement in honor and consistent with security to the participants in this dispute." That is the kind of settlement I want. If the leaders of mankind do not face up to that great moral obligation as well as legal duty, the danger is that we shall move into a massive war in Asia. No one can dispute the ugly fact that I now give you: It is hoped by our Government that Red China will not move, but it is recognized by our Government that if Red China moves we cannot beat her with bombing, conventional or nuclear. We can do great damage. We can destroy her cities and her industrial complex, we can kill millions of her people, but she still will move on the ground and we could not beat her with American troops. The talk is 300,000 to 350,000 American troops to begin with, but that will be just a drop in the manpower bucket. We will have to send 3 million to begin with; half of them will come home in coffins in the first 18 months, and this country will be bogged down in Asia for 25 years. For generations of the future, Asia is going to be controlled by Asia and not by Western powers. I would plead that my Government really put into practice that great moral teaching that the President so often uses, "Come now and let us reason together, sayeth the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. Though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. * * *"

Unless the nations are willing to sit down at an international conference table to reason together, the great danger is that the United States will become the greatest threat to the peace of the world. A continuation of our conduct in North Vietnam, in my judgment, is certain to lead to war. What we are doing now is shooting fish in a barrel in North Vietnam, against a country with no naval or air force, a country that has not yet moved on the ground. I cannot square it with the principle that I think ought to be morality, that should characterize the foreign policy of my Government.

Senator PROXMIER. I am here because, on this issue, I feel very strongly; because on this issue, even the Senator from Oregon is wrong. He is wrong in Vietnam. He is wrong about the course that President Johnson and this administration is pursuing. We have used power, let's face it. We have used direct, overt military power. We bomb, we strafe, we burn. That is true. We have attacked in North Vietnam and defended in South Vietnam. War is a dirty business. It is a terrible business and it is a cruel business.

From the first, we have responded to proven aggression. We must recognize, in all fairness, that we have been in Vietnam not just 2 or 3 months. We have been in South Vietnam for 10 years, and for years our presence in South Vietnam has been carefully, painfully designed to avoid military action by American soldiers. Even following the Tonkin Gulf and the Pleiku incidents, the attacks on Americans, we confined our military targets. We limited our retaliations. Most important of all, we have designed our military strategy not to secure unconditional surrender by Hanoi, not to engage China or Russia, but simply and clearly to secure a cessation of aggression by North Vietnam. Yet this restrained, limited policy has been attacked: Senator Moise has been attacking our policy in South Vietnam for many, many months—at least for 2 or 3 years. Lately he has been joined by other leading American citizens. Walter Lippmann, perhaps the most brilliant and profound commentator we have on the scene today, agrees that we are losing in South

Vietnam and that we should get out. The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, has said that our policies in South Vietnam involve us in a great danger that the American public does not appreciate and that they should be accompanied, as he feels they are not, by definite negotiations. University professors from coast to coast have been criticizing our positions. At Columbia University they had an all night teach-in on Vietnam, beginning at 11:30 p.m. and going to 8 a.m., with professors speaking in relays against our being in Vietnam. Nobody spoke for the administration. At the University of Michigan the hat was passed and money was raised on behalf of the Vietcong. Our record has been attacked throughout the world. As a matter of fact, Kossygin, the Soviet leader, in talking about the white paper, said "How in the world can the Americans ever categorize their acts in South Vietnam in a white paper? The dirty acts of Americans should be in a black book."

What are these dirty acts? What is this dirty American policy they are talking about? Not only have we restrained our military action, but our efforts in South Vietnam have been very largely constructive and economic. They have been exactly the kind of economic program designed to build the seedbed of democracy, that the Oregon senior Senator was talking about. Our economic assistance in South Vietnam has been well over a billion dollars. Just in the last 2 years, \$230 million has been allocated for food for peace for South Vietnam. There is no military threat to North Vietnam in this. It was food to help build the peaceful life. Our agricultural assistance to South Vietnam has not been confined to sending food. We have recognized that the kind of technical assistance used in the Alliance for Progress can be used in South Vietnam, too. We have trained thousands of Vietnamese farmers in the marvels of modern agriculture. We have trained them in irrigation, concentrates, animal husbandry, and insecticides. We have introduced fertilizer, we have introduced corn and potatoes. This constitutes no military threat, but it does build the peaceful life. The economic program can eventually become the seedbed of political freedom. We have helped to equip or build 10 big vocational schools; 7,000 students are actually enrolled. We have built four teacher-training schools; right now we are training 2,000 Vietnamese teachers. The fact is that in the years since 1955, the number of South Vietnamese children going to elementary school has increased from 350,000 to 1,400,000. It is almost a miraculous increase and it would not have been possible without American assistance. This causes no military threat to North Vietnam, but it does build the prospect for peace, and it does provide the seedbed of political freedom. We have established and stocked first aid centers in 12,550 villages and hamlets in South Vietnam. In 5 years, we have cut malaria from an incidence of 7 percent of the population down to less than 1 percent.

These are the kinds of things you do not read about in the newspapers, because they are not spectacular. They do not involve violence, conflict, bombing, or troops. This is what most of America's efforts in South Vietnam have been. We have helped build 1,400 wells to provide clean, fresh water for 750,000 rural inhabitants. We have made fresh water available to one-half million urban dwellers and 35 cities. And this constitutes no threat to North Vietnam. It is building the basis for political freedom and independence. We have built an entire road system. We have financed the purchase of railroads and equipment. We have built a big powerplant south of Saigon, not as a threat to North Vietnam but to build for peace. The U.S. Government has built 50 factories in South Vietnam that now employ 13,000 people. We have put a textile

May 25, 1965

industry in South Vietnam, built a national network of seven major radio stations. None of this constitutes a real threat to Vietnam, but is for peace.

Consider this American record and ask, "What does America get out of this?" People talk about America's bad record, people talk about our imperialism—the Communists talk about our imperialism—why have we poured in billions of dollars? Why have we sacrificed hundreds of our young men who have died in South Vietnam? Why have we risked the lives of thousands of others? Do we want Vietnam's money? Do we want oil? Do we want any food? Do we want an economic advantage? Not even the Vietcong can charge us with that. Our hands are clean.

What do we want? What we want is very simple: (1) We want the independence of South Vietnam—what is wrong with that? (2) We want peace and freedom in Asia and in the world, and what is wrong with that? (3) We want to stop Communist aggression, and what is wrong with that? American policy is not reckless. It is not an all-out military policy, just as it is not withdrawal. In this controversy, the real division is not between those who want to withdraw and those who would blast North Vietnam and China off the face of the earth. Our policy is more realistic than either of those. Our policy is to measure and restrain military action, to build for peace, and to stay in South Vietnam for years and years no matter how long it takes to out-work, to out-educate, out-serve, and if necessary, but only if necessary, to out-fight. To pay any price. It has been said this is too much * * * this is too big a burden * * * we cannot afford it. Our responsibilities all over the world are too widespread.

Can we afford it? Is it too big a burden? The fact is that this Nation has just had the biggest tax cut in our history, an \$11 billion tax cut. Can we afford it? The defense budget is less this year than it was last year, and less last year than it was the year before. Can we afford it? The President has just submitted the lowest foreign aid program since the beginning of this program 15 years ago. Can we afford it? Bureau of Labor Statistics show unemployment is at the lowest level in 8 years. This is the greatest prosperity in all of American history. We have never had so much income after taxes, even allowing for inflation. Can our will to defend freedom be so feeble that this rich country cannot afford a fraction of what we spend on cosmetics to stand up to communism? And, of course, military and even economic assistance is not enough. All the time it is true that we must press night and day for conditions permitting a basis for negotiations that will bring independence for South Vietnam.

What has been President Johnson's position on peaceful negotiations? I know President Johnson, and I have disagreed with him far more than I have disagreed with my distinguished colleague, Senator Morse. Senator Morse and I both know President Johnson well. He speaks honestly and sincerely when he says that he will go anywhere at any time, see anyone, if he thought it could serve the cause of peace. Until very recently there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam. Before we began to use our power in the last few weeks, the principal foreign offices in the world said negotiations were impossible. The British Foreign Secretary at the White House recently told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations. The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations have been fruitless; they have been rebuffed by Hanoi and

Moscow. The Canadians report that their officials cannot even get in to see the Communist leaders in North Vietnam. Until very recently, if one is talking realism and not some nice theory that we would like to have, there has been only one basis on which we could stop, and that is withdrawal.

If we withdraw, what happens in South Vietnam? Thousands and thousands of brave people who have fought for years would be murdered. What happens in the rest of the world? You do not have to list the rest of the areas of the world, just go to China. Just last week, Mao told the London Observer, "After a Communist victory in South Vietnam, the conflict will be aggravated." The Communists do not look forward to peace after South Vietnam. They say, "This is a beginning. If we win here, then we really aggravate the conflict * * *"

What makes this situation very difficult for Americans to understand, or Americans to defend, is that we are facing a new kind of aggression. These people are not just walking across the border as clearly and simply and obviously as the Hitler march. This is an invisible, subtle, and apparently indigenous kind of aggression. We fall into the trap that this is civil war, and wherever this terrorist infiltration tactic is developed in the future, we will take it to be a civil war. These are the types of terror tactics the Communists have perfected, tactics involving kidnapping of officials, deliberate murder of mayors and leaders of villages, the murder of thousands of Vietnam exofficials. If the Communists win here, if this kind of action can prevail, there is no reason why the Communists should not use it elsewhere—in Asia, in Africa, and in South America.

This is a far crueler, tougher war. It seems as though we are losing or have lost. The fact is that we can win. The military situation is bad. I think it is true that this administration and the last administration were very wrong in not telling us the true situation about how we were losing in South Vietnam. But it is a fact, as every reporter I have heard has reported, that morale in South Vietnam is now rising. Not only do the Catholics and the business communities support our position, but the Buddhists, the students, and the labor people are supporting recent developments in Vietnam. Most promising of all, now that we have shown that we not only have the greatest power in the world, but that we have the will to use it, North Vietnam seems to be taking a different view of negotiation. The New York Times recently reported that diplomats of the non-aligned countries said privately that North Vietnamese officials might be willing to agree to a new Geneva conference on Indochina. The indications were private—publicly, the North Vietnamese officials indicated withdrawal of U.S. officials mandatory before negotiation. There were no conditions in the private approach. The British Foreign Secretary declared that there is more hope of negotiation than even a day ago, that there has been a change in the attitude of the Communists toward negotiation. Meanwhile, the President maintains the posture, which he sincerely believes, that this country must persist with all its might to resist aggression in South Vietnam, and to defend freedom there with its military strength. But far from being inconsistent, it seems to me that the posture the President has assumed is essential to finally creating peaceful negotiations. This is the same administration that has made proposals for economic development of all southeast Asia, including perhaps North Vietnam, in the event of peace. This is the same administration which indicated there would be no direct reprisal for the bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, specifically no attack on Hanoi. This is the same administration that directed Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleve-

land to say that the United States would be willing to have the United Nations, specifically U Thant, act in negotiations in Vietnam.

