

couragement that I have often remarked that from Dr. Cowling I received a college education all over again. Rather than eulogize him I would leave with you four thoughts that were basic to him, and which I believe he would want us to live by.

First was his regard for the U.S. Constitution. He often remarked that because he was born in England and came to this country as a boy with his parents, he learned from them to be an American by choice. In this land he saw freedom of opportunity, made possible by the wisest form of government ever devised by man. The Founding Fathers drafted a superb document in the Constitution, which provides for a central government with limited powers, powers held in check by the delicate balance of three independent branches. He saw something precious being lost in the increasing centralization of power.

The second thought is the importance of a viewpoint by which to gauge one's activities. Dr. Cowling was a man of learning. He earned four degrees at Yale and received more than a dozen honorary degrees. After completing his undergraduate course at Lebanon Valley College and then taking further study at Yale, he realized that he had a lot of information but what he most needed was a viewpoint. He therefore took the divinity course at Yale, that his knowledge might be oriented to a philosophy of life. As I have already mentioned, this orientation was the ethical insights of Jesus Christ in which he had utter confidence as representing not another opinion but the will of God. He often quoted to me this from Emerson:

"Most men act from motives of external compulsion; few are strongly and steadily inspired from within."

He said that the last six words were the most appropriate motto for his life—strongly and steadily inspired from within. All that he did was an expression of the viewpoint to which he had committed himself.

A third basic idea is the distinction between self-sacrifice and unselfishness. The first position offered to him was the presidency of a mission college in China which he was inclined to accept. When he met with the trustees in New York they congratulated him upon the sacrifice he was about to make. The realization came to him that their hopes for the college centered on sacrifice. The trouble was that the sacrifice they envisaged was his, not theirs. He declined to be sacrificed on the altar of their inadequate idealism, and concluded that most talk about "sacrifice" is hollow. What is needed is unselfishness in which everyone can participate. No few should be asked to renounce the material blessings of this world, but everyone should be expected to use his resources generously. Dr. Cowling became a great fundraiser for worthy causes because he appealed to the unselfishness which characterizes life at its best. Not what a man receives in salary or income is as important as what share of it he gives willingly and gladly. Those who were close to Dr. Cowling know that in all his fundraising and service he did not take for himself, but gave freely out of his basic philosophy.

The final thought is the centrality of man's religious life. Throughout all his years Dr. Cowling attended Sunday worship with regularity never missing a Sunday except on rare occasions of necessity. Yet for him worship was no magic ritual. Formality and liturgy had little appeal to him. Worship was important because it keeps a man sensitive and open to the creative spontaneity of the God behind creation, and provides opportunity to express gratitude for the magnificence and mystery of life. Worship is part of man's search for truth and of his expression of ultimate concern. This view of churchmanship is illustrated by the two

periods in his life when Dr. Cowling deviated from his practice of regular attendance. The one was in the last 2 years when his hearing in large groups failed, and he saw no merit in sitting through a service in the intellectual stimulation of which he could not share. The other period was during the final illness of President Lars Boe, of St. Olaf College. While his colleague and friend was bedridden Dr. Cowling spent each Sunday morning visiting with him and reading to him. Affectionate concern for a beloved brother in Christian fellowship was in itself to him an act of worship to the common Father who had made them neighbors and friendly rivals in Northfield.

As we gather to pay tribute to our beloved friend and benefactor we must indeed be grateful for the rich legacy that he leaves us—the legacy of a life richly lived and fully dedicated to all that gives hope and courage to mankind. We can commit his soul to our Heavenly Father in the quiet assurance of Christian faith, which he so beautifully manifested throughout his pilgrimage. We can pledge ourselves to the remembrance and the doing of the truths he so steadfastly served.

A WELL-DESERVED TRIBUTE TO WALTER L. REYNOLDS, OUT- STANDING PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Thursday it was my privilege to be present when Walter L. Reynolds was honored by his many friends for his 37 years of dedicated public service. As chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Government Operations Committee, Walter has given willingly and unstintingly of his knowledge and ability. As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I know how ably Walter served. We shall miss his wise counsel but, hopefully, he will be back to see his friends on Capitol Hill often.

The work of staff members make it possible for Members of the Senate to serve better their constituents and the Nation. Walter Reynolds did much of the staff work on S. 2, a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, which was introduced on January 6, 1965, by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McCLELLAN] and cosponsored by 76 Senators. The bill was reported on January 26, 1965, and passed by the Senate on January 27, 1965. It has gone to the House of Representatives where it has been referred to the House Committee on Rules.

Walter has also participated in the development of legislation to increase the Federal Government's control of science and technology in the field of space and technology information.

Other special legislative work by Walter included helping implement the first and second Hoover Commission recommendations and the Legislative Retirement Act.

Many of Walter's friends have expressed their respect and admiration. At this time I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the telegram Walter received from the Vice President be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Vice President HUMPHREY was a member of the Committee on Government Operations when he served in this body.

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

JANUARY 27, 1966.

DEAR WALTER: My warmest greetings. Your 37 years of faithful public service are truly an inspiration. The Senate has good reason to be so very proud of you. Sorry I cannot be with you, but am committed in New York shortly. I know your wise counsel and vast knowledge will still be available to us. All best wishes to Clare and yourself.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to be here yesterday when so many of my colleagues paid tribute to Walter L. Reynolds, who has just retired as chief clerk and staff director of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. I want now to add my voice to those who have already spoken by stating that the Senate is losing the services of one of its most talented professionals.

Few men have shown greater ability in handling the enormous task of running a committee staff.

Walter was not only available at any time to assist but, even more significantly, I could always count on the accuracy of the information he gave me. His counsel will most assuredly be missed. I want to take this opportunity to wish him continued success in the years to come.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 contained a provision requiring the President to consider denying aid to any nation whose ships were involved in trade with North Vietnam.

I have received a report from the Department of State on the progress made in carrying out the intent of Congress toward obtaining the cooperation of aid recipients in reducing this trade. This report will be of interest to the Congress and the general public, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 21, 1966.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of State shares the deep concern you have expressed over continued voyages of free world ships to North Vietnam and is making continuing efforts to reduce that shipping. High-level approaches have been made to all countries involved.

These efforts have met with considerable success and the number of free world vessels in the trade has been diminishing steadily, with none of the vessels carrying strategic cargoes. During 1965 the number of voyages by free world vessels declined considerably as compared with 1964. The decrease has been particularly significant during the past 5 months, when the monthly average was only 13 calls. By comparison the monthly average of free world calls in 1964 was 34. The majority of these vessels were not carrying goods to North Vietnam, but were arriving in ballast to pick up outgoing cargoes.

The free world shipments in question are not being made by the governments concerned, but by private traders in ships sailing under various national registries. Each country has special legal problems in controlling such shipping which take some time to resolve, but we have been making every effort to obtain early and effective action.

In making diplomatic representations, the executive branch is mindful of the provisions of the recent amendments to foreign assistance legislation which call for the denial of economic and military aid to countries that do not take appropriate steps to remove their ships from the North Vietnam trade. We have notified all affected governments of these legislative provisions, and have continued to press them to obtain maximum cooperation from those very few countries still having ships in the trade.

The only aid-recipient countries whose ships have called at North Vietnamese ports within the past 6 months, and some of these were under long-term charter to Communist countries and therefore not under control of their owners, were Cyprus, Greece, Liberia, and Norway. Some of these countries state that they have no legal authority to control in peacetime the movement of privately owned vessels but the Lebanese and Liberian Governments have issued regulations making it unlawful for their ships to carry cargo to or from North Vietnam. In other cases, the shipowners in the countries concerned have obviously found it in their own interest to get out of the trade, as witnessed by the drastic reduction, and in some cases complete elimination, of their involvement in shipping to North Vietnam.

Questions have been raised as to the position of Great Britain on the problem. The great majority of British vessels in the North Vietnam trade are small coastal vessels owned and registered in Hong Kong and under time charter to Communist operators, yet carrying the British flag. The value of total British trade with North Vietnam (imports and exports) amounted to about \$265,000 in 1964 and all of it was nonstrategic. Nonetheless, we are engaged in energetic representation to the United Kingdom and other friendly countries who have been involved in the North Vietnam trade in order to accomplish withdrawal of all free world shipping from that trade.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

TOWARD BETTER CITIES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on December 9, 1965, Vice President HUMPHREY made a notable speech to the National Symposium on City Life. It sets forth the critical needs of our modern urban society and points the way toward the solution of the most pressing problems. The Vice President called for a broad program to overcome the evils of slums, ignorance, and congestion which plague our cities.

Now, the President has pledged his administration to reconstruct the cities in the mold of the Great Society and provide an opportunity for every citizen to achieve his full potential.

The Vice President's speech gives us a clear picture of the urban life the administration seeks for every city dweller. Funds for public housing and urban renewal are to be increased. The rent supplement program will begin.

Of special significance is the proposal for demonstration grants to cities for comprehensive planning and rebuilding

of the existing urban complex. Since the time when he was mayor of Minneapolis the Vice President has championed the cause of a better life in urban America. It must give him great satisfaction to participate in the realization of his goals.