It is true we did not go to the U.N. before. We did not go because, as the Senator from Oregon implied, Russia has the veto in the Security Council, and frankly, we could not get a two-thirds vote in the Assembly. U Thant said in a press conference in Ottawa on May 26, 1964, "I feel that the situation in southeast Asia is such that I have my own doubts regarding the competence of the United Nations to undertake the task which is being advocated by some members of the United Nations." The Secretary General of the United Nations said that the U.N. could not act under these circumstances and, it has been clear that when the United States of America clashes directly with countries like North Vietnam and Red China, which are both outside the United Nations, there is no precedent. The precedent of the Gaza strip, the precedents of the Congo and Cyprus are terribly different. This is the same administration that had Secretary of State Dean Rusk give a respectful reception to the proposal of 17 so-called nonaligned nations that petitioned us to negotiate. All of this is good. It indicates that we do not have a policy of simply pounding away hoping something will happen. We are carrying an olive branch in one hand as well as arrows in the other. But we have those arrows, and the fact is that vinegar is just as essential as the oil of peace. We stand prepared to continue bombing if defense requires it. Not only do we have a massive, awesome power, but we have the will to use it. The President pledged that we will stay in South Vietnam for 10 or 20 years, if necessary, to stop communism.

This resolution may be as significant as President Truman's resolve in Berlin in 1948, in Greece, in Korea, when against criticism and under very different circumstances, he decided to stand against the Communists. It may be as significant as John F. Kennedy's resolve in October of 1962, when we discovered that the Soviet Union had planted missiles in Cuba. This resolve, which has been so denounced, could stabilize the last great front of Communist aggression, and I predict that this U.S. persistence in South Vietnam will drive Hanoi to the bargaining table. On the other hand, had President Johnson chosen the withdrawal option, and that is the realistic option, peace as well as freedom would be in far greater danger throughout the world. He has chosen the tough course, the painful course, but the right course. You do not need a graduate degree to understand what, basically, is going on: this is aggression. This is the kind of aggression the free world, at its terrible regret, failed to meet in Austria; and the Sudetenland and Manchuria, the kind of aggression that resulted in the violence and death and the agony of 4 long years in World War II. In South Vietnam we are meeting it. We are meeting it with military force, but with restrained force. We meet it with military force at the same time that we're building an economically stronger and better future in South Vietnam, as I documented. And, we meet it with the olive branch of negotiations in the other hand.

Let us not forget that it was not Lyndon Johnson who 4 years ago stepped up our military commitment to South Vietnam. It was the same John Fitzgerald Kennedy who gave the finest speech on peace of this generation at American University in May 1963—the same John Kennedy whose greatest monument is a test ban treaty that begins the first hopeful step toward the control of nuclear destruction of the world. It was the same John Kennedy who, however, recognized that the price of peace and freedom can sometimes be cruel and terrible, that there are times when we must face aggression, and

May 25, 1965

11162

that a cruel and terrible price must be paid. And John Kennedy, with all his intelligence, with all the massive information only the President of the United States can have, saw that South Vietnam is the place that this generation must pay it.

Question: "Why, Senator MORSE, in your opinion, has President Johnson not asked Congress for a declaration of war following constitutional procedure, instead of using the last summer's Senate resolution authorization for action in Vietnam?"

Senator MORSE. As you know, I have taken the position over and over again in the Senate, that if we are going to make war we ought to first declare it. There is not the slightest justification under the Constitution of the United States for our making war in South Vietnam. Under the Constitution, the President of the United States has the responsibility and power to proceed immediately in the defense of this Republic to meet an emergency which has occurred by way of an attack on the United States, as Franklin Roosevelt did at Pearl Harbor. But, he does not have the right to make war in the absence of the declaration of war. Under article No. 1, section 8 of the Constitution, the power to declare war is vested in the Congress of the United States, and not in the President. * * * I was one of two Senators who voted against what I considered to be but a scrap of paper under the Constitution, when last August the Congress passed a resolution to authorize the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to protect the security of this country. The Congress, in my judgment, has the duty to decide whether or not American boys were going to be sent to the battlefield, and they should not send them to die in battle in the absence of a declaration of war. I think that it is a great mistake that we have not had a public declaration.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, would you like to comment on that question?

Senator PROXMIER. The fact is that the Congress of the United States as Senator MORSE implied, did act on a resolution last August. The resolution was to give Congress the opportunity to go on record for or against our actions in South Vietnam, including whatever military action the President decided was necessary. That resolution passed 512 to 2. It was greatly to his credit that Senator MORSE had the courage to be one of the two men who voted against it. But the fact is that the Congress of the United States was consulted, the Congress of the United States did act, and it seems to me that under these circumstances our course in South Vietnam is clear. Wherever we act in a hostile situation, wherever military force is involved, it is not necessary to always have a declaration of war. This is a bad situation—there have been Americans who have died; the latest count was something like 315 or 320. That is a terrible situation. At the same time, I think we must recognize that under these circumstances, traditionally, we have not required a declaration of war. The action taken by the Congress of the United States was not only overwhelmingly passed, but since that time there has been only one other resolution entered and modified, that by Senator JAVRS. That resolution supported the administration right down the line, simply saying that the administration should at the same time seek negotiations. * * *

Question: Senator PROXMIER, there seemed to be some confusion in your speech, the same confusion which has appeared in the statements of the Government, concerning whether our goal is to stop aggression or whether it is to stop communism. Most of the aggression, as you call it, is indigenous aggression—80 percent is being done by South Vietnamese. If we could get, by force or by agreement, the North Vietnamese to stop assisting the Vietcong, would we then

move out of Vietnam and allow the South Vietnamese Communists to take over the country? If not, how do we justify intervening in a civil war on the side of a very unpopular government?

Senator PROXMIER. We have made it clear that our policy in South Vietnam is designed to stop aggression. As a matter of fact, Adlai Stevenson has said in the United Nations that if North Vietnam will stop its aggression, we will do our best to remove our military presence. Of course there are indigenous Communists in South Vietnam. That is a well-known fact. It is also well known that tens of thousands have infiltrated from the North, including the officer cadre, including the plans, and lately, including most of the weapons. That was not true some years ago, but it certainly is true now without any question. The New York Times has reported that something like 90 percent of the replacements for the Vietcong are coming from the North. At any rate, if the North Vietnamese cease their aggression, then we feel that our military job is done, and the South Vietnamese will be able to handle the situation themselves.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, would you care to comment?

Senator MORSE. I want to point out that, although it is perfectly clear that the primary objective of the administration is to seek to prevent the advance of communism on a unilateral basis, it cannot be done by the United States, because you are dealing here with a population that is involved in a civil war. They (the administration) does not like to talk about a civil war, but if I marched a hundred Vietnamese across this platform, 50 North and 50 South, you could not tell the difference. You are dealing in a war in South Vietnam with a father on one side and some of his sons on the other; brothers on one side and brothers on the other; uncles on one side and some of their nephews on the other. You are dealing with a war among Vietnamese, and the 17th parallel is a perfectly artificial line that divided this country. Our problem is to have them set up their own system of government, whatever they choose. It will probably be some form of communism or socialism or totalitarianism. But, that raises the fundamental issue: whether or not the United States is now going to set itself up on a unilateral basis to police the world against communism. If that is going to be our position, we have neither the manpower nor the resources to do it * * * we are writing our own decline if we start to make that approach. That is why I am pleading for multilateral action. I had hoped SEATO might do this job, but SEATO has become a paper tiger. SEATO countries agree that they would act together in maintaining peace in this area of the world—they wrote in certain words of art in that treaty, known as protocol agreement, in which the signatories thereto considered Vietnam an area of vital concern and of mutual interest. Of course, what your Government is not telling you is that there was a sleeper by way of a side agreement, and if the sleeper was to have a concerted action, there had to be a unanimity among the signatories to SEATO. Where are our SEATO partners? Who are they? Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, Great Britain, and France. You cannot get them to come in to be of assistance to the United States.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan spoke at the Washington Press Club just a few months ago. When asked if Pakistan, into which the United States has poured hundreds of millions of dollars for military buildup, was going to come in and help us, he said: "No. That is a U.S. problem. Our problem is with India." When the Secretary of State was before the Foreign Relations Committee last

summer, I made the point that the SEATO allies were not helping us—we were doing it all alone. You could not get help out of France, out of Great Britain, out of New Zealand, you could not get it out of any of them. But he said, "Oh, Mr. Senator, Australia has just doubled its commitment under SEATO to help us in South Vietnam." I said, "Mr. Secretary, you just insulted my intelligence. Now, before you insult the intelligence of the rest of the committee, would you like to have me tell them what that understanding involved?" (He did not know I knew.) "Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that this Australian commitment is to increase its manpower commitment to South Vietnam from 30 men to 60 men, but with the understanding that they won't go near the battlefield? Do you want to deny, Mr. Secretary, that you got a commitment out of them that within the next few months they might make available four to six cargo planes to take material from Australia into South Vietnam?" The sad, ugly fact is that the SEATO nations have left us cold. * * * Tell it to Burma, tell it to Indonesia, tell it to Australia, New Zealand. The fact is that in Australia and New Zealand, the press have been greatly concerned about American escalation in North Vietnam. * * * I never thought I would read in American history of the dropping of napalm bombs on jungle towns, killing civilians—men, women and children. The United States is guilty, and history will so find us guilty and condemn us. I never thought my country would send soldiers into South Vietnam, and have taken the pictures that have been shown us in the Foreign Relations Committee, of American soldiers standing by when the most horrendous brutalities are committed upon the Vietcong. And what's the answer? "Why, the Vietcong uses a reign of terror—they commit atrocities and brutalities upon South Vietnamese." They do. But, we are a party to it when we do not use our force to prevent this kind of violation of the Articles of War. The Secretary of State tried to justify the use of gas on the grounds that it protects women and children. Let me say that the use of gas is a clear violation of the convention of 1925, because it violates the Articles of War. Why was all gas prevented in that treaty? This is the kind of gas that was used in World War I, along with lethal gas, because this gas incapacitates the soldiery and makes them easy to kill while under its influence. My country is trying to alibi that at which it got caught, and we have been caught frequently. Do you think our Government would apologize to Cambodia if that American plane had not been shot down within Cambodia after it had dropped napalm bombs on a jungle town, killing civilians? It is pretty hard for us to face up to ugly realities, but the sad fact is, our hands are not clean, our hands are dripping with blood in Asia, to our everlasting discredit.

Moderator JONES. Senator MORSE, that was a long and extended answer—I am therefore going to alter the procedure for a moment to give Senator PROXMIER an opportunity to respond.

Senator PROXMIER. What Senator MORSE has just said is that we cannot stop communism throughout the world. The next thing he said, as I understand it, was that we cannot count on SEATO or others to help us. The implication of that to me is that nobody is going to stop communism. I say we can stop communism, and we will. We have not begun to feel the burden in this country. Now, about this situation of using weapons * * * there is nothing in the world that is perhaps easier to do than to make an attack on the weapons of war; I think it serves a good purpose to do so, and I think it should be done. I agree that we made a tragic and stupid blunder by using gas in South Vietnam. There is no question about that. But let's be fair about it. While it

was stupid, and it gave the Communists a propaganda victory, let us recognize the circumstances under which that gas was used. I have a clipping from today's newspaper. "London, April 1, Colonial Secretary Anthony Greenwood told Parliament today that British colonial police used nontoxic gas 124 times in the last 5 years." That doesn't make it right, but I imagine that tear gas could be used here in Portland. You can buy it. Any police force can have it and does use it. When this gas was used, and it was used on three occasions, it was totally ineffective on every single occasion. It was used so that it would not be necessary to use other weapons that are far worse—so that we would not have to use napalm, so that we would not have to use machine guns, so that we would not have to kill people. Civilians were being used as shields, and it was thought necessary to provide some method of saving the lives of civilians so it would be possible to step in and overpower the others. Nevertheless, it was stupid for one other reason. In a military situation, you can count on escalation. We use a gas that is a tear and nausea gas. They—the enemy—use a gas that is a little worse; we use gas which is little worse; and the first thing you know you have bacteriological warfare—you have mustard gas, you have some weapons which, fortunately, have not been used since World War I. It was a bad mistake, but at the same time, I think it should be put in perspective.

Question: "Senator Morse, assuming that SEATO and the United States do not want to assume the responsibility in southeast Asia, should the United States at any time, along a unilateral basis, stand against Communist aggression in southeast Asia? If so, where do we draw this line?"

Senator MORSE. We will not know until we take it to the United Nations, first through the Security Council, and then to the General Assembly. I am satisfied that at least 85 nations, and probably not more, would vote to take jurisdiction if given the opportunity to take jurisdiction, because they are scared, too. They know what this great threat in Asia means for all the rest of the world. They know that if you start a massive war with Red China it will not be over for a quarter of a century. I am satisfied, also, that basic in the philosophy of many of our military, is the sincere conviction (but I think dead wrong from every standpoint), that you have got to fight China sooner or later, and this is the time to fight her. I am satisfied that we are following the course of action of a provocateur, and that we are going to step it up until finally China makes a misstep. And when China makes the misstep, get ready for the bombing of China. The first target will be the nuclear installations, but do not forget, they can be rebuilt. It may take 10, 15, or 20 years to rebuild them, but when they are rebuilt, they will be rebuilt with a vengeance, and we will leave a heritage to future generations of American boys and girls of the hatred of the Chinese for the next 1,000 years. That is why I want to take my country out of the unilateral course of action—that is why I want to bring in others to help maintain the peace. China is not going to stop for us, but line up 85 to 90 nations around this world against her, and in my judgment, she will think a long time before she follows a course of action of nonnegotiating an honorable settlement.

I believe that the fundamental purpose of our policy in Asia is to establish an American foothold. * * * It goes right back to Dulles wanting France to get out of Indochina, to his wanting Great Britain to come in with us—back to his refusal to sign the Geneva accord of 1954, although he said we would live up to its tenets—and we have violated one after another ever since. * * * I cannot

give you any assurance that, if the U.N. does not take jurisdiction, you are not going to have very serious trouble in South Vietnam, but I will face the ugly question. If we are put to the point where we, and we alone, are going to have to fight a war in Asia, then the first thing we should do is try to work out an arrangement where the people would not be massacred. Then, and only then, would I have the United States withdraw, because South Vietnam is not in the perimeter of America defense. If we got into a war with Russia tomorrow, we would not leave an American boy in South Vietnam any longer than it took to get him out, because South Vietnam is not vital to the United States in time of war. * * * Western nations better face up to the fact that Asians are not going to allow them to stay in Asia.

Senator PROXMIER. The United Nations is now paralyzed. As Senator MORSE said, we have to go to the General Assembly. The Assembly cannot meet until next September. We have to draw the line against the Communists. We can say, "Take it to the United Nations"—I do wish this were a practical solution, but the fact is that the U.N. is not in session, and will not be in session. The Secretary General has indicated that this was a question that was, in his estimation, probably too big. Furthermore, if we try to get the United Nations involved on the basis of having to take jurisdiction between North Vietnam and the United States of America, there is about as much chance that North Vietnam would stand still for that as there is that the Oregonian is likely to name the Senator from Oregon as mediator in its next labor contract. The fact is that North Vietnam was invited to sit in on discussions by the Security Council at the time of the Tonkin Gulf episode. North Vietnam was urged by the Soviet Union, by the United States, and by members of the Security Council. She flatly refused, and said that she would have nothing to do with it, and would not be bound by any decision of the Security Council. Under these circumstances, how in the world can we get the U.N. involved?

Question: "Senator PROXMIER, you said that the aggression in South Vietnam is of a subtle kind, and is invisible, and I would agree with you. What can Congress do if the terroristic attacks against Americans in the last few months turn out to be inside jobs by those who disagree with the policy of restraint that you advocate and the President hopes to carry on?"

Senator PROXMIER. We are acting in North Vietnam militarily. We decided to take overt military action very recently. It has been stated over and over again by President Johnson by Secretary Rusk, by Secretary McNamara, and others, that we have done so because of the infiltration and invasion from North Vietnam. This is not just a pipe-dream—this is not a guess. It is true that this is a subtle kind of war, but the fact is that the invasion has been documented. The International Control Commission has found that there has been aggression from the north. They have said so—they have found it—it is a fact of life, and this is what we are trying to stop. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the man who planted the bomb to blow up the Saigon Embassy admitted that he had been paid by the Vietcong to do it. It is true that the evidence, under war circumstances, is never the kind of thing that one would like to have in court. However, we do know that there is invasion from the north, and that is what we are trying to stop.

Senator MORSE. There is nothing that stops the United Nations from being called into session from within 10 to 15 days. Just read the charter. It calls for an extraordinary session of the United Nations, and we ought to call for an extraordinary session of the U.N. immediately. As to aggression in South Vietnam, within 3 weeks of the filing of the white paper, witnesses before the Foreign Relations

Committee continued to testify that this was primarily a war from within in South Vietnam, by South Vietnamese, using American weapons. In recent weeks there have been some weapons coming in from the north, but there is still no showing of any substantial number of North Vietnamese military men out of the North Vietnamese Army. Of course, there has been some training of South Vietnamese up in North Vietnam, but we are the last country in the world that ought to talk about training soldiers of another country. We have been doing it all around the world, and we have been doing it in South Vietnam for a long time.

What we do need to face up to is that, in South Vietnam, we have been guilty, time and time again, of aggression on our part. Take the Tonkin Bay incident. The first propaganda of the administration was that the American ships were 75 miles from those North Vietnamese islands 3 to 6 miles off the coast of North Vietnam, which were bombed by South Vietnamese vessels—vessels which we equipped, which moved with the full knowledge of our Embassy and of U.S. Navy ships in Tonkin Bay at the time. Our administration said they were 75 miles away. Well, if Russia had a destroyer 75 miles from Key West, for example, and Castro sent over a destroyer to bomb Key West, you know what we would do to that destroyer 75 miles away. We would give it one chance to come into port, and if it did not come to port, we would sink it, because we would know that it was there for a cover. The 75-mile issue blew up in their face, because we—the Foreign Relations Committee—got the log of the ships, and when the bombing of the islands took place, that American vessel was within 13 miles of the islands. That is why I say we acted as a provocateur. Of course, our ships were on the high seas, and had the right to be where they were, as far as the high sea laws were concerned. But, we had no right to be there as a cover to those South Vietnamese vessels. Time and time again, we have been participants in a violation of the borders of Cambodia, of the borders of North Vietnam, and, as is usually the case when you get into a dirty war, both sides play dirty. We have been playing dirty along with the Communists.

Moderator JONES. In accordance with the procedures of debate, each Senator will have an opportunity to make a brief summary remark.

Senator PROXMIER. My good friend Senator WAYNE MORSE is a great Senator and a great debater, but it seems he has failed to distinguish the difference between our action in South Vietnam and that of the North Vietnamese. We are there because we were invited by the duly constituted and recognized Government of South Vietnam, a Government that has been recognized by over 100 nations in the world. Although there have been five successive governments, each one has wanted us to stay, and every element in this Government today has asked us to stay there. On the other hand, the North Vietnamese are there to subvert that Government, to overthrow that Government, to destroy that Government. I think there is all the difference in the world on that basis. Senator MORSE has offered us an alternative, but what an alternative. He has said the U.N. Charter indicates that we can call the United Nations together in 10 or 15 days—but why is the U.N. paralyzed? It is paralyzed because the nations cannot vote. It is paralyzed because the problem of the Russian dues to the U.N. will not be solved until September. I wish it were not so—I wish we were living in a different kind of a world. Oh, how I wish we had an international court of justice, and that we could take the Communists to that court. How nice it would be if we could get 85 nations to join us in South Vietnam. But, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, we cannot even get the SEATO nations to

join us in South Vietnam. If communism is going to be stopped, we have to stop it. Finally, the position of the administration in this perplexing, complex, and difficult situation, is that negotiation, and the will to try and hope and pray and work for a peaceful solution through negotiation, is important. But that is not the only important element. When dealing with the Communists, in the kind of real world in which they are operating, you have to have two other legs to this stool, too. One of those legs is the kind of hard, tough, grinding assistance we are developing in Vietnam so she can develop her independence, so that she can have the seedbed of political freedom. The third leg, and the one that is so hard for Americans who live peace to accept, is that of force and power—the force of military muscle and the will to use that military muscle. What the administration is doing is to use our military force, use our economic ability, and at the same time sincerely and honestly work to create a situation in which negotiations will be possible, but negotiations that can permit a free and independent South Vietnam and stop Communist aggression.

Senator MORSE. When my very close friend Senator PROXMIRE talks about our being invited into South Vietnam by the Government of South Vietnam, I would ask him, "Which one?" "When?" No government has been set up by the people of South Vietnam. We saw to it that that did not happen in 1956. We stopped the government from being set up in South Vietnam. We set up our own puppet, and a whole chain of puppets. Senator PROXMIRE says a hundred or so nations have recognized that government. Well, we have spent \$100 billion now in foreign aid to some 100 nations and they are not going to offend us very quickly. I want to say that it is pretty difficult for this great power of the United States to find very many people taking positions that they will not recognize a puppet. * * * We never have been called in by a government of the people of South Vietnam. I am for a procedure that will give the people of South Vietnam their own government, not an American-imposed government, which they have had ever since 1954.