In his speech the Vice President recognizes the key role of education in the fulfillment of the Great Society. The budget provides \$2.8 billion, an increase of 23 percent over fiscal 1966, for this purpose. Included in this total is \$1.5 billion for aid to elementary and secondary education, a boost of more than 50 percent over last year. The major portion of these funds will go to improve the education of children from areas of poverty. The new Teacher Corps to augment school staffs in low income areas will further help to uplift deprived children.

These are but two parts of a many faceted effort to evaluate the quality of life in our cities. The Vice President has made an eloquent and stirring statement of the situation we face and the road we are taking toward a better future. I commend the speech to all my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's speech be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS, VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON CITY LIFE, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 9, 1965

It is indeed a privilege for me to participate in this symposium on "The Troubled Environment" sponsored by the ACTION Council for Better Cities.

I have long admired the numerous action programs you have sponsored—programs dealing with the complex tasks of living, working, and traveling within our urban areas.

The council has been instrumental in stimulating creative thinking and action in such areas as community mobilization, urban research and education, and technical services.

So it is not surprising that ACTION should sponsor this symposium on the most confounding, and crucial, problem of them all: the relationship of the socially and economically deprived residents of urban America to the vital task of urban development.

It is especially significant that this symposium is not just trying to understand the nature of these complex and challenging issues.

You are also asking the critical questions: What can we do about them?

How can we make our contribution in the struggle to rescue our cities?

As President Johnson noted last year in his historic message to the Congress on housing and urban development: "Whatever the scale of its programs, the Federal Government will only be able to do a small part of what is required. The vast bulk of resources and energy, of talent and toil, will have to come from State and local governments, private interests and individual citizens."

As the President also noted in this important message, and as I am sure this symposium will demonstrate, "We do not have all the answers, we need more thought and wisdom and knowledge as we painfully struggle to identify the ills, the dangers and the cures for the American city."

Consider our present state of affairs, within the past 2 years:

Congress has established a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Congress has agreed that a system of rent supplements for low-income families should be developed to supplement the traditional approach of public housing.

Congress has enacted new and expanded programs to fight air and water pollution.

Congress has established a program of urban mass transportation and approved the construction of a mass transit system in the District of Columbia.

Congress has passed historic education laws and an expanded poverty program to provide new weapons for an attack on the educational and social problems of the slums.

Congress has passed a variety of new housing and urban redevelopment programs, designed especially to avoid mistakes of the past and to meet needs of the future.

Yet it is clear we are only at the beginning. The design by which we shall overcome the shame of enduring slums, in the richest Nation in the world, is still unclear. It is unclear to Government. It is unclear to the experts.

And our recent efforts, while making progress in many areas, have also demonstrated the complexity and tenacity of the problems which confront us.

We have learned there are no simple solutions, and no single answers.

We are open to the widest and most creative thinking in this field, from builders and land developers, planners and architects, mayors and bankers, political scientists and businessmen. In this spirit, we look forward eagerly to the conclusions and recommendations of this symposium.

Although we have not yet produced the design that contains all the answers, we are coming to understand more fully the most pressing problem facing us in our cities. It is this: to eradicate the explosive combination of poor housing, poor schools and inadequate public services, high rates of unemployment and crime, and the prejudice and discrimination which comprise the slums of urban America.

All other urban problems pale by comparison. And until we are capable of improving the lives of people—largely Negro—who live in these areas passed over by our national prosperity and affluence, we will be stymied in all other attempts to restore and redevelop our cities.

We are sophisticated enough to know that physical slums alone do not produce the economic and social problems concentrated there.

If it were possible to replace overnight the tenements in our great cities with new housing, we would not at the same time overcome unemployment, juvenile delinquency, drug addiction, poor education, ill health, and family breakdown.

For this reason President Johnson has stressed the importance of mounting comprehensive areawide attacks on the interrelated problems of housing, employment, education, crime, and health.

Only as we attack simultaneously the problems generated by both the physical environment and socioeconomic conditions can we hope to make significant progress in this difficult struggle.

One of the most significant tasks of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be to assist our cities in organizing this type of comprehensive attack. In this regard, the following matters merit priority attention:

First, we must grasp the relationship between increased income of slum residents and their ability to secure more adequate housing and other services from the private and public sectors.

As the poor achieve the level in our economic structure where honest choices are open to them in securing housing, I am confident the forces of our free enterprise system will respond to this market.

line of world food production, something must give.

The man-food ratio around the world, never high enough to be very exciting to two-thirds of the world's population, has actually been in a decline the last half dozen years. Total food output has increased during those years, to be sure, but at a slower rate than population increase. In many of the world's underdeveloped areas, the man-food ratio is in serious decline.

Those of us in North America, who wrestle with perennial surpluses of both food and feed grains, too frequently view our problem in the short run. We are export conscious, particularly in relation to the current situation. While this may be important in a particular year, it is high time that we begin to fashion our domestic programs and policies with a view toward the political and economic realities of the developing world food crisis.

At the beginning of the Christian era, world population was estimated to have numbered around 250 million. In the next 15 centuries it doubled, reaching 500 million by 1600. Three centuries later, by 1900, world population had tripled, and stood at about 1.5 billion. In the less than two thirds of a century since 1900, world population has approximately doubled again. Reliable estimates indicate that in the little over one-third of a century remaining until the year 2000, it will double again, and will stand at about 6.3 billion people.

If the 6-billion-plus people predicted by the year 2000 are to be sustained, with no improvement in diet whatever, man will need to develop the capacity to feed another 3 billion people—and this must be done in the short term of one-third of a century. This means that we must duplicate in the next generation the production record that man has achieved since the dawn of history.

There are only two possible answers to the problem posed above: (1) increased agricultural production worldwide, with sufficient trade flexibility to permit effective geographical distribution, and (2) a widespread and rapid increase in birth control practices.

In the long run, say by the close of this century, birth control is the only solution. But this is developing extremely slowly in the population pressure areas of the world, and probably will continue to develop slowly because of the low levels of education and living standards. Hence the immediate need before us is to increase agricultural production and to work out more effective means for distribution of our foodstuffs—just the converse of some of the agricultural and trade policies currently popular in the United States.

It is meaningful to use the trend in per capita grain production as an indicator of both agricultural progress and the quality of diet. A majority of all calories consumed comes from grains, either directly or indirectly, after conversion into meat, milk or eggs. Thus a rising per capita output of grains in any population makes possible either a rise in calorie intake or the production of additional animal protein if this is needed or desired.

The underdeveloped areas of the world, once able to feed themselves, now clearly are dependent for their very existence on sustained food shipments from the developed nations, largely from North America. The output of grain per capita of farm population has shown a striking increase in North America, more than doubling in the 25 years from 1934-39 to 1961. During the same interval, grain output per capita of farm population actually declined in Latin America and increased only modestly in Africa and Asia.

The transportation of the advanced mid-20th century agricultural technology of North America into the underdeveloped areas of the world will be, at the best, a very slow and arduous process. Yet, we must not

despair in our efforts to build up the agriculture economies of the underdeveloped nations. To the extent that this can be done it will both promote economic and political stability within those nations, and will in part alleviate the burden that must inevitably fall on North American agriculture in the latter part of this century to prevent mass starvation in large areas of the underdeveloped world.

We face the prospect a decade hence that the great breadbaskets of North America will be called upon to supply food for large areas of the world until the population-food ratio can again be brought into approximate equilibrium. The latter cannot be accomplished quickly or painlessly. We therefore confront the challenge, in North America, to keep our food production machine in a healthy state, fueled for a massive effort in the years ahead.

The public conscience of the United States has moved toward a commitment, neither written nor enacted into legislation, that we will not permit mass starvation any place in the world. The two decades since the close of World War II have been the longest famine-free period in the history of the world. This has been possible largely because of the strategic deployment of American surplus foodstuffs under the food-for-peace program.

Both President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY have indicated that we should give consideration in our agricultural policy to producing specifically to meet the food needs of the underdeveloped nations. Increasing numbers of Congressmen also speak along this vein. When the time comes that food needs abroad are more apparent than now, it is my prediction that the U.S. Congress will find some way to meet them, perhaps under some kind of arrangement that resembles a sale, just like many people in this country think that our massive sales for foreign currency of surplus commodities over the last decade represent a genuine sale, when many of these transfers really were in the nature of a gift.

We must, therefore, view the tremendously efficient agricultural plant of North America as one of the most powerful tools in our kit of international diplomacy. And then, having viewed it this way, we must pursue more sensible internal price support and production programs than have persisted in recent decades. Likewise, we must follow trade policies which are fitted more nearly to the economic realities of our time.

If we can catch the vision in North America of the central role our enormous food machine can and must play in the total world scene in the decade ahead, then we can only be optimistic concerning the position of our agriculture in the international scene.

INFLATIONARY TRENDS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, ever since last October, when I addressed the bankers of Kentucky on economic trends, I have been stressing the possibility of harmful inflation, urging appropriate steps to prevent it, believing in the old maxim of an ounce of prevention being worth a pound of cure, and so forth. I renewed my warning to the Senate on January 18, and those interested can find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day under the heading of "Inflation," commencing at page 455.

On yesterday, in referring to items that I considered to be more vital than to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, I again referred to the rapid build-up of inflationary trends. That reference will be found at page 1257 of the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, January 27.