The United Nations is in a position to work. Read the charter. Who is responsible for the fact that the U.N. went out of session? It was what Ambassador Stevenson called a procedural vote on article 19, the most substantive vote that could be cast in that general session. That is why the students of the United Nations are severely criticizing the United States for our course of action on article 19, and they should criticize. That is why your Senator led the fight in the Senate against the policy of our Government, backed up by a surprising number of Senators, when I said "You should hold the nose of Russia and France to the grindstone in the United Nations—not let them out of it, and insist on a vote on article 19." But I am talking about an extraordinary session of the United Nations, an extraordinary session called for the nations to carry out their responsibility to keep the peace. I have no doubt what the General Assembly would do if reconvened, if there was any hope of maintaining the peace by the United Nations sending whatever number of divisions of the U.N. troops necessary to enforce the peace in southeast Asia. They would quickly waive any obligations regarding any money if they could get this matter decided; then they could go back to the debate on article 19.

I did not come here, and Senator PROXMIRE did not come here, to ask for agreement. We came believing that what is needed in this country on this critical issue is the thought of the American people—to get the American people away from their dogmas and their slogans. Remember, you, too, have a responsibility of statesmanship. Yours is the responsibility of citizen-statesmanship. Never forget that foreign policy under our constitu-

tion does not belong to the President of the United States. That is one of the myths or bubbles that needs to be burst. Foreign policy belongs to you, the people. The President is the administrator of the people's foreign policy, subject to the checks of Congress. We now have to think about American boys and girls 100, 200, 500, and 1,000 years from now. It is my deep conviction that if we follow this course, we will never leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren.

Moderator JONES. Thank you, Senator MORSE, and particularly for that final word. It has been our privilege to listen to a discussion of truly historic proportions this evening, for which we thank both of our guests very warmly.

SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENT TO THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Senate adopted a most significant amendment to the voting rights bill. The amendment, sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York, will enfranchise thousands of Spanish speaking citizens. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY deserves the gratitude of all those dedicated to equality in voting for directing his great abilities to the passage of this amendment.

This amendment would prohibit the denial of the right to vote in any election of any person because of his inability to read, write, or understand English if he has successfully completed the sixth grade in a public or accredited private school in any State, territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

The amendment provides:

No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

Mr. Speaker, Congress certainly has the power to pass this literacy test amendment under the enforcement clauses of the 14th and 15th amendments.

The 14th amendment to the Constitution guarantees that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." In New York State thousands of American citizens have been denied the equal protection of the laws.

New York State requires a prospective voter to take an English language literacy test or to establish his literacy by

showing an eighth grade education at a school conducted in English. As a result of this requirement thousands of American citizens of Puerto Rican origin do not register to vote. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY estimated that there are approximately 730,000 Puerto Ricans in New York, of whom approximately 480,000 are of voting age. Less than one-third—about 150,000 are registered to vote. While it cannot be said that all the other 330,000 are not registered because of the literacy test, there is no doubt that a substantial number do not register for this reason.

The New Yorker of Puerto Rican origin has every opportunity to be as well informed a voter as his English-speaking neighbor. There are Spanish-language newspapers, televisions, and radio. The schools in Puerto Rico teach civics and American history. The English-language literacy test is an arbitrary requirement for voting and should be abolished.

I have sponsored legislation throughout my service in Congress to abolish the literacy test completely. In this Congress my bill to eliminate the literacy test is H.R. 2477. I testified at length before the House Committee on the Judiciary on this question. I believe the least we can do in this session is to adopt the literacy test amendment sponsored by Senator KENNEDY of New York.

Unfortunately, this amendment is not included in the voting rights bill which has been reported out by the House. In view of the action taken by the other body, I hope the House will adopt it, and I urge the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to accept the amendment when the voting rights bill is on the floor. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in this fight to bring full rights of citizenship to thousands of Americans who speak Spanish.

COMMUNITY SERVICE SOCIETY AND THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of Mrs. Barbara Reach before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Currency. Mrs. Reach is staff associate of the Community Service Society, the oldest and largest voluntary family service agency in the country. We will shortly be debating the administration's Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and I believe that this testimony will add to our deliberations. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to read the following testimony:

STATEMENT PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 1354; H.R. 5840, APRIL 9, 1965

(By Barbara Reach, committee on housing and urban development)

My name is Barbara Reach and I represent the Committee on Housing and Urban Development of the Community Service Society of New York.

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11173

ing severe sales declines in anticipation of reduced prices resulting from tax reduction.

Sincerely,

F. W. MISCH,
Vice President.

FORD MOTOR CO.,
June 9, 1964.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: Your letter of May 22 arrived while I was away from the office and I understand our Washington office indicated to you in my absence that this reply would be forthcoming soon.

We were pleased to learn from your letter that you will be continuing your efforts to reduce or repeal the discriminatory 10-percent excise tax on automobiles.

You asked in your letter if the present position of Ford Motor Co. continues to be the same as in the past on the subject of passing on any reduction in the excise tax to its dealers.

In response to similar inquiries in 1958, I stated that our company would immediately pass on to our dealers the full amount of any reduction in the excise tax. That is still our position. The suggested retail price shown on the price label would also be lowered by the amount that the excise is reduced. We have no doubt that competition for the consumer's dollar would insure that our dealers, in turn, would pass a reduction on to their customers. You realize, of course, that the company has no authority to commit what the dealers' decision on this matter would be, however.

Thank you for your efforts over the years in support of reduction or elimination of the passenger car excise tax.

Very sincerely,

HENRY FORD II,
Chairman.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, May 28, 1964.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 22 concerning my views on whether the removal or reduction of the present 10-percent excise tax on new automobiles would be passed along to the customer by the automobile companies.

As you know, our new passenger cars are sold by General Motors to franchised dealers who, in turn, sell to the customer. The price at which this final sale is made is one that is agreed to by the dealer and the customer. The manufacturer is not a party to this transaction and of course the dealer is free to sell at any price agreed to with the customer.

It is for this reason that I cannot speak for General Motors dealers. However, I think that there are good grounds for believing that the savings would be passed along to the customer. In this connection I would like to quote from a letter recently sent by the Automobile Manufacturers Association to Representative MILLS, expressing a view to which I fully subscribe:

"Any excise tax imposed by the Federal Government on new cars is passed through to the car dealer by the manufacturer. This is a matter of long historical record. A review by some of our member companies of the various changes in excise tax rates on U.S. passenger cars which have taken place since 1926 shows that the changes in excise tax amounts were reflected both up and down in the billing prices to car dealers. There is no reason to expect any different treatment of tax changes in the future. Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the retail automobile markets today, and stimulated by a reduced suggested retail price, the reduction in the excise tax on new

passenger cars should be reflected in lower prices to the new car buyer."

I am enclosing a copy of the full AMA statement from which this quotation is taken. You will note that the association is proposing that Congress not extend the 3-percent increase in the excise tax authorized in connection with the Korean wartime emergency, and is further urging affirmative congressional action to reduce or eliminate the remaining 7 percent of this discriminatory excise tax. In order to minimize the disruption of the market during the period such a reduction is under review by the Congress, the association is suggesting that provision be made in current tax legislation for the retroactive application of the reduction to the date hearings begin on specific legislation.

I very much appreciate your continued active interest in removing this discriminatory excise tax. I hope you will feel free to call on me at any time that I may be of assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. GORDON,
President.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I received a letter from the Reverend Patrick Morison, pastor of the Hanna City and Limestone Presbyterian Churches, together with a copy of a letter he had addressed to the President. I asked the reverend if I might use that letter and read it into the Record and I have his approval to do so.

His letter addressed to the President reads as follows:

HANNA CITY AND LIMESTONE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES,
Hanna City, Ill., April 19, 1965.

President L. B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have received or will soon receive a letter from the Clergyman's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. This letter has been circulated among American clergymen to gain their signatures of support. The letter will petition you to seek a peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis at all costs.

As a Christian clergyman and citizen I oppose this letter for three reasons. First, it vastly oversimplifies a complex cultural, political, and military problem. Second, it assumes that peace is possible if only the United States would pull out of Vietnam and sit down to confer on Communist terms in good faith. This letter contains one of the most arrogant and clerically irresponsible judgments I have ever read: "The United States is actively responsible for the rain of fiery death poured out on a helpless peasantry." Such a perversion of the facts could have been written in Moscow, Peiping, or Hanoi.

Third, the writers of this epistle fail to count communism as an implacable, vicious, cunning, satanic enemy of freedom, democracy, and above all, Christianity. The cruelty, treachery, and conscienceless aggression of communism ought to be obvious to all but the wilfully blind or stupid.

God may indeed use communism to bring judgment upon the West (even our United States), but we cannot make such judgment for Him, and clergymen have no right to "play prophet," speaking authoritatively on that about which they know little and have no revelation. Furthermore, to pervert the picture for purposes of propaganda is dishonest. I am sure our Nation is far from

perfect and not always most just, but this does not obligate us to surrender to communism nor to trust it.

Yes, I am dismayed by the war in Vietnam (and in Congo and elsewhere) and I long for peace, but to betray ourselves or allies into Communist tyranny and designs will bring neither peace, nor freedom, nor honor, nor godliness. Only Jesus Christ can bring lasting personal, social, or world peace. He "Who is coming in power and great glory."

Yours truly,

PATRICK MORISON.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

THE PEGASUS B

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report another major success on the part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the exploration and conquest of space. At 3:35 this morning the Saturn booster placed into orbit the Pegasus B meteoroid technology satellite. This is the ninth straight success of the most powerful operational launch vehicle in the world, a remarkable achievement that bodes well for the future of our entire space program.

The Pegasus satellite exposes more than 2,000 square feet of instrumented panels to register meteoroid impacts in the region near the earth. The 3,200-pound spacecraft, attached to the last stage of the Saturn, is in an orbit with a predicted lifetime of over 3 years—the instruments are designed to operate for about 1 year. The achieved orbit with an apogee of 740 kilometers and perigee of 513 kilometers, is within 1 percent of the planned values—an example of the Nation's increasing capability for high-precision space operations. The total weight in orbit is over 23,000 pounds, making it one of our heaviest successful payloads.

The information we will receive from this mission will be important to our total capability for operations in space, both manned and unmanned.

The actual deployment in space of 100-foot panels was televised by a camera mounted on the booster; I am sure many of you will see it before long on your own TV sets.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the industrial and scientific team responsible for this mission for another step forward in the power and prestige of the United States.

Since preparing these remarks, I have been informed that throughout the day the three television networks will show pictures of the Pegasus B.

PECULIAR TREND OF TEXTILE MILL MARGINS

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

11174

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I today asked the Federal Trade Commission to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The trend of cloth prices and textile mill margins has been so peculiar since the enactment of last year's cotton legislation that a thorough inquiry is in the public interest.

Text of my letter to the Commission:

The trend of cloth prices and cotton mill margins since the enactment of the one-price cotton legislation of last year is so peculiar that I strongly urge that you make an investigation to determine whether the prices of cotton textiles are being fixed in restraint of trade.

The statistics enclosed herewith, provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, show a steady upward trend in cloth prices despite the drop in cost of raw cotton made possible by last year's legislation. You will note that mill margins jumped sharply when the lower-cost cotton became available. There is no indication that consumers have benefited from this legislation, despite official assurances Congress received last year that it would save them more than \$700 million.

Clearly, cloth prices have not responded to a substantially lower raw material costs. This of course does not necessarily mean that a conspiracy to fix prices exists, but it is highly unusual in a supposedly competitive industry. Consequently, it seems to me that a thorough inquiry would be in the public interest.

I enclose herewith:

1. A table showing cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962, together with a chart reflecting these same statistics.

2. A copy of a letter dated January 31, 1964, from the Secretary of Commerce to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry giving assurances to the Congress that the proposed cotton legislation would save consumers more than \$700 million.

This has special interest for me because I am a member of the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. We will soon be considering a revision of the present legislation.

Below are copies of two of the documents I enclosed:

Cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962
(Cents per pound)

	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1962			
January.....	60.63	35.78	24.85
February.....	60.76	35.82	24.94
March.....	61.07	35.98	25.09
April.....	61.23	35.85	25.38
May.....	61.19	36.13	25.06
June.....	61.24	36.34	24.90
July.....	61.29	36.19	25.10
August.....	61.12	35.89	25.23
September.....	60.83	35.23	25.70
October.....	60.71	35.08	25.63
November.....	60.68	35.10	25.58
December.....	60.67	35.30	25.37
1963			
January.....	60.55	35.45	25.1
February.....	60.47	35.06	24.81
March.....	60.49	35.95	24.54
April.....	60.26	36.08	24.18
May.....	60.00	36.16	23.84
June.....	60.11	35.86	24.25
July.....	60.28	35.57	24.71
August.....	60.60	35.33	25.27
September.....	60.99	35.19	25.80
October.....	61.34	35.11	26.23
November.....	62.00	35.27	26.73
December.....	62.29	35.37	26.92

Cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962—Con.

(Cents per pound)

	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1964			
January.....	62.32	35.47	26.85
February.....	62.37	35.55	26.82
March.....	62.37	35.58	26.79
April.....	62.00	35.63	126.37
May.....	61.62	35.67	125.95
June.....	60.87	35.76	125.11
July.....	60.95	35.60	125.35
August.....	61.00	27.64	33.36
September.....	61.02	26.82	34.20
October.....	61.25	26.80	34.45
November.....	61.48	26.98	34.50
December.....	62.58	27.30	35.28
1965			
January.....	63.24	27.30	35.94
February.....	63.28	27.26	36.02
March.....	63.42	27.26	36.16

¹ Does not include the 6.5 cents per pound cotton equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales opened beginning 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1964. USDA made no adjustment for these payments prior to August 1964.

Source: "Cotton Price Statistics," Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(Extract from hearings on cotton program before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., pt. II, p. 510, Jan. 28, 29, 30, 31, and Feb. 11, 1964)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1964.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that during the course of your current hearings on the need for emergency cotton legislation, the question continues to arise as to whether or not a reduction of 8½ cents per pound in the cost of cotton to domestic mills would be reflected in savings to American consumers of cotton textile products. When similar legislation was being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, Hickman Price, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified in behalf of this Department that savings to consumers would amount to about \$90 million for each cent of reduction. A reduction of 8½ cents per pound would thus result in a saving to consumers of more than \$700 million. This saving, Mr. Price said, would come with a lag of from 3 to 8 months, the time from first consumption at the mill to ultimate consumer, and would be reflected in either lower prices or higher quality of the merchandise.

Speaking with personal knowledge from many years in the manufacturing and marketing of cotton textiles, I agree that such a raw material cost reduction in the highly competitive textile and apparel manufacturing industries would generate a chain reaction of savings to consumers. It is the best estimate of our Department that these savings would be of the general order of magnitude indicated by Mr. Price.

Sincerely yours,
LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

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

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

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

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

MIZE QUESTIONS BILL "RIDERS"

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to appear before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to express my concern about the use of omnibus bills. Often these bills combine new concepts with established programs and thus bring into being a new area of Government spending which probably would not be authorized if the new concept was presented as an individual bill.

I have had a bill drafted which I plan to introduce to ban bills and amendments dealing with more than one substantive matter. I realize that this is a far-reaching reform, but the reception I had before the joint committee indicates to me that many other Members share my same concerns about the abuses in omnibus bills.

During the time that this proposal was in the talking stage as far as my office is concerned, the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal editorialized in favor of this approach.

I appreciate this support by one of the leading and influential dailies in Kansas, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, "MIZE Questions Bill Riders," in the RECORD:

MIZE QUESTIONS BILL RIDERS

Representative CHESTER MIZE, Republican, of Kansas, is on the right track in questioning the fairness and feasibility of omnibus bills and in starting a movement to limit each bill considered in Congress to one substantive matter.

MIZE said this week he has asked that a resolution to that effect be drafted while he conducts research to see if such an approach to legislation would be feasible. If it is, he said, he hopes someone in the Senate will join him in introducing the measure.

In question are two types of bills—omnibus bills and bills onto which riders are attached.

An omnibus bill is one which makes a number of miscellaneous provisions or appropriations. The other type usually contains fewer provisions but can be even more deceptive than the omnibus bill.

Granted, these types of bills have at times served worthwhile purposes by making it possible to enact necessary legislation when it was too late, or for some other reason it was impossible, to do it any other way. But often, MIZE believes, they have served as expedients to slip through measures which likely would have been killed if they had received the undivided, unclouded attention of Congress.

An example of what he is talking about, MIZE said, was the recent education bill, "where the new expanded idea of Federal assistance to public school students and indirect aid to nonpublic schools was tied to the existing programs of aid to impacted areas.

"We saw it in medicare, where compulsory hospital and medical care for the aged was

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2619

bitrary acts no less vicious than the edicts of dictators who have suppressed democracy in the world. The tyranny of the majority in a legislature, supported by a judicial oligarchy, can be as harmful to free government as the autocracy of an individual despot.

Our written Constitution has been vanishing, presumably in accordance with the spirit of the times. An impression prevails at present in both Houses of Congress that the Supreme Court will at any time amend the Constitution by judicial fiat to conform to ideological or sociological doctrines of the day.

Our forefathers provided us with a legal method of changing the Constitution. It has been used 24 times and is still available to meet the wishes of the people and the spirit of the times.

A Blessed Event**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of an improved mail service for our country, I was pleased to learn that plans have been approved for a congressional investigation into the Post Office Department's sectional plan for mail processing and the effect it will have on employees and mail service.

The sectional center concept, which will lead to the elimination of many of the railway post offices, is not the answer to improved service in my opinion. I am not alone in this opinion and would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Bennett County Booster II, Martin, S. Dak., on May 13, 1965:

A BLESSED EVENT

People in western South Dakota were blessed Monday, April 26, with their first installment of "Progressive Postal Service." For the benefit of readers who are unfamiliar with the term, it is a fancy name for bureaucratic bungling.

It stemmed as though the Metro mail service, which was established a few years ago, was doing a pretty good job of getting mail in and out of area post offices with a reasonable amount of service. That's probably what was wrong.

Somewhere, someone got the idea that mail forwarded to sectional centers could be handled in greater volume and faster than through the local area post offices. This plan has been tried in other areas prior to coming to western South Dakota, and apparently is achieving about the same results.

One of these sectional centers has been established at Pierre. And as of April 26, all mail in this area is to be routed to this sectional center.

As a result mail going from Martin to Pine Ridge can no longer go the 45 miles over U.S. Highway 18. It is to be sent from Martin to Kadoka, to Pierre, to Presho, to Rapid City, to Hot Springs and back east, again, to Pine Ridge—a distance of at least 500 miles. Also, mail returning from Pine Ridge to Martin goes back around the same route, instead of coming across U.S. Highway 18.

Somewhat, mail service between Martin and Pine Ridge isn't quite as good as it was prior to April 26, 1965.

In order to test this new modernized service, press time at the Booster was moved

ahead in time to catch the 5 p.m. mail Wednesday out of the post office at Martin. Copies of the Booster now have been getting to Pine Ridge Friday morning where as they previously got there Thursday morning.

This is not an isolated example.

Prior to the change, a letter could be mailed at 5 p.m. at Kadoka and it would be placed the next morning on the Kadoka truck arriving at Martin at 6:30 a.m. Now, before the letter can get on that truck, it must first go into Pierre, back to Presho and back to Kadoka to get on that same truck.

The sectional center idea has hit other areas of the country, too. The Pioneer Press of Mott, N. Dak., points out:

"The Bismarck mail bus stops at Burt now and we get all our mail from Dickinson post office. In the past, the Bismarck mail bus came to Mott and laid over until evening. Not true now—the Dickinson bus picks up our mail, hauls it to Dickinson (85 miles) then it goes by train to Bismarck (102 miles) then it is loaded on a bus and hauled to towns east of Mott, to Burt (95 miles). The point is: Burt is 8 miles east of Mott."

The trouble with the postal service, says the head of the General Accounting Office, is too much modernizing.

The mail flo system is one example cited by GAO. Under mail flo letters and packages were supposed to flit through big city post offices virtually untouched by human hands. The trouble was, said Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, it didn't work.

But before finding out that the pilot experiment in Detroit had serious deficiencies, Mail-Flo was installed in Philadelphia and Denver, where it increased the costs of postal service by hundreds of thousands of dollars and decreased labor productivity.

Why should adequate service at reasonable cost be an impossible job for the Post Office Department?

Public utilities solve the problem of increasingly complex operations to serve an expanding population. The Post Office does not.

Utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, give adequate service at lower or stabilized rates as their customers increase. The Post Office does not.

Utilities put money aside for improvement, and most privately owned utilities manage to pay dividends to their stockholders. The Post Office does neither.

Why, we repeat, can't the Post Office do its job?

The fault cannot be blamed on the 500,000 men and women—our friends and neighbors and fellow citizens—who deliver the mail. It has to lie at the very top where decisions are made. And we wonder just how bad the postal service has to get before the public stops bawling out the people behind the post office window, and starts directing its anger at the fumbler in Washington.

The 275th Anniversary of Philadelphia's 21st Ward**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the special June supplement of the Review, the community newspaper of Philadelphia's 21st ward, which is celebrating its 275th year in 1965.

Amid buildings constructed long be-

fore the Declaration of Independence, the people of Roxborough, Manayunk, and Wissahickon have preserved a community as unique as the one that saw the British march up the ridge early in the morning of May 20, 1778.

Although the little village of Roxborough, which once consisted of a few houses scattered down the road, is now fully grown, one can still see signposts of the past. For instance, Roxborough is one community where you can still see a horse on the street. Many riding stables serve patrons who like to gallop up and down the trails of the Wissahickon.

It is true that there are now more houses and people in the community, which was once known as Roxborough Township. There are also more churches and schools. Television, automobiles, and the Schuylkill Expressway have brought a new era to the formerly isolated ridge of land between Wissahickon Creek and the Schuylkill River.

Yet the 21st ward is still an exciting place. Although concrete has covered the fields and pastureland, and shopping centers and parking lots have come to the vales and valleys of Roxborough, Shawmont, and Wissahickon, the unusual loyalty of the people of the 21st ward for their community is one signpost of the past that will never come down.