Naturally, I was gratified that on yesterday in submitting the report of his Council of Economic Advisers, the President admits that there is a threat of harmful inflation and said:

To insure against the risk of inflationary pressures, I have asked Americans to pay their taxes on a more nearly current basis, and to postpone a scheduled tax cut. If it should turn out that additional insurance is needed, then I am convinced that we should levy higher taxes rather than accept inflation—which is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation.

At the same time, the President called upon both labor and management to avoid inflationary pressures by holding down wages and by holding down prices.

Mr. President, the Congress must recognize that when you have virtually full employment with an ever-increasing transfer of production from civilian to war purposes, it is futile to appeal to labor and management to hold down prices, if the Congress votes to inject into the economy billions of new dollars of borrowed money. The President has issued his guidelines—which labor has ignored—and he has referred to the possible necessity of increasing taxes. But as yet, he has not publicly acknowledged the degree of priority that should be given the war in Vietnam in budgeting available revenue for the next fiscal year. The war in South Vietnam, undoubtedly is going to be more expensive than many in the Nation now realize.

While it is both the privilege and the province of the President to furnish leadership in a program of sound fiscal policy, the Congress cannot deny that it controls the purse strings and cannot escape accountability for deliberately engaging in inflationary deficit financing.

VIETNAM PLEA TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON BY ILLINOIS FACULTY MEMBERS, SCIENTISTS, AND SCHOLARS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the Chicago Daily News for Thursday, January 20, 1966, there appeared a large advertisement in the form of an open letter to President Johnson signed by a great number of faculty members, scientists, and scholars of the greater Illinois area with respect to U.S. involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

These eminent men of learning state in their plea to President Johnson:

1. We urge that our Government explicitly indicate its willingness to participate in a peace conference to implement the Geneva agreements of 1954, and that the question of interpreting the Geneva agreements be left to the conference.

2. We urge that our Government acknowledge that the National Liberation Front—as one of the principal parties to the conflict—should be a principal participant in all negotiations. Political realism requires that we enter into direct negotiations with all concerned parties in the spirit of "Pacem in Terris" and the recent policy statement of the National Council of Churches.

3. We urge that our Government make it clear that our efforts toward negotiations are in no way an ultimatum, and that we do not threaten any massive escalation of

The housing industry has provided millions of middle-income Americans with good housing, in quality and physical facilities.

The problem has been that large numbers of our people—especially those caught in our urban ghettos—cannot bid for this housing in the private market.

For this reason, the success of the war on poverty and related programs is critically important in our struggle to build better cities.

It is also necessary to continue our programs of public housing as authorized in the Omnibus Housing Act of 1965 and, in particular, to secure appropriations as promptly as possible for the rent supplement program authorized in the same legislation.

The rent supplement approach is a new attempt to provide low-income housing in partnership with the private sector of our economy—low-income housing that is attractive and does not carry the stigma associated with mammoth institutionalized public housing projects. This approach must be given a full and fair trial.

It is also essential that housing be made available to all Americans on a nondiscriminatory basis. Persons who can afford housing cannot have that opportunity denied to them because of prejudice and discrimination.

As in the field of employment, there exists in the area of housing ample opportunity for voluntary private action by builders, real estate agents, and bankers.

But there also exists a responsibility for government at all levels to take appropriate steps if that voluntary action is not effective in meeting this serious problem.

Second, we must understand the urgent necessity to provide quality education in our slum areas.

Our schools can rescue millions of youngsters caught in the downward spiral of second-rate education, functional illiteracy, delinquency, dependency, and despair.

Here is the chance to disprove the myth that children from slum areas are unable to learn, that schools can only provide some form of custodial care until they drop out and became unemployed or delinquent.

Each child is an adventure into a new tomorrow, an opportunity to break the old pattern and make it new. Today we have the chance to make that pattern one of self-esteem, self-respect, ambition, and responsibility. Project Head Start, for example, is showing us what can be done to give children an early start on these things.

Third, we must use fully, and wisely, existing programs for urban redevelopment and rehabilitation.

As the Omnibus Housing Act of 1965 demonstrated, we have provided new and more flexible tools in this complicated and difficult business of rebuilding or restoring blighted areas in a selective manner that recognizes the legitimate interest of the existing residents. And which preserves the unique character of neighborhoods.

It is, however, incumbent upon our States and local governments to develop imaginative programs which put these new tools into effective operation.

Finally, in our efforts to develop areawide responses to the fundamental problems of housing, transportation, education, and employment, we must not ignore the smaller dimension wherein the individual can experience the rewards of a rich and varied life.

In particular, Government policy must be directed toward encouraging the restoration and, where necessary, the creation of vibrant and living neighborhood communities.

In the final analysis, a city cannot simply be a place to live, to work, to exist.

A city must be a community in the deepest meaning of the word—a combination of material and spiritual resources which pro-

vides every individual an opportunity to lead a secure and meaningful existence.

This involves a concern for humane and intimate details, as well as a determination to conquer the major social and economic ills. This means a concern for the small park, the corner store, the neighborhood center and recreational area.

These are some of the matters which deserve priority attention as our States and local governments, in partnership with the Federal Government, mount comprehensive attacks on the urban slums and ghettos of America.

But the problem of the slums is largely a problem bequeathed to us by the past.

The problems of the future raise very different considerations.

We know that the next few decades will see a great increase in American population, and an even greater increase in urban population.

Americans hope that the next wave of urban expansion will provide a better environment than the last wave created.

The suburban expansion of the late forties and fifties provided good housing, but in most cases it did not provide the essential elements of good communities.

I am not one of the critics of American suburbia. It is a remarkable accomplishment, one which has provided more good housing for more people than perhaps any development in history.

But the planning 20 years ago that guided the construction of schools, transportation facilities, waste and water systems, and civic facilities often was not enough.

Today, our people are better educated, more prosperous, and legitimately demand that their living environment should work as well as their well-engineered kitchens and family rooms.

This is primarily a task for private and corporate imagination.

Government, acting alone, is not sufficiently flexible or sufficiently free from a variety of pressures to build good and imaginative towns.

But I believe Government can help provide the basic facilities, the framework in which local initiative, private enterprise, and nonprofit groups can build good towns.

Government at all levels can create stronger and more enlightened planning instruments to help make key public decisions as to where and how the urban expansion should take place.

It can explore measures which might reduce land costs in urban development.

It can provide Government loans for good quality and farsighted planning and building of water supply and waste disposal facilities.

It can provide the funds for good transportation planning, and for the building of a mass transit system to supplement the freeway system.

It can provide loans and grants for better schools and better cultural and recreational facilities.

I feel all these are appropriate tasks.

But beyond all these we need a good deal of creativity and imagination, from architects and planners, political leaders and social and political experts, builders and land developers, the great corporations and great financial institutions that are increasingly drawn into the field of urban development.

The programs of the Federal Government are often attacked for the failures of American urban development—inadequate planning, urban sprawl, barracklike public housing, poor public transportation, poor recreational and social facilities.

Certainly we must shoulder a good deal of the blame.

But as we develop new legislation, new approaches, I believe more and more of the responsibility for urban development, its fail-

ures and its successes, will be properly in the hands of local communities and the private forces of the development.

In this process, as has happened in a number of cities, the business community can play a vital and major role.

It can provide some of the money for local planning, some of the talent necessary to analyze problems and devise solutions, some of the public support we will need.

The intellectual and financial resources of our universities and foundations are also needed. The educational community must not be fearful of grappling with these intractable problems. The university must not just be a tower of ivory, but a tower of strength in the daily life of the people.

And I believe these additional resources can help provide the imagination and creative thinking that will produce American cities to match and surpass anything we have achieved so far.

There is one factor which must not be overlooked: For the first time in history we possess the resources to create cities that reflect man's highest aspirations.

While we do not presently have all the answers, I, for one, do not doubt for a minute our ability to discover them. Nor do I doubt our capacity to implement these solutions once they have been discovered. And what an exciting challenge this is.

Is there a higher calling than liberating millions of our fellow Americans from the vicious trap of deprivation and defeat? Is there any task more vital than improving the quality of life for every American?

And as we progress along this difficult road, as we build cities worthy of the human spirit, we will be preserving for countless generations the values of our Nation and civilization.

This is the challenge awaiting our response. We ask your help.

COLLISION AHEAD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, early in this Congress I presented a considerable number of documents showing the widespread support for an expanded world food program. The evidence continues to accumulate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the RECORD the condensation of an address by Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture at Purdue University, who is well known to most Members of Congress. Dr. Butz will be remembered as an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture during the Eisenhower administration. The condensation of Dr. Butz' excellent address appears in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Dr. Butz' excellent presentation of the food and population collision ahead is well worth reading. It is also illustrative of the agreement among many schools of thought on the need for greatly expanded agricultural production here and around the world to meet human needs.

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

BREADBASKET FOR THE WORLD—DECLINING FOOD-PEOPLE RATIO ABROAD CHALLENGES U.S. AGRICULTURE TO MASSIVE EFFORT.

(From an address by Dr. Earl L. Butz)

(NOTE.—Dr. Earl L. Butz, dean of agriculture, Purdue University, spoke before the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco.)

The world is on a collision course. When the massive force of an exploding world population meets the much more stable trend

the war if they are not immediately successful. We recognize that successful negotiations require the cooperation of our adversaries, but we believe that threats of further escalation will not contribute to securing such cooperation.

I concur most heartily with the points made and add my voice to their urgings in pleading with the President to follow their sage advice.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement, together with names and addresses of the signers, appear in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON FROM UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE FACULTY MEMBERS, SCIENTISTS, AND SCHOLARS OF THE GREATER ILLINOIS AREA

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Peaceloving people all over the world are deeply grateful for the efforts of the administration toward achieving peace in Vietnam, especially the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. But in the judgment of the undersigned there is more to be done to maximize the effectiveness of peace efforts.

1. We urge that our Government explicitly indicate its willingness to participate in a peace conference to implement the Geneva agreements of 1954, and that the question of interpreting the Geneva agreements be left to the conference.

2. We urge that our Government acknowledge that the National Liberation Front—as one of the principal parties to the conflict—should be a principal participant in all negotiations. Political realism requires that we enter into direct negotiations with all concerned parties in the spirit of "Pacem in Terris" and the recent policy statement of the National Council of Churches.

3. We urge that our Government make it clear that our efforts toward negotiations are in no way an ultimatum, and that we do not threaten any massive escalation of the war if they are not immediately successful. We recognize that successful negotiations require the cooperation of our adversaries, but we believe that threats of further escalation will not contribute to securing such cooperation.

It is still our hope that the U.S. Government seeks no wider war. We agree with you, Mr. President: "Weapons do not make peace; men make peace, and peace comes not through strength alone but through wisdom and patience and restraint."

(This statement has been sponsored by the Greater Illinois Faculty Committee on Vietnam. Its coordinating committee consists of: Dr. David Bakan (University of Chicago); Dr. Earl Davis (University of Illinois at Urbana); Dr. R. W. Faulhaber (De Paul University); Rev. G. G. Grant, S.J. (Loyola University); Dr. Paul B. Johnson (Roosevelt University); Dr. John Pappademos (University of Illinois, Chicago Circle); Dr. Maxwell Primack (at large); Dr. Bernard G. Rosenthal (Illinois Institute of Technology); Dr. Ernest Samuels (Northwestern University). Institutional affiliations throughout are listed for purpose of identification only. The views expressed in the above letter represent only those of the undersigned faculty members and not of the colleges or universities with which they are associated.)

AMUNDSEN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Martin W. Horan, business; Richard H. Lerner, English; Randall J. Longcore, mathematics; Elaine G. Rosen, biology science; David Simonson, social science; Bette C. Slutsky, biology; Nancy M. Tilly, humanities; Leo J. Yedor, social science.

AURORA COLLEGE

Paul A. Bower, economics and business; Eleanor H. McFarlane, biology; Charles Harvey Miley, psychology; Leo Seren, physics; Leigh M. Tracy, political science.

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

Benjamin F. Bast, history; Lawrence J. Clipper, English; R. J. Gwyn, mass communications; Dwight W. Hoover, history; P. J. Ostergren, political science; Gerry Ruth Sack, political science; Robert L. Tyler, history; Patrick T. White, English.

BELOIT COLLEGE

Albert R. Gilgen, psychology; Norman R. Leer, English; Richard Olson, art; Charles P. Seguin, mathematics; Brock Spencer, chemistry; Stephanie B. Stolz, psychology; Chad Walsh, English.

BETHANY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Alvin F. Brighthill, homiletics; Dale W. Brown, Christian theology; Donald F. Durnbaugh, church history; Earle Flke, Jr., homiletics; Paul M. Robinson, Bible studies; Graydon F. Snyder, Bible studies; D. J. Wieand, Bible literature.

BOGAN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Phillip Abrahamson, social science; Vincent Arcilesi, art; J. R. Brownfield, English; Janet B. Dephoure, English; Irving A. Haber, social science; Michael Kaufman, social science; Eleanor McGreevey; James F. Moldenhaver, English; Janice Preston, social science; Susan Shaw Rich, humanities; Robert C. Scott, science; Thomas B. Steiner, social science; Carol Kyros Walker, English; Norman E. Walker humanities.

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY

William L. Bowers, history; Bernard Bray, political science; Lester H. Brune, history; Edgard L. Chapman, English; John H. Harvey, foreign language; John S. Haverhals, mathematics; Brendan E. A. Liddell, philosophy; Jon L. Martinelli, history; Kenneth Morris, Jr., library; Hilde Nelson, library staff; Anne B. Plummer, library; Marjorie A. Smith, English; Reed M. Smith, political science; Gary R. Tippet, mathematics; Donald E. Wright, English.

CHICAGO MEDICAL SCHOOL

R. S. Geiger, neurology and psychiatry; Paul Gordon, pharmacology; Sue Hanlon, biochemistry; R. F. Jeans, psychiatry; Joe Levin, psychiatry; Irving Lyon, biochemistry; C. E. McCormack, physiology; Leo Saldel, biochemistry; William C. Shoemaker; Jean Sice, pharmacology; James E. P. Toman, pharmacology.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Phillip Anderson, pastoral psychiatry; Victor Obenhaus, ethics; Cyrus V. Giddings, devotion and lay (ed.); Winslow Kelley, public relations; Robert G. Collier, librarian; Joseph King, parish ministry; Perry Le Fevre, theology; S. Mouri, business manager; Thomas W. Ogletree, constructive theology; Howard Schomer, church history.

DE PAUL UNIVERSITY

Louis E. Allemand, philosophy; Rosemary S. Bannan, sociology; Carol J. Connor, dean of women; Robert L. Crist, English; Zahava K. Dorinson, English; Siebron J. Eppinga, architecture; Robert W. Faulhaber, economics; Joseph S. Giganti, economics; Lawrence Gluck, mathematics; Richard C. Groll, law library; William A. Hayes, economics; Robt. Q. Kelley, law library; Don J. Kerwin, law library; Gerald F. Kreyche, philosophy; Martin J. Lowery, history; Adolph E. Mark, economics; Sue Marquis, sociology; Ramdas Parikh, law library; Lawrence A. Ragan, English; Virginia Rutherford, English; Arthur N. Scheller, Jr., law; Robert J. Starrs, law library; Arthur F. Svoboda, business math.; Frederick I. Tietze, English; William R. Waters, economics.

EARLHAM COLLEGE

Richard A. Baer, Jr., religion; Jackson H. Bailey, history; Gerald R. Bakker, chemistry; O. Theodor Benfey, chemistry; Trim Bissell, English; Robert R. Brewster, modern languages; Hans W. Buchinger, languages; Mary Lane Charles, languages; James B. Cope, biology; William H. Darr, art; Martin O. Dietrich, languages; William Fuson, sociology; Leigh T. Gibby, English; Robert G. Godsey, business administration; Helen G. Hole, English; Leonard C. Holvik, music; Lewis M. Hoskins, history; Wendy H. Kiskan, languages; Paul A. Lacey, English; Arthur Little, drama; James V. McDowell, psychology; Calvin Redekop, sociology; Roberta G. Selleck, political science; Wilmer J. Stratton, chemistry; David Telfair, physics; Stuart E. Whitcomb, physics; Joseph Whitney, geography.

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Charles P. Beall, political science; Richard J. Bloss, political science; John F. Burke, Jr., economics; Parviz Chahbaz, psychology; Howard R. Delavan, social psychology; Leland E. Hall, political science; John H. Moore, sociology; Margaret Soderberg, political science.

ELMHURST COLLEGE

George W. Barger, sociology; William R. Barclay, English; Gordon W. Couchman, English; Robert F. DeRoo, psychology; Robert C. Eaton, economics; Marguerite M. Ekren, English; George Gazmararian, business administration; Robert L. Glogorsky, chemistry; Ronald G. Goetz, religion; A. H. Limper, religion and Christian education; James J. Williams, classics.

THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Francis W. Boelter, Old Testament; Kenneth I. Clawson, business management; Wayne K. Clymer, pastoral theology; Philip O. Deever, Biblical literature; Paul H. Eller, church history; W. C. Harr, mission and ecumenics; K. James Stein, church history; Richard Tholin, church and sociology; Eugene B. Wenger, Christian education; James E. Will, theology.

GARRETT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Merrill R. Abbey, preaching; John D. Batsel, librarian; Edward P. Blair, New Testament; George A. Buttrick, seminary; C. H. Ellzey, church administrator; R. W. Flsher, Old Testament; Paul Hesscot, theology; J. Jones, religion in higher education; Charles F. Kraft, Old Testament; Murray H. Leiffer, sociology; Sam Laeuchl, history; Alvin Lindgren, church administrator; R. W. Scott, world Christianity; G. S. Shockley, Christian education; Rockwell C. Smith, sociology; A. C. Sundberger, Jr., New Testament; Morris Taggart, pastoral psychology; Tyler Thompson, philosophy of religion; Philip S. Watson, theology; Glora M. Wynser, Christian mission.

GEORGE WILLIAMS COLLEGE

John W. Dubocq, education; Clinton W. Oleson, English; Dwane Robinson, sociology; Marjorie Schultz, history; Edward W. Stowe, sociology.