The Intellectuals and Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, this country is witnessing a new development in the arena of higher education. Although it is not listed in the catalogs of some of our leading colleges and universities, and neither is it listed in the calendar of sporting events of these schools, a clique of professors have invented teach-ins. The goal of these is to attempt to persuade anyone willing to listen that this country, in its efforts to stay the advance of communism in Vietnam, has gotten off its course.

Stewart Alsop, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, says:

It is mysterious that so many American intellectuals look forward with complacency—even positive relish—to Communist victory in Asia, which they regard as inevitable.

Mr. Alsop makes a good presentation of this new development in his article which follows:

THE INTELLECTUALS AND VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam has brought to the surface again a mysterious phenomenon. This is the peculiar fatuousness which the profoundly antiintellectual Communist system seems to inspire in a good many American intellectuals and would-be intellectuals.

At least until 1948, it was fashionable among many intellectuals to admire, or find excuses for, the system presided over by that ferocious enemy of the free intellect, Joseph

May 25, 1965

A2620

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Stalin. This fatuousness of an older generation of intellectuals provided useful ammunition for the homegrown antiintellectual yahoos, like Senator Joseph McCarthy. Nowadays it is becoming fashionable to proclaim that Mao Tse-tung's version of communism is the wave of the future in Asia, and to castigate the American Government for its blind refusal to permit the future's wave to roll over South Vietnam.

From Berkeley to Harvard, the chic thing for the politically aware professor to do is to conduct teach-ins on the iniquities of American imperialism in Vietnam, or to march in protest demonstrations, or, for the less dashing, to sign open letters to the President, like the remarkably silly open letter of protest recently signed by 149 Yale professors.

Surely this is a mysterious business. Logically, liberal-minded intellectual persons should hate and fear Mao's communism as instinctively as they hated and feared Hitler's nazism. For as an idea killer, an enemy of the free mind, Mao outdoes Hitler and Stalin combined.

The anti-intellectual campaign in Communist China, which began in earnest in 1963, is now reaching a peak of intensity. Chinese intellectuals have been bluntly warned that they are suspect, not only individually, but as a class. Some months ago Hu Yao-pang, secretary of the Communist Youth League, announced that "intellectuals always belong to certain social classes and serve the interests of these classes."

Warnings to intellectuals are now constantly reiterated in the Communist press. In January of this year, for example, Red Flag, the Chinese Communist theoretical journal, thundered against "intellectuals who refuse thought reform, refuse to integrate with the masses, and become 'spiritual aristocrats' perched proudly high above the toiling masses."

According to a leading Government expert on Communist China, the idea that Mao wants above all to kill is "the concept of humanism—i.e., the fraternity of peoples, human dignity, happiness, and individualism." Humanism has become a respectable concept among Soviet intellectuals since the post-Stalin thaw. Therefore Tse-tung is determined to "wall off Chinese intellectuals from any contact with currents of relative moderation in the Soviet bloc," and the whole concept of humanism is now denounced in China as a bourgeois distortion of Marxism-Leninism.

The attack on humanism has its superficially amusing aspects. For example, Prof. Ma Yen-sheng, of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, recently published a long letter of abject "self-criticism." Professor Ma wrote that he had found himself of late increasingly filled with bourgeois sentiments. He began to have strange notions about the idea of universal love, and even to dream of a world filled with friendly love, and forever at peace. Thus was his mind increasingly infected with bourgeois sentiments.

And how did the infection start? Largely as a result of listening to the degenerate, Western, bourgeois work, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony.

A fondness for bourgeois music is deeply suspect, and instantly marks an intellectual as a candidate for a "mental-reform-through-labor camp." Debussy, against whose music Mao is said to have conceived a particularly violent prejudice, is even more dangerous than Beethoven. The periodical Peoples' Music recently announced that the music of the Chinese patriotic oratorio, "The Long March," had been completely rewritten because in its original form it recalled Debussy's degenerate bourgeois style.

Writers must be especially wary of the taint of bourgeois influence and humanism. The Chinese Journal of Literature and Art

has warned writers that the "writing of middle-character stores" is proof of such taint. A middle character is someone not perfect and not totally bad. In Chinese Communist literature, middle characters (i.e., human beings) no longer exist. All characters must be either perfect toilers and peasants, or wholly evil class enemies.

In last October's issue of China Youth Daily, the following sharp warning to a leading Communist Chinese philosopher appeared: "The kind of life advocated by Comrade Feng Ting, which would provide good things to eat and wear, good places to live in, and cordial relations between husband and wife and between parents and children does not accord with the Communist ideal."

On the contrary, the Communist ideal demands that the youth of China make a class analysis of their parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles and other relations. Deviationist ideas are to be reported immediately to the local block officer or farm party secretary. Even jokes may smack of deviation—a Peking newspaper warns that some jokes savor strongly of feudalism and capitalism.

Nor are the dead immune. China Youth tells its readers that "we should make a class analysis of those who have died." Such a class analysis seems likely to lead to the removal of the famous and beautiful tombs of Hangchow. For these tombs "are the graves of poets, scholars, and courtesans, and are therefore * * * serving merely the purpose of spreading the foul odor of the reactionary ruling classes * * * and must be removed."

How is one to avoid being sent to a "Mental-Reform-Through-Labor Camp" as a result of a negative class analysis? Very simple:

"[We must] use the thought of Mao Tse-tung to analyze * * * events. If they correspond with the thought of Mao Tse-tung, they are right. We must support, believe, praise them. If not, they are wrong * * * we must expose and attack them." George Orwell's big brother asked for no more total an abdication of man's right to think for himself.

Perhaps the "Thought of Mao Tse-tung" is indeed the wave of the future in Asia, and the American effort to contain Asian communism is therefore futile, as such intellectuals as Dr. Hans Morgenthau preach. But it does seem mysterious that so many American intellectuals look forward with complacency—even positive relish—to the Communist victory in Asia, which they regard as inevitable. For they are looking forward, of course, to the rapid spread of a system which means the murder of the free mind.

"The Character of Lee"—Address by Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the military brilliance of Gen. Robert E. Lee is historically documented. The genius and gentleness of Lee, the man, are worthy of emulation. His character was, indeed, inspiring.

The character of Lee was the subject of a presentation at the Robert E. Lee High School, at Springfield, Va., in observing the 100th anniversary of the close of the War Between the States.

The presentation was made by Capt.

Eugene H. Breitenberg, U.S. Army, retired, who served as Department of Defense Civil War Liaison Officer to the National Civil War Centennial Commission. Captain Breitenberg is now a member of the faculty of the Annandale, Va., High School.

A taped message from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower was included in the presentation, which was entitled "The Character of Lee."

In view of the national scope of the anniversary observance, I think this tribute to a great American should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for its publication in the Appendix.

The presentation was made by Captain Breitenberg, on April 9, 1965, before the principal, the faculty, and the students of Robert E. Lee High School.

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

THE CHARACTER OF LEE

It is a distinct honor to be privileged to speak to you and especially so on this day, the 100th anniversary of the meeting of Gen. Robert E. Lee and Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in the McLean house near present day Appomattox, Va. The surrender of General Lee's army of northern Virginia, for all practical purposes, ended a war that had pitted father against son, brother against brother, American against American.

It would seem most apropos to the occasion, consistent with a Presidential proclamation and a public law, if we took stock for a few minutes of the character of Robert E. Lee, especially in light of the fact that this school, your school, is named after that illustrious gentleman, soldier and noble American.

Sir Winston Churchill, proclaimed already by many historians as the one most likely to be honored as "man of the 20th century," had this to say of Robert E. Lee in book 11, chapter 10 of "A History of the English Speaking Peoples": he was " * * * one of the noblest Americans who ever lived, and one of the greatest captains known to the annals of war."

Such is the esteem in which Robert E. Lee is held by practically all historians. Such esteem is further enhanced in the thousands of books written about the Civil War period and by the men who fought in that so called "irrepressible conflict." Said Churchill of the Civil War " * * * the noblest and least avoidable of all the great mass conflicts fought up to that time."

During my tour of duty as Department of Defense Civil War Centennial Liaison Officer to the National Civil War Centennial Commission, with the primary duty of coordinating Armed Forces participation in centennial commemorative events, I often was asked to speak to military, civic, school and other groups. It occurred to me that my talks would be more meaningful if the proclamation could be heard in the President's own voice, rather than quoted. Accordingly, I requested and received the following taped message from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"The years 1961-65 will mark the 100th anniversary of the American Civil War.

That war was America's most tragic experience. But like most truly great tragedies, it carries with it an enduring lesson and a profound inspiration. It was a demonstration of heroism and sacrifice by men and women of both sides, who valued principle above life itself and whose devotion to duty is a part of our Nation's noblest tradition.

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2627

ments that are needed to keep a normal, healthy household functioning, but there is never a note of fear in their voices.

When we are in school, we are taught to observe the rules of silence for the sake of an orderly system, and not in fear of what might have been said. Our subjects of history, languages, and mathematics are not colored by propaganda to make America seem always right. We are taught to admit our mistakes, and we are taught to correct them.

Each afternoon I come home from school and enter the house to find my baby sister happily playing, and my mother busy with household chores. Dad is out working to support his family in his own chosen field of work. My older sister's career will be her choice, not the state's. When she decides to marry, her marriage will be made for her happiness, and the license will be the only legal paper provided and needed. My brother speaks of becoming an electronics engineer. If, as he grows older, some other field will lure him, only his talents and ambitions will have to be considered. My little sisters, living in their child's world of comfort and happiness, are too little to realize their advantage of being American children. They will grow in the love of their parents, not in the paid love of a state nursery school teacher.

In the evening, when my father reads the newspaper, the facts in the articles are written as they happen, not as the state would like them to happen. As in almost every American home, the family is drawn to the TV set. Programs are selected for the fam-

ily's enjoyment. Some evenings the choice involves a rather heated family discussion. However, when the program is finally chosen, we know that it is governed by the manufacturer of perhaps a famous soap product, and not a ministry of propaganda. And when, at times, the family decides to go out for entertainment, we choose our own place, and time for return is not governed by a set curfew.

In attempting to show what my country means to me, I have expressed in words the freedom in my everyday life. It is the same freedom every American experiences, and we must fight to keep, so that every future American will experience it.

Tabulation of Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed an experiment in the First Congressional District of Alabama in order to learn more about the opinions of the district's citizens regarding important national and international issues of the day.

We have been overwhelmed by the tremendous number of persons who took the time to respond to a written questionnaire which we mailed to every home in the district. More than 16,000 persons responded.

This is a great tribute to the First District because it shows that our people want to make their ideas on important issues known to their elected representative in Congress.

In order that representative government can be effective it is important that elected officials know the views of the voters. This is one way that I can be informed as I proceed to serve the First District.