THE ILLINOIS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Rubin Battino, chemistry; Daniel Brenner, architecture; Forrest F. Cleveland, physics; Paul E. Fanta, chemistry; Robert Filler, chemistry; Gunther Goes, mathematics; David Gutman, chemistry; R. Ogden Hannaford, architecture; Isidore Hauser, physics; Caroline Herzenberg, physics; Robert C. Hinkel, English; Louis Johnson, architecture; Octave Levenspiel, chemical engineering; Peter G. Lykos, chemistry; Robert J. Malhot, physics; Ralph E. Peck, chemical engineering; S. Matthews Prastein, physics; Maxwell Primack, philosophy; Bernard Rosenthal, psychology; Frederick Ritter, German; E. Schmocker, architecture; Robert L. Warnock, architecture; David Zesner, English.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY AT NORMAL

Carrol B. Cox, Jr., English; Perry Hackett, music; R. H. Holtzman, education and psy-

chology; Philip James, art; George P. Warren, Jr., physical science; John Wesle, art.

ILLINOIS TEACHERS COLLEGE, CHICAGO NORTH

Harold E. Berlinger, music; Rose C. Brandzel, sociology; Norman Britan, anthropology; Thomas S. Farr, political science; Valentine R. Glockner, education; Robert S. Krueger, sociology science; Ely M. Liebow, literature; Hugh S. Moorhead, philosophy; Robert N. Paine, literature; Dorothy L. White, library science; Marilyn J. Ziffirin, music.

ILLINOIS TEACHERS COLLEGE, CHICAGO SOUTH

Fred O. Anderson, audio-visual; Martin K. Baker, education; John J. Bowen, physical science; Forrest E. Hazard, English; David Kopel, psychology; Robert C. Meredith, English; Lucille Mozzil, English; Henry A. Patin, education; Oscar Walchik.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

James Allison, psychology; James Appleman, English; Robb Baker, English; Brad Bayliss, YMCA; Richard Bebbe, accounting; Ernest Bernhardt-Kabisch, English; Elizabeth Cagan, psychology; Stephen Cagan, English; N. John Castellon, psychology; C. L. Christenson, economics; Norman S. Cohen, history; Dorrit Claire Cohn, German; James A. Dinsmoor, psychology; Paul L. Doughty, anthropology; James P. Egan, psychology; P. A. Fillmore, mathematics; David G. Frey, zoology; Sheldon Gellar, government.

R. K. Gibbs, coordinator for school science; Isidore Gormezano, psychology; R. G. Gunderson, editor, Quarterly Journal of Speech; George D. Guthrie, chemistry; I. F. Harik, government; George A. Heise, psychology; A. Holschuh, German languages; R. C. Jeffrey, speech; Louis Kibler, French and Italian; Roy E. Leake, Jr., French and Italian; Leon H. Levy, psychology; Don B. Lichtenberg, physics; Arthur S. Lloyd, Episcopal chaplain; Charles Leonard Lundin, historian; William A. Madden, English; H. R. Mahler, chemistry; Bernard S. Morris, government; Herbert J. Muller, English and government; G. K. Neumann, anthropology; Donald M. Nicol, history; Lloyd R. Peterson, psychology.

Otto Pikaza, Spanish and history; William Primrose, music; Gerald Rabkin, English; H. V. Rickenberg, bacteriology; Mark Rillins, psychology; Donald E. Robinson, psychology; J. Rocha-Pons, Spanish and Portuguese; Mercedes Roldan, linguistics; Samuel N. Rosenberg, French and Italian; P. Russian, Germanic languages; Dorothy Saltzman, universal school; Irving S. Saltzman, psychology; Norbert Samuelson, Hillel Foundation; W. D. Satterfield, English; John Scardreff, physics; Michael Scriven, history and philosophy of science.

Gilbert Siretti, Wesley Foundation; Kenneth E. Spilman, Presbyterian chaplain; Bernard Spolsky, linguistics; Frederick A. Staue, psychology; O. L. Taylor, speech and theater; Richard Thomas, English; Robert Tully, recreation; H. Haines Turner, labor education; M. E. Ward, Germanic languages; W. R. Webster, Roger Williams Foundation; Philip R. Wikelund, English; Richard David Young, psychology.

KENDALL COLLEGE

Leon M. Aufdemberge, theater; John Binder, history; Sarah F. Campbell, psychology; Josephine W. Hayford, humanities; Peggie Hutchinson, humanities; W. H. Hutchinson, humanities; Carol Lewis, music; Marcia Mintel, humanities; Philip Rummel, economics; Marti Zeitlin, chemistry.

KNOX COLLEGE

William E. Brady, English; Michael G. Crowell, English; J. W. Daley, philosophy; John S. Davenport, English; Rodney O. Davis, history; George E. Dimitroff, mathematics; Richard M. Fulton, political science; Mikko Hane, history; Frederic Jacobs, English; Alan P. Johnson, English; George L.

Melville, economics; R. Pulgandla, philosophy; William V. Spanos, English; John L. Stipp, history; Douglas L. Wilson, English; Howard A. Wilson, English.

LAKE FOREST COLLEGE

Lindley J. Burton, mathematics; Kenneth R. Calkins, history; George H. Crowell, religion; Richard W. Hantke, history; Forest Hansen, philosophy; Nathan I. Huggins, history; John W. Kalas, philosophy and religion; Maija Kibens, philosophy; Arthur Lessing, philosophy; Nancy Metzel, philosophy; Thomas Moodie, history; S. Prescott, sociology and anthropology; Robert Sharvy, philosophy; John G. Sproat, history; W. P. Zenner, sociology and anthropology.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

John Bannan, philosophy; Robert Barry, philosophy; Daniel DeBarbieri, history; Thomas Gordon, English; Rev. G. G. Grant, S.J., philosophy; Edwin Menez, classics; William R. Trimble, history; Corey Venning, political science.

M'KENDREE COLLEGE

Ronald W. Brandenburg, physics; Robert H. Brown, sociology; Otha L. Clark, history; John R. Curtis, Jr., religion; Fred A. Fleming, biology; Glenn H. Freiner, music; W. N. Grandy, philosophy; William C. Hodge, art; Stephanie Owen, music; David M. Packard, English; Roland P. Rice, social science; Orville H. Schanz, music; R. W. Scharnau, history; Lester F. Wicks, chemistry.

MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY

Frank J. Carey, music; Robert H. Hamilton, history; Paul S. Koda, English; Myron W. Taylor, English; W. H. Tilley, English; Kenneth Tompkins, English.

MUNDELEIN COLLEGE

Sister Mary Assisum, dean of students; Sister Terese Avila, BVM, Spanish and Portuguese; Russell Barta, sociology; Linda Bauer, administration; Irene Bohan, chemistry; Katherine Byrne, counselor; Michael E. Carbine, staff; Sally A. Chappell, art; Constance Choganian, history; Yohma Gray, English; Norbert J. Hrubby, administration; Sister Georgia Kcown, Russian; Paul O'Dea, English; Sister M. J. T. Scanlan, education; Sarah D. Solotaroff, English; Sister M. C. Thornton, history.

NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Donald A. Boyer, science; Mary Boyer, religion and philosophy; Fred Bunt, education; Calvin K. Claus, psychology; Bertha K. Stavrianos, psychology.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Michael Anania, English; Lee F. Anderson; Bernard Beck, sociology; Jack W. Burnham; Carl W. Condit, art; George Dalton, economics; Karl de Schweinitz, economics; Robert Eisner, economics; Richard Ellmann, English; Lawrence Evans, English; Arnold Feldman, sociology; Arthur Geffen, English; Peter P. Jacobi, journalism; John I. Kitsuse, sociology; Paul F. Kress, political science; Curtis D. MacDougall, journalism; William Monter, history.

Marshall Matson, English; Daniel Murtagh, English; Mohammed I. Nadin, economics; Peter Reill, history; Carl Resek, history; Lee Ramsey, English; John Allen Rowe, history; Ernest Samuels, English; Samuel Shoenbaum, English; James J. Sheehan, history; James E. Sheridan, history; Martin Shinbrot, mathematics; L. S. Stavrianos, history; Robert H. Wiebe, history; R. F. Williams, mathematics.

NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE

Ella S. Duke, English; Richard M. Eastman, English; Marc Karson, political science; William H. Naumann, religion; Erling W. Peterson, English; Mary Piech, psychology; J. Sackmann, religion; George St. Angelo, political science; Marian H. Schap, music; R. G. Thurston, sociology and anthropology; Renate W. Wolf, English.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Harold E. Aikins, history; John M. Antes, education; Orville Baker, English; Howard R. Ballwanz, earth science; David L. Danielson, chaplain; M. L. Dillon, history; Melvyn Dubofsky, history; Charles E. Freedeman, history; Charles H. George, history; Anne Greene, English; M. Hasan, physics; Edward T. Herbert, English; Duane R. Johnson, industry and technology; Martin Kallich, English; Benjamin Keen, history; Cornelius J. Looser, earth science; Donald E. O'Hair, chaplain; Andrew MacLeish, English; David Markham, speech; Nancy G. Markham, English.

Edward L. McGlone, speech; James V. McKittrick, chaplain; Donald M. Murray, English; G. G. Petersen, industry and technology; John F. Plummer, Jr., industry and technology; Ernst L. Presselsen, history; Albert Resis, history; Jesse P. Ritter, Jr., English; Marvin S. Rosen, history; Ronald L. Russell, chaplain; Robert W. Schneider, history; G. Schoenbohm, foreign languages; Mary Louise Seguel, education; Aubrey J. Serewicz, chemistry; James R. Shirley, history; Charles L. Thomas, industry and technology; Charles O. Tucker, speech; John R. Van Kirk, chaplain; Allen D. Weaver, physics; Dale H. Weeks, economics.

NORTH PARK COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Glenn P. Anderson, church history; Robert D. Byrd, political science; E. C. Dahlstrom, pastoral studies; Jean M. Driscoll, political science; Zenos Hawkinson, history; Hans Mollenhauer, German; F. Burton Nelson, theology; Leslie R. Ostberg, chaplain; Vernon Wetterstein, history; Charles Wiberg, history.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Kenneth L. Andrew, physics; Kathryn N. Black, child development; William C. Black, psychology; Ralph Bray, physics; Ray B. Browne, English; R. V. Cassill, English; Sewell, P. Champe, biological sciences; L. A. Coburn, mathematics; Terry Denny, education; Roland A. Duerksen, English; Chester E. Eisinger, English; Mary P. Endres, education; Jack W. Fleming, child development; Allen Hayman, English; Robert S. Hunting, English; Albert Kahn, biological sciences; J. Kuc, biochemistry and botany; Ruch Kuc, horticulture; Robert A. Miller, English.

Irving Morrisett, economics; Neil Myers, English; J. Bennet Olson, biological sciences; Norman Pearlman, physics; Marc Pilisuk, psychology; H. B. Ranken, psychology; Nani Ranken, philosophy; Eleanor L. Robinson, child development; Michael G. Rossman, biological sciences; Henry F. Salerno, English; Donald Schleuter, physics; Richard A. Schwarzlose, English; Raney Stanford, English; Irwin Tesman, biological sciences; Robert Tompkins, philosophy; H. E. Umbarger, biological sciences; I. Walerstein, physics; G. N. Wollan, mathematics.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

Dean Brodkey, English; Jacques A. Chevaller, psychology; Jean Eliot, education; Robert Greenberg, philosophy; Joseph Hackman, economics; Paul B. Johnson, graduate dean; Sue S. Lofton, education; Quin McLoughlin, psychology; Craig Orear, education; Max Flager, mathematics; Dale Pontius, political science; A. LaVonne Prasher, English; Robert E. Rutherford, English; Robert W. Sankey, English and Spanish; Priscilla Purinton Siek, English; Bernard A. Sherman, education; Jane W. Stedman, English; Jerome Valberg, philosophy; George H. Watson.

ROSARY COLLEGE

Gilbert R. Hancock, art; Marjorie Hirano, art; Robert E. Hostetter, biology; Geraldine McCullough, art; David J. O'Brien, sociology; Linda W. Steed, Spanish; Patricia M. Stracisic, physical education.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Frances D. Adams, English; Nathan Azem, Anna State Hospital; Hilda S. Delgado, an-

thropology; Sanford E. Elwitt, history; C. Harvey Gardiner, history; Robert L. Gold, history; Lewis E. Hahn, philosophy; Jerome S. Handler, anthropology; Rodger Hegler, anthropology; Don Inde, philosophy; Wayne Leys, philosophy; George McClure, philosophy; Cal X. Meyers, chemistry; Willis Moore, philosophy; Frank C. Nall II, sociology; Paul A. Schilpp, philosophy; Lon R. Shelby, history; Dan R. Silverman, history.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, EDWARDSVILLE BRANCH

Robert F. Erickson, history; Douglas M. Moore, behavioral science; Gunter W. Remmling, behavioral science; Patrick W. Riddleberger, history; Ernest L. Schusky, behavioral science; Stuart L. Weiss, history.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

David Bakcn, psychology; Jeanne Bamberger, college; Alice Benson, college; Peter M. Blau, sociology; Zena S. Blau, Institute for Juvenile Rescue; Wayne C. Booth, English; Merlin Bowen, English and humanities; Howard Brofsky, music; David Bruck, mathematics, biology; Yan Tsi Cahiu, physics; Robert C. Coburn, philosophy; John M. Dolan, philosophy; Stanley Fenster, physics; Stanley Fischer, humanities; Richard E. Flatman, political science; William Fowler, human development; Herbert Friedmann, biochemistry; Carol Gilligan, social science; James F. Gilligan, medicine; Leonard Gordon, Indian civilization; Eric P. Hamp, linguistics; Robert J. Havighurst, education; Marshall G. S. Hodgson, history.

Frederick C. Jaher, history; Herbert Kessler, art; Jessie Lemisch, history; Hans Lennenberg, music; Frederick F. Lighthall, education; Edward E. Lowinsky, music; Roy P. Mackal, biochemistry; Suzanne McCormick, philosophy; Leonard B. Meyer, music; Marvin Mirsky, humanities; Hans J. Morgenthau, history and political science; Paul Moses, art and humanities; Peter D. Noerdlinger, physics; William O'Meara, humanities; Laura N. Rice, psychology; Larry Rosenberg, sociology; Milton J. Rosenberg, psychology. Melvin Rothenberg, mathematics; J. C. Rylarsdam, divinity scholar; Jack Sawyer, psychology and sociology; Joseph Schechter, physics; Ralph Shapey, music; John M. Shllen, human development; Herman Sinaiko, humanities; Richard G. Stern, English; Michael Stocker, philosophy; Lars Svenonius, philosophy; Leo Trettler, music and humanities; Robert Ware, philosophy; Naomi Weinstein, psychiatry; Ira G. Wood, biochemistry; Benjamin D. Wright, education.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE

Ronald J. Baumgarten, chemistry; Irving D. Blum, English; Shirlee Blumenthal, English; James Bond, biology; Preston M. Browning, English; Melvin H. Buxbaum, English; Sabine Casten, chemistry; Louis Chandler, physics; Audley Connor, health service; Eloise J. Cornelius, social work; Herbert J. Curtis, mathematics; Robert De Mar, geology; Donald Dimmitt, art; Annette Elvolve, English; Frieda Engel, social work; Lloyd Engelbrecht, library; F. Carroll English, Spanish; M. Ferguson, student counseling; Beverly Fields, English; David Foulser, mathematics; Margaret George, history; Emily Goodman, history; Nicholas Goodman, mathematics; Louis Gordon, mathematics; William Gramp, economics; B. Greenwald, student counseling; Norman Gritz, French; Mary Hannaford, English; Jared Haslett, physics.

Marcia Heinemann, English; Elaine Z. Herzog, chemistry; Roscoe E. Hill, philosophy; Willis Jackman, English; Ted Jackson, speech and theater; Alexander Karnikas, English; Doroles Keranen, English; Bernard Kogan, English; Eliezer, Krumbein, education; Frederick Kuellmer, geology; John Kysar, health service; Joseph Landin, mathematics; Darrell Lemke, history; John Mackin, English; Ruth Marcus, philosophy; Ernest F. Masur, materials English; Milton C. Mayes,

library; Alan McConnell, mathematics; John D. McNee, art; A. R. Merrifield, social work; Marian W. Merrill, library; Robert L. Miller, chemistry; Karen J. Minge, English; Seymour Mirelowitz, social work; Judith Neri, English; Robert Pancnem, systems, English; John Pappademos, physics; M. H. Pitts, student counseling; Mary V. Reed, English.

Henry B. Russell, French; Constantine Santas, English; Richard Sherwood, library; H. P. Schuchman, health service; John B. Shipley, English; Mary C. Sidney, English; Diane Smith, English; James G. Smith, English; Pinkney C. Smith, history; Adam J. Sorkin, English; Michael J. Spencer, library; Paula D. Stone, English; James B. Stronks, English; William W. Tait, philosophy; Robert E. Terrill, English; Irving Thalberg, philosophy; John Vickers, philosophy; Richard S. Vission, English; John E. Walley, art; Samuel A. Weiss, English; Thomas Weissshaus, English; Herman B. Weissman, physics; Maurita Willett, English; Lester Winsberg, physics.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA

Charles A. Anderson, music; Floyd D. Anderson, speech; Guy T. Ashton, anthropology; David E. Aspnos, electrical engineering; James S. Ayars, Michael Barr, mathematics; I. David Berg, mathematics; Dorothy M. Black, library; Rudy Berg, English publications; Robert S. Blum, music; Dennis Boland, economics; Agnes E. Brandabur, English; Anne M. Brown, economics and education; John Callahan, English; Gerry Callis, art; Berenice A. Carroll, history; Robert Carroll, mathematics; Jacquelin Chase sociology; Richard Cleveland, mathematics.

Sandra Cleveland, mathematics; R. C. Conant, electrical engineering; Earl E. Davis, psychology; Frances Day, mathematics; Mahlon M. Day, mathematics; John J. DeBoer, education; M. Derber, labor and industrial relations; William J. Dodge, mathematics; Irene K. Dwyer, speech; J. W. Eisen, labor and industrial relations; A. M. Ervin, anthropology; Marianne A. Ferber, economics; A. Belden Fields, political science; Morris W. Flrebaugh, physics; Jacqueline W. Flenner, computer science; George N. Foster, art; Merlin J. Foster, computer science; Dale Franzwa, communications; Helen Franzwa, speech; L. B. Geislers, radio station; Viktors Geislers, agriculture.