I want to call particular attention to 2 of the 10 issues raised in the questionnaire. Of those responding to the questionnaire fully 86.2 percent oppose President Johnson's proposal to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and thus they favor continuing the State authority to enact right-to-work laws.

On the other hand, 73.5 percent of those responding believe that our national security is at stake in the conflict in Vietnam, giving support to the administration in its determination to help South Vietnam resist outside aggression from the north.

Following is the complete tabulation of results of the questionnaire:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor "medicare" for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	20.5	79.5
2. Would you approve of a Federal law repealing State "right to work" laws?	13.8	86.2
3. Should the Federal Government undertake a program for controlling pollution in lakes, rivers, and streams?	75.9	24.1
4. Do you believe that our own national security is at stake in the Vietnam conflict?	73.5	26.5
5. Would you favor a change in our immigration laws to base a person's admittance to the United States on skills rather than on country of birth?	51.2	48.8
6. Do you feel any State should have the right to apportion 1 house of its State legislature on factors other than population if a majority of the State's voters agree?	74.0	26.0
7. Do you support Federal aid to education?	45.6	54.4
8. Would you support a constitutional amendment to provide for a 4-year term for the U.S. House of Representatives with 1/2 of the House Members elected every 2 years?	74.4	25.6
9. Do you favor the proposal to give a tax credit to individuals for the costs of higher education?	74.1	25.9
10. Would you support a program of Federal rent subsidies to low- and middle-income families?	18.2	81.8

The President's Position on the Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the two following articles on the President's position on the Vietnam situation.

Both editorials are excellent and again demonstrates Mr. Johnson's humanitarianism and leadership.

[From The Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, May 14, 1965]

JOHNSON'S STRATEGY IN ASIA

President Johnson's televised address from the White House Thursday had a ring of similarity to other speeches he has given recently, on the subject of Vietnam, but there were notable and significant differences.

Heretofore, the President had discussed southeast Asia from the standpoint of Amer-

ican policy. On Thursday he talked mostly not of policy but of strategy.

He did reiterate, it is true, the basic U.S. policy of defending South Vietnam against Communist aggression, by whatever military action is necessary, and of making every effort to achieve a satisfactory settlement by negotiation. However, he went on to indicate in considerable detail some of the strategic devices which may be employed in implementation of that policy.

The strategy is complex but it boils down to this: Prevail upon Communist North Vietnam to break away from the dominance of Red China and chart its own course in foreign affairs. Or, to put it another way, the North Vietnamese are being encouraged to stop allowing themselves to be used as pawns of Peiping and to start acting in their own self-interest.

An essential part of this strategy is to convince the North Vietnamese that their self-interests lie in peaceful settlement rather than in continuation of the war against South Vietnam to further Red Chinese ambitions of conquest.

"It would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to come to the conference table," President Johnson said. "Communist China apparently desires the war to continue, whatever the cost to their allies. Their target is not merely South Vietnam. It is Asia."

The President went on to portray elaborately the bright economic future that is possible for all the Vietnamese people—to be established primarily by U.S. financial and technical assistance to promote progress in agriculture, in industry, in education, in health, in housing. He made a point of emphasizing that "when peace has come * * * all the people of Vietnam, North and South alike," will share in the economic bounties.

Noteworthy, also, was the President's specific invitation to the Soviet Union to join the United States in helping to "create a better life for the people of southeast Asia."

One exceedingly large question, as President Johnson well knows, is whether the North Vietnamese Communists have sufficient power and mastery of their own house to end the war in South Vietnam against the wishes of Red China. As the air raids on North Vietnam intensify, and the price of aggression rises steadily, the political leaders in Hanoi may well be asking themselves the same question.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1965]

JOHNSON UNDERLINES IDEALISM IN VIETNAM POLICY

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Firmness, compassion, and conciliation are the watchwords of the great

A2628

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 25, 1965

drive that President Johnson has launched to win support for American policy on Vietnam.

Rarely has the country seen anything like it.

His speech before the editorial cartoonists here May 13 was the 12th time in 2 weeks that he has made public utterances on foreign policy. In addition, so-called truth squads of top administration officials have been sent out to counter opposition. This opposition centers in the academic and intellectual world.

TALKS FAVORED

With a kind of grim patience President Johnson makes these three points:

We are not fighting in Vietnam because we want to but "to make aggressors understand that force will meet force" and that "aggression is not only wrong, but it will not work."

We know that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Repeating his earlier Baltimore phrase, the President said here, in his latest nationally televised broadcast, "We are ready for unconditional discussions. Most of the non-Communist nations of the world favor such discussions. And it would clearly be in the interest of North Vietnam to come to the conference table."

Why then, aren't there discussions? President Johnson directly charges that "Communist China apparently desires the war to continue whatever the cost to their allies." He adds:

"I am continuing and increasing the search for every possible path to peace."

Finally, President Johnson emphasizes the constructive and idealistic aspect of what he sees as the basic American goal in Vietnam. It is this nonmilitary aspect that he develops in his latest talk; not what the South Vietnamese are fighting against, but what they are fighting for—food, education, and health.

President Johnson's educational campaign is keyed to the idealistic aspirations of young people. It is chiefly in the colleges that protests against the Vietnam war have centered. He does not sound a martial or belligerent note in his latest talk. He does declare the United States unwavering purpose to meet what he charges is North Vietnamese aggression.

But the whole emphasis is on the idealistic side, with reference to American cooperation to bring material improvement to the South Vietnamese. Such improvement has come, he declares, even in spite of the war. He lists such gains at length, remarking in passing that since 1954 the United States has spent \$2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people.

COMMON EFFORT SOUGHT

Mr. Johnson boldly challenges not only the idealistic aspirations of his own citizens but of other countries, including the Soviet Union.

Mr. Johnson painted the struggle as one where the United States is developing food, health, education, and housing for the South Vietnamese but where Communist terrorists are raiding these very improvements in a deliberate campaign.

His speech contained homely details of rice, corn, and pig production, and of an improved sweet potato that promises a "sixfold increase" in yield.

Wistfully at the end he spoke of the hope of peace, when "we can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam—North and South alike."

Mr. Johnson's speech was available by TV satellite for broadcast all over Europe. It was another example of diplomacy by satellite. He sought to draw attention to many constructive things done in Vietnam that are obscured by the war. He tried also to refute two assumptions—that the Vietnamese have no interest in the struggle and

that American support has brought only war and destruction.

The President gave support to an Asian Development Bank to help finance economic progress.

He spoke in the East Room of the White House to an audience of about 300, many of them cartoonists who draw his picture on editorial pages.

"I call on every industrialized country, including the Soviet Union," he said, "to create a better life for the people of south-east Asia.

"Surely the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the ways of war."

The critical point in administration arguments is that the war in Vietnam is due to aggression from the North. It would end promptly, according to this view, if outside support ended.

Critics of the administration assert that the war is a civil war, and that the Communist guerrillas, or Vietcong, are indigenous. While undoubtedly aided from outside, the Vietcong, these critics say, would carry on the struggle without such aid.

Mr. Johnson in his latest speech returned to his critics.

"How incredible it is," he said, "that there are a few who say the South Vietnamese do not want to continue this struggle. They are sacrificing and dying by the thousands."

He cited "their patient valor" as an inspiring example for Americans. He quickly added praise for American civilians who have been working in Vietnam. "They toil, unarmed and without uniforms," he said.

Resolution of New York State Student Christian Movement in Support of the Pending Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the very fine resolution on the pending voting rights legislation which was approved recently by the annual spring assembly of this movement.

I might first point out, Mr. Speaker, that this organization has a membership which includes 72 colleges and universities in New York State, and is affiliated with the New York State Council of Churches. The president of the organization is Mr. Thomas Genne of Syracuse University. The vice president is Mr. Richard Schafer of Colgate University. The communication secretary is Miss Shiela Stanley, a sophomore at Keuka College at Penn Yan, N.Y., and a constituent of my district.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT IN NEW YORK STATE

Acting in accordance with the conviction that the Church of Christ to be truly the church must continually reaffirm and implement its traditional role of reconciliation among men, we seek and urge an elimination of all social, political, and economic influences which deny or restrain the full expression of human worth and dignity to any of our citizens.

Furthermore, we deplore and urgently seek to eradicate from our minds and hearts and from our churches and society any feelings, attitudes, and actions which represent or perpetuate injustice to any man because of his creed or race.

Furthermore, we support and urge the immediate passing of such legislation as may guarantee the franchise to all qualified persons and express our considered opinion that such legislation shall in no wise equivocate or compromise the moral and Christian principles of both church and state.

This resolution was passed at the annual spring assembly of the Student Christian Movement in New York State, Cazenovia, N.Y., April 11, 1965.

(Signed) MISS SHIELA STANLEY,
Communications Secretary.

Republicans: Another Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a recent statement by our distinguished colleague from the State of Maine, Representative STAN TUPPER, the full text of which appeared in the Portland Sunday Telegram May 16, 1965.

Congressman TUPPER, in his comprehensive and forceful statement, has placed in proper perspective the problems of the Republican Party; moreover, he advances some provocative proposals for the party's course in the future.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Maine for his contribution to the cause of strong two-party government.

If the Republican Party is to correct the damaging imbalance that exists in the strength of our two-party system, there must be abrupt and bold changes made within the minority party; another year may be too late.

We now have at best a one-and-a-half party system in Washington, with the specter of one-party government in the Nation increasingly before us. The responsibility for this serious imbalance rests squarely with the Republican Party.

If honest with ourselves, Republicans must admit that our party has abjectly failed to capture the imagination of the voters for well over three decades. Our victories have nearly always been victory of the individual rather than of party. The only Republican presidential victory since 1928 was a reward to a war hero. General Eisenhower could have just as easily been elected as a Democrat, and often gave the impression that he wished he had been.

While it grieves me to say so, the Republican Party is still looked upon by the average run-of-the-mill voter as the party of the wealthy, rather stuffy and lacking in imagination. Despite the considerable efforts of a handful of Republican governors, senators, and Congressmen to change this unfortunate image, it still persists.

It is disquieting to read comments scorning the idea that there is danger of the Republican Party declining to a splinter party status simply because it has managed to survive in the past. This is but wishful thinking; with little better than 20 percent of the registered voters now preferring the Republican Party, we face the ultimate loss of many of these loyal partisans unless we give them a better reason to vote Republican.

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2643

In sum, the Republic of Korea proposes to utilize 1965, the year of hard work, most meaningfully so as to move toward prosperity and progress at an ever-increasing speed.

Vietnam: Digging In and Pitching In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if U.S. policy in Vietnam could be summed up in two short phrases, they would be "digging in" and "pitching in."

Today in Vietnam our marines, our paratroopers, and our South Vietnamese allies are digging in against an offensive from the Communist Vietcong that is almost certain to come with the inception of the monsoon season.

It will be a long, wet summer in Vietnam and the inclement conditions will favor the guerrilla actions of the Vietcong. The Communists may be hoping to obtain a swift and decisive victory during the coming months in order to force the withdrawal of American support from the South Vietnamese.