Gene Gilmore, journalism; Michael J. Glaubman, physics; Diane L. Gotthell, political science; Mark P. Hale, Jr., mathematics; Mary-Elizabeth Hamstrom, mathematics; Richard Harvey, geologist; Edward W. Haurek, sociology; Ernest O. Herreid, food science; H. R. Johnson, compulsory science; Scott Keyes, urban planning; R. A. Kingery, engineering; Neil Kleinman, English; Daniel C. Kramer, political science; Robert Kubala, electrical engineering; Robert B. Lees, linguistics; D. A. Levin, labor and industrial relations; Harry Levy, mathematics; Lucretia Levy, mathematics; Jerry M. Lewis, Michael Lewis, sociology; Richard J. Loftus, English; Royal B. MacDonald, music.

Harold Mark, social work; Donald W. Markos, English; M. Marmo, labor and industrial relations; Thomas G. McLaughlin, mathematics; James R. Millar, economics; Kenneth Moore, anthropology; Howard Osborn, mathematics; Charles F. Osgood, mathematics; Hiram Paley, mathematics; P. J. Paley, labor and industrial relations; Sherman Paul, English; J. D. Phillips, economics; T. Thacher Robinson, mathematics; David Sachs, mathematics; Sandra J. Savignon, French; H. I. Schiller, economics and business research; Robert L. Schneider, English; W. H. Shoemaker, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese; Douglas D. Smith, mathematics; Arthur E. Sowers, physics.

David K. Stigberg, music; Gardiner Stillwell, English; Donald R. Taft, sociology (emeritus); C. Gomer Thomas, mathematics; Robert A. Tinkham, industrial education; Richard F. Tomassa, sociology; Kay S. Toness,

anthropology; Odin Toness, anthropology; John M. Treadrea, social studies; Steward L. Tuckey, food science; Preston H. Tuttle, English; Rudolph J. Vecoll, history; Richard Wasson, English; E. Weinberg, mathematics; Robert F. Welsh, English; J. S. Werry, child rescue center; Paula Westerlund, physical education; R. Westerlund, bureau of institutional research; Robin Whitney, mathematics; K. Witz, mathematics; Lynne Woods, English; Robert W. Woody, chemistry; Wilson M. Zaring, mathematics.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS MEDICAL CENTER

David H. Elwyn; Charles F. Lange, biochemistry; Harold Levine, medicine; John Levitsky, preventive medicine; A. S. Markowitz, microbiology; Kenrad Nelson, M.D.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Edgar Crane, marketing; William V. D'Antonio, sociology; J. Massingberd Ford, theology; Earl J. Johnson, theology; Donald P. Kammers, government; Joseph P. Locigno, theology; Daniel McDonald, English; Luke Miranda, theology; Peter J. Riga, theology; Ralph Sturm, English.

WILSON JUNIOR COLLEGE

J. S. Anderson, art; Rufus Baehr, social science; Robert Burlleigh, English; Charles R. Connell, modern language; Colleen Cummings, English; Earle G. Eley, English; William R. Gnatz, social science; June Griemlief, English; William I. Harber, physical science; Mavis Hoberg, social science; Conrad Levin, mathematics; Florence Levinson, child care; Elizabeth Loomis, child development; Robert L. Neville, social science; Leon Novar, social science; Yoa Sachs, humanities; Walter Schneeman, English; Joan W. Swift, child development.

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY AT WHITEWATER

Francis R. Coelho, art; William L. Lafferty, English; Thomas M. Parker, art; Everett Refior, economics; William O. Reichert, political science; David B. Saunders, English; Ruth A. Schauer, English; F. L. Sederholm, Spanish and theater; Gertrude S. Storm, biology.

WRIGHT JUNIOR COLLEGE

David F. Benegas, business; Jerome Blumenthal, humanities; June Brindell, English; Stuart Bonem, social science; Herbert R. Burgess, social science; Robert A. Johnston, speech; Helen Karamikas, humanities; Ernest A. Liden, Jr., social science; Per O. Loseth, humanities; Sue Portney, social science; Edward C. Reinfrank, sociology; William C. Resnick, psychology; Peter R. Senn, social science; Anne Shapiro, social science; Marvin Steinberg, social science; William L. Stevens, humanities; Carl F. Von Vogt, English; Meyer Weinberg, social science; B. A. Young, business.

OTHERS

R. C. Arnold, high energy physics, Argonne National Laboratory.

Edyth E. Barry, Southeast Junior College. Robert Benne, Christian ethics, Lutheran School of Theology.

John F. Bennett, English. Sandra Ben-Zeev, Southeast Junior College.

R. C. Brunet, high energy physics, Argonne National Laboratory.

Severyn T. Bruyn, sociology. A. Gordon Ferguson.

J. V. G. Forbes. Raymond A. Ford, speech.

David Griffith, high energy physics, Argonne National Laboratory.

Charles J. Harriman, Joliet Junior College. Clifford Holmes, psychology.

Myron R. Holmgren, Joliet Junior College. Rev. Charles E. Kenney, M. M., Maryknoll Seminary.

Ira A. Klipnis, Columbia College. John B. Koch, economics.

John M. Lamb, Lewis College. Harry Levine, Hektoen Institute.

David Lindberg, missions and world religion, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago.

Barbara Lowrey, Lewis College.
Alvin W. Lynn, history.
Joseph M. McFadden, Lewis College.
David Palmer, library.
Richard E. Palmer, MacMurray College.
Alan Peters, Columbia College.
Herbert Pinzke, Columbia College.
Spaulding Rogers, psychology.
Arthur L. Rosen, Hektoen Institute.
Eugene E. Schwartz, computer sciences, Illinois Institute of Technology.
J. Weiden Smith, MacMurray College.
George M. Stabler, sociology.
John Stobart, English, Joliet Junior College.
Father Benice Strack, chaplain, College of St. Francis.
Wieslaw Strzalkowski, Lewis College.
Rev. William H. Thompson.
N. Doyal Yaney, chemistry.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on January 22 Americans of Ukrainian descent pause and remember the Independence Day of Ukraine which was declared 48 years ago. Because their independence was so short lived, the Independence Day of the Ukrainian people is not a day of celebration. Unlike our Fourth of July, there will be no freedom speeches and no fireworks, for the people of Ukraine suffer under the tyranny of communism. Yet one thing is clear. The spirit of freedom and the longing for the day when they may once again enjoy self-determination remain intact within the safe sanctuary of the people's hearts and minds. The seed of freedom, once planted cannot be destroyed, and sooner or later, despite whatever difficulties or obstructions are placed in its path, the flower of freedom will emerge and the people will once again experience the joy and blessings of a free society. All Americans join with the many sons and daughters of Ukraine who have come to our shores hoping that the day will hasten when people everywhere will enjoy freedom and independence.

THE JOB CORPS CENTER AT TILLAMOOK, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. Ralph Bomback of Torrance, Calif., addressed to the people of Tillamook, Oreg., thanking them for what the Job Corps Center at Tillamook has done for her son. I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article from the Headlight Herald describing the dinner honoring Miss Esther Chapman of Tillamook, Oreg. This dinner was given by the corpsmen in appreciation for the outstanding job Miss Chapman is doing in working with corpsmen in administering general educational development tests.

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

[From the Tillamook (Oreg.) Headlight Herald, Jan. 2, 1966]

IT'S NICE TO HEAR * * *

The following letter came this week addressed "To the Citizens of Tillamook, Oreg."

It was delivered to the Chamber of Commerce office which in turn brought it to us. We think the thoughts expressed are about as nice a note with which to end the year of 1965 as any we could find.

"To the Citizens of Tillamook, Oreg., From a Mother Whose Son is in the Job Corps:

"I wish to extend one of the biggest 'thank you's' I have ever had the privilege to say. I wish to thank you for your patience and understanding toward my son and others like him in the Corps.

"I know at times it must be awfully hard to accept these boys away from home, as I realize there must be many problems they bring to your town, but try to realize that you are saving my son (at least) from a life that I felt was going to be a pretty sad one without a future. He was a school dropout at 18. He wasn't a bad boy, had never been arrested for anything, but he just couldn't keep up with school.

"Finding out about the Job Corps saved him, I feel, from a dull life ahead, to at least a decent future. It gave him an interest in life plus the fact that he is getting a little of the so important education we all know these boys need in this day and age.

"I feel so indebted to the Corps for what they're teaching him, and also your town for enduring their presence there.

"Bless you all during this year ahead and again my warmest 'thank you.'

"Gratefully yours,

Mrs. RALPH BOMBACK.

TORRANCE, CALIF."

[From the Tillamook Headlight Herald, Jan. 2, 1966]

MISS CHAPMAN HONORED AT CORPS GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CLASS DINNER

Miss Esther Chapman was a recent guest of honor at a Tillamook Job Corps Center dinner. The corpsmen who honored Miss Chapman are members of a recently formed General Educational Development class at the center, and included Roger Chinn, Huntington, W. Va.; Curtis Nichols, Beckley, W. Va.; Donald Neuman, Hanover, Ind.; Jerry Miller, Clinton, Mo.; Wilbur Miller, Richmond, Va.; Roosevelt Washington, Fort Pierce, Fla.; Linnell Cobbins, Kansas City, Mo.; Franklin Evans, Newton, Miss.; Bill Harvey, Saratoga, Calif., and Robert La Bar and Alvin Hanen, both from Austin, Tex.

At the dinner, Miss Chapman was presented with a corsage and a gift as a token of appreciation by the boys for her guidance and assistance in their taking the General Educational Development tests at the Tillamook High School.