We are determined to blunt this attack, to deny victory to the Vietcong, and, thereby, hasten the day when the conflict can be taken off the battlefield and into the conference room.

At the same time that we are making military preparations, we also are pitching in to assist the economic progress of South Vietnam, and to help the Vietnamese people to better lives.

In his recent statement to the Nation's editorial cartoonists, President Johnson described the achievements in development which have resulted from our financial and technical assistance—despite the state of crisis in Vietnam.

It is clear that in Vietnam the United States is pitching in to help defeat those age-old enemies of man—hunger, ignorance, poverty, and disease—just as we are digging in militarily against a 20th century scourge of humanity: Communist aggression and tyranny.

At this point I am pleased to insert four recent newspaper editorials commenting on U.S. policy in Vietnam, including two from the Milwaukee Journal.

These editorials point up both the digging in and the pitching in aspects of the struggle in Vietnam, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 14, 1965]

THIRD FACE OF VIETNAM

Another picture of the Vietnam struggle emerged from President Johnson's statement Thursday to a group of editorial cartoonists. It depicted the steady task of development that continues amidst the shooting and terror.

"It is the most important battle of all," the President said. "For a nation cannot be built by armed power or political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past."

The progress outlined by the President is amazing, considering the turmoil that has

engulfed the country. Since 1954, the United States has spent more than \$2 billion in economic aid for South Vietnam. This has helped double rice production and increase corn output and has brought modern farming techniques that otherwise might never have been introduced.

The United States has helped vaccinate more than 7 million people against cholera and millions more against other diseases. We have helped build 12,000 hamlet health stations. A new medical school is under construction that will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire South Vietnamese population.

American money has gone into the construction of more than 4,000 classrooms in the last 2 years; 2,000 more schools will be built in the next 12 months. Our funds have been used to purchase 8 million textbooks and to increase elementary school capacity. Total enrollment, 300,000 in 1955, now stands at 1.5 million.

The struggle in Vietnam has three faces, the President said—armed conflict, diplomacy and politics, and the job of development. The last existed before hostilities began and will be there when peace has come.

"Then perhaps," he added, "we can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam—north and south alike." That was the most hopeful comment of all.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 20, 1965]

BACK TO THE BOMBING

The lull in American bombing of North Vietnamese targets is ended, apparently without any response by Hanoi to indicate a willingness to begin negotiations.

The 6-day suspension did, however, serve several purposes: It indicated a response to critics in Congress, in the intellectual community, and among our allies who have been exerting pressure for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. It demonstrated that President Johnson is not inflexible in the course being followed in the war. It provided an opportunity for a direct approach to Hanoi through a third party—an effort which has so far proved fruitless.

The refusal of North Vietnam to give any positive response to President Johnson's display of good faith is interpreted as evidence of the influence of pro-Beiping elements in the Hanoi government. The Communists are said to hope for a quick and decisive victory during the monsoon season between June and August.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are preparing for such an effort, hoping that its repulse will bring the Reds to the conference table.

It appears now that the bombings will continue on much the same scale as in the past until such time as developments bring some meaningful response from the north and another bid for negotiation appears to have some chance.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel,
May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE—ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday morning in his TV appearance to detail again the whys and hows of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because a few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but addresses such as Thursday's can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts it up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and others in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a paper tiger and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even reader to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

[From the Bridgewater (S. Dak.) Tribune,
Apr. 29, 1965]

There are diametrically opposed points of view as to what we can do and should do in Vietnam. But there can no longer be any dissent to one fact: this Government is totally committed to using whatever force and whatever tactics are necessary to preserve South Vietnam from a Communist takeover. The President went all out when, at a conference of Governors, he declared that this would be the policy even if it takes "20 or 50 years." He has also said that he is always ready to negotiate an honorable peace but has found no signs of any willingness on the part of the Communists to move in that direction.

Intelligence Digest, a British publication which deals in world affairs and has a reputation for prescience, quotes one of its special correspondents as saying: "It is now obvious that the United States has worked itself into a monstrous dilemma in Vietnam and finds itself, so to speak, suspended between the devil and the deep blue sea. What is so aggravating to America and her allies is the fact that there do not seem to be any alternatives for the solution of the situation but the following three courses of action: (1) An indefinite prolongation of the present situation; (2) a negotiated neutralization of Vietnam and subsequent American withdrawal; or, (3) an expansion of the war at the risk of a conflict with Red China and/or Soviet Russia."

This is a widely held point abroad. And certainly no one can any longer believe that there is a simple solution to the Vietnam problem. The President, it seems absolutely clear, has made his decision and there will be no back tracking. That decision, as U.S. News & World Report sums it up, "is to be generous if the Communists end their aggression, but brutal if they choose a test of military strength." The magazine adds that Red China has been informed that she will be subject to attack with all weapons, including nuclear, if she enters the fight.

In other words, it is up to the Communists to decide whether the war is to grow hotter or not. And in this country, the President's

position is being given the most powerful kind of bipartisan support within and without Congress. For instance, Barry Goldwater, in one of his newspaper columns, writes that the Johnson policy "has worked wonders in turning the war from a hopeless morass into a sharply focused issue." Going on, he suggests that this country issue a "target ultimatum" to the Hanoi government. This would consist of naming a series of targets of increasing importance that would be hit successively until Hanoi accedes to peace terms. He also proposes that we ask our Asian allies such as the Philippines, to enter the Vietnam ground war.

There is another important facet to the picture. Newsweek sums it up this way: "For the time being, at least, Washington's newfound decisiveness has stolen the initiative from the Communist camp. In sharp contrast with the recent past, it is now the leaders in Moscow and Peking who seem uncertain and confused, who are groping for a way to answer the U.S. challenge." So far as anyone can see now, they don't want to risk direct warfare, on any scale, with the United States, while, at the same time, they are vitally concerned with saving face.

No one knows what the future will bring. But the United States is demonstrating that it is not a paper tiger.

The President's Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the activity of the United States in moving into the Dominican Republic to protect the lives of our citizens has had a serious effect upon our people, who have followed this operation closely. The Hartford Times, which is one of the major newspapers in Connecticut, recently commented on the forthright nature of the President's actions, and I believe it deserves the recognition of all Members of the House. I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, May 3, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISIONS

The decisions made by President Johnson in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic—to defend our commitments and responsibilities—is bound to have salutary effect. The firming exposition of our attitude will arouse criticism; there always is "another way" to act.

But we think that the President has made our position more creditable, in this way carrying on in the direction taken by President Kennedy at the time of the Cuban missiles crisis.

An overriding disposition to defer, to stand on the beach and talk about rescue when diving in and effecting the rescue is required, always leaves at question whether one can, or will swim.

President Johnson is distinguishing between occasions—the time to talk, and the time to act. And in national affairs such distinction is as important and laudable as is our basic disposition to negotiate or compromise.

One senses an opinion had formed that the U.S. endorsed negotiation and deferment even when that constituted a retreat into

words rather than an advance toward a solution. Events in Vietnam and at Santo Domingo have corrected any such misapprehension.

We champion peace, but also we champion responsibility and our commitments. Peace is weakened when we veer off from the job of making our will believable.

Americans Will Do Farm Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans will do "stoop labor" if they are paid for it.

This statement of Ralph McGill, writing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, clearly supports the position of Congress in terminating Public Law 78 and the insistence of the Secretary of Labor that domestic workers can be hired if competition is permitted to return to the farm labor market.

At a time of frequent charge and countercharge, and in a further effort to set the record straight, I include Mr. McGill's remarks for our colleagues' information:

NO FOREIGN LABOR

(By Ralph McGill)

It is claimed that "Americans won't do stoop labor." The answer seems to be that they will do it if they are paid for it.

Public opinion in California appears to be rallying behind a congressional act and the Secretary of Labor whose job it is to enforce it. The Congress barred importation of cheap foreign labor to harvest crops.

The outcry from growers in California is loud and angry. They insisted Americans won't do stoop labor—picking vegetables, fruit, and lettuce. They demanded the government allow the import of cheap Mexican labor.

The position of the growers was, to persons outside the State, untenable and somewhat shocking. The growers were among the loudest in their support of free enterprise. Yet, in a State where 400,000 Americans are jobless, growers put themselves in a position of demanding that the Government provide them with labor that would not merely work for wages below the competitive level but would also accept living conditions that all too often involved squalor and misery. Investigations revealed that some growers had provided good working and living conditions for the contract laborer. A majority had not.

Secretary Willard Wirtz, in carrying out the congressional legislation, suggested that jobless Americans would respond if the wages were adequate and the living conditions improved. The contract under which foreign labor was imported guaranteed work for three-fourths of the contract period. The Department of Labor suggested this be tried with U.S. workers. It was. The lettuce crop was harvested in the Imperial Valley. Statistics here indicate the work was done more efficiently.

Some growers continue their demands to bring in foreign labor while their own people are without work. Some canning representatives, in a recent meeting with the Secretary, threatened to move their operations into Mexico, thereby throwing thousands more Americans out of work.

There are indications that American industry leaders outside California are holding up a warning finger to the growers who make free enterprise seem ridiculous by insisting on avoiding the competitive labor market and retaining the special privilege of importing noncompetitive labor with Federal help.

The Secretary of Labor has been consistent. He argues that adequate domestic workers can be hired from the 400,000 unemployed if competition is permitted to return to the farm labor market. Reasonable wages, decent housing and food for field hands, he insists, will bring the workers. Mr. Wirtz summing up included these points:

"Treat your domestic workers right, and you will never lack for them. If you don't treat them right, there will be no certification of foreign workers to ease the transition. Higher wages may mean some slight increase in retail prices, but the American housewife should be willing to pay a half-cent more for a head of lettuce to improve the lot of farm labor."

Mr. Wirtz has been heard to say that the economy of the great factories in the fields resembles the industrial development of the years following the Civil War when millions of immigrants were brought in to fill the new factories and mills, to lay the rails west, to dig the canals, and so on. There no longer is any reason for U.S. agriculture to be allowed special considerations in a State where some 400,000 Americans are out of work.

California's farm economy is the most prosperous in the Nation. Public opinion in the State—and over the Nation—supports the congressional act and the Secretary whose job it is to enforce it.

U.S. Cancels Grand Jury Probe in Social Security Fee Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of acquainting other Members of the House of Representatives with a situation involving social security claims, I have obtained permission to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the May 16, 1965, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Sunday Register.

While this article deals only with a situation in Iowa, there is evidence that highly questionable practices in the handling of social security claims may be much more widespread. If it does become apparent that an appreciable number of social security beneficiaries have been the victims of sharp practices in the establishment or maintenance of their claims it may be necessary for a proper committee of Congress to delve into the matter.

Following is the newspaper article:

U.S. CANCELS GRAND JURY PROBE IN IOWA FEE DISPUTE

(By Nick Kotz, of the Register's Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A scheduled Federal grand jury investigation of two Iowa attorneys was called off after the attorneys agreed to refund several thousands of dollars they charged social security applicants.