The general educational development tests, which consist of five different categories, are given by Miss Chapman and are recognized nationwide as being equivalent to a high school diploma. If a person taking the test falls one or several categories he may take that part of the test again.

One of the corpsmen from the Tillamook Job Corps Center passed all of the tests and the results were forwarded to his local high school and State system of higher education; a group has several tests yet to complete and others will be taking the tests in the near future. The tests, which can now be taken by any Job Corps enrollee, are in cooperation with the Oregon State Department of Higher Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.; they will enable many boys who have not been able to complete their education an opportunity to do so. At this date the class at the Job Corps Center numbers 25 boys who are studying very hard.

Donald Neuman, the corpsman who passed the test in December, sums up his feelings and appreciation in the December issue of the Tillamook Job Corps Center Newsletter by saying, "I am very proud to have passed the tests and I'm grateful to Miss Chapman

who gave the tests to me at the Tillamook High School and the Job Corps counselors who made it possible for me to take the tests. I don't know how to express my feelings, but I do plan to stay in the Job Corps until I am capable of obtaining a good job. It will give me great pleasure to see my mother's face when I tell her I have passed the tests. Well, I can't think of more to say, except, I hope there will be many more boys who pass the tests in the new year of 1966, and every year to come."

When interviewed, Donald stated that he attributes his passing the tests to a lot of home study and reading after dropping out of the eighth grade, and the fact that he began to realize how important an education was when he began applying for a job.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a lot of uninformed criticism of the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. There has been a lot of informed criticism also. I think the letter from Mrs. Bomback and the story about Miss Chapman proves that this Job Corps program is helping to solve one of America's most fundamental problems. Mrs. Bomback should be congratulated for a wonderful letter of appreciation to the people of Tillamook, Oreg. The underprivileged youth of our country have a potential if given an opportunity—the Job Corps is providing that opportunity. We should expand it as rapidly as possible so that anyone knocking on the door can enroll in the Job Corps and be able to go to a Job Corps Center such as the one run by the Bureau of Land Management in Tillamook, Oreg.

Mr. President, I think this country will remember Lyndon Johnson as a great leader for calling on the American people to wage war on poverty. I take great pride in the fact that I served on the committee that reported the economic opportunity bill. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to feel that I have been a part of such a worthwhile effort. I would like to quote the words of Don Neuman, a corpsman who passed the general educational development tests in December:

I am very proud to have passed the tests and I'm grateful to Miss Chapman who gave the tests to me at the Tillamook high school and the Job Corps counselors who made it possible for me to take the tests. I don't know how to express my feelings, but I do plan to stay in the Job Corps until I am capable of obtaining a good job. It will give me great pleasure to see my mother's face when I tell her I have passed the tests. Well, I can't think of more to say, except, I hope there will be many more boys who pass the tests in the new year of 1966, and every year to come.

MEDICARE AND YOU

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on January 25, 1966, I was privileged to address the sustaining board of fellows of the Mount Sinai Hospital of Greater Miami. Because of the wide interest in medicare, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEDICARE AND YOU

(By Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF)

Today I am here to speak to you about one of the chief ways we as a nation have

mum of 2 years of service would be required as a qualification.

GI aids were given to the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, and the returns indicate that this was one of the best investments that our Government has ever made. Not only did it produce men of talent in many fields of endeavor but actually the entire program over a period of years was operated at no expense to the Government when it is taken into account that the earning power of many, many thousands of GI's was increased tremendously over what it might have been had they not have received education at the hands of the Government.

These men now in uniform and those to come may have to spend several years in the service of their country, thereby depriving them of opportunities to either secure an education or to make any substantial progress in occupations of their choice.

Under present conditions these boys are being called into service and they have no other recourse. We do not feel that any of them should be deprived of any benefits which have now become traditional simply to save a few million dollars yearly. This is particularly so when huge doles are being passed out to other segments of our population. We hope that the Yarborough bill in its present form will be enacted into law.

REMARKS THANKING THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn to the major address which I shall make this morning, I wish to say that when we finished the consideration of the District of Columbia minimum wage bill the other afternoon, I was called immediately from the floor to a press conference on the bill.

It was not called to my attention until yesterday that the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], very graciously made a few remarks in which he thanked me for what he considered to be a proper handling of the bill on the floor of the Senate. That is typical of the majority leader.

I am only sorry that I did not know of his remarks at the time, so that I could have thanked him then. I should like to have the RECORD show at this time my deep appreciation for his kind remarks. I also take the liberty of applying those remarks to my entire subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

The minimum wage bill was not my bill. It was the bill of the committee. What the distinguished majority leader had to say in regard to the passage of the bill should be said in behalf of the entire subcommittee, including the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROVY] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Republican members of the subcommittee, and also the bipartisan members of the full committee.

The subcommittee ironed out most of our differences on the minimum wage bill in the committee, as is often done. We understood that the amendments which were offered on the floor of the Senate would be offered by the minority, as it was their right to do. We let the Senate work its will on the amendments.

I not only thank the majority leader for his comments, but I also thank every

member of my subcommittee for their complete cooperation in the handling of the bill.

VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an article which appeared in the London Daily Telegraph in its issue of January 21. The author, writing from New York, is a noted commentator and American citizen, Arnold Beichman. But because of the necessity faced in writing for a British audience, his appraisal of the American dilemma in Vietnam takes on a somewhat different quality from that of much comment in our own press. Mr. Beichman has sought to clarify in a rational and objective manner the situation in which we find ourselves. He writes with sympathy for our dilemma, with an understanding of the history of our involvement, but with a high degree of penetration to the core of our dilemma.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Facing the Truth in Vietnam," appearing in the London Daily Telegraph, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

FACING THE TRUTH IN VIETNAM

(By Arnold Beichman)

(NOTE.—A distinguished American commentator on world affairs, who has visited South Vietnam three times, outlines America's real dilemma.)

New York.—Because we are children of Hollywood, it was easier to understand the war while crusing the South China Sea last summer in the U.S.S. *Midway* 100 miles off the Mekong Delta.

Here, in what seemed to me more monastery than battleship, lived 3,400 men with one aim. Still it was Hollywood, except bigger. With his permission, I sat upon the captain's throne on the bridge thinking of myself as John Wayne in some war epic of the sea, watching my planes catapult into the sparkling sunshine.

At Tan Hiep, an airstrip 22 miles southwest of Haiphong, it was a fragmented Sunday when I arrived. Silent men in overalls sat around under the big, sandbagged tent, long past waiting. Men, wearing their dark glasses, slept on cots; men reading—"Middle of the Journey," "Guns of August," something by Taylor Caldwell; men tipping a coffee jug.

A sharp ring on the telephone. It's for Captain McHugh, who steps forward, listens and flies off. He's a FAC—a forward air controller—Air Force designation for a pilot who creeps about at 2,000 feet and lower in a slow-moving L-19 telling supersonic jets from the *Midway* what he wants bombed. A chopper chugs in, American machinegunners at the open doors, lands, and is boarded by nine small Vietnamese soldiers, their helmets oversized.

The question didn't occur in the *Midway*, but it's here you ask: what are we doing in Vietnam, in the monsoon, in the dripping, hot sun?

Had President Eisenhower foreseen that American protection of southeast Asia and South Vietnam would be forever, would he have undertaken the obligation? Had he realized what the commitment meant, would President Kennedy have undertaken it and yet done so little to meet it? Or President Johnson, running on his own in 1964, pre-tending all was rosy in Vietnam while de-

nouncing Barry Goldwater as a warmonger? (I voted for Mr. Johnson.)

WHAT THIS WAR MEANS

This war is just beginning for Americans: 1,500 dead, 6,500 wounded, 120-odd missing since 1961. (Comparable figures for the Vietnamese: 35,000 killed in action, 80,000 wounded, 25,000 village civilian officials assassinated.)

As wars go, this one is as different for us as the American Revolution was for gentlemanly Johnny's English grenadiers. Any war is different when a boobytrap is a needle-sharp bamboo stake tipped in human excrement. We are now learning why this war is different and what the infusion of Marxism into the mysterious East has meant to that continent and its islands.

The war really began in 1960. Today, perhaps a handful of Americans understand the logic of the American presence, why that presence must be maintained and what it will take to make that presence endure; that, no matter what, South Vietnam will be a permanent American base with a minimum of 100,000 occupation troops and a billion dollars a year in economic aid, assuming that there is a stalemate.

I am not at all sure how many administration leaders really understand all this because they themselves may, by now, believe their own "cover" stories. For all these years everything about Vietnam was a fiction, a willing suspension of disbelief with miracles every day at no cost to anybody.

It is hard to tell an electorate, however sympathetic, that their country is involved in a faraway place for the unforeseeable future, that it could mean a land war, that precisely because you are a super power with super weapons you can't use the super weapons because—well, you just can't.

Miracles were going to do it—workhorse helicopters; flare-planes to make the sun stand still; amphibious vehicles for flooded paddies; the green-beret special forces; the American "advisers"; Maxwell D. Taylor, general, Ambassador and proconsul; defoliation chemicals; fortified enclaves jutting into the sea; and, until the year-end lull, the bombing of North Vietnam.

The big truth still to penetrate "the inner eye" of the administration is that a professional revolutionary with a gun can match a professional soldier even with the 7th Fleet or Air Force behind him. This does not denigrate American courage nor exaggerate Vietcong moral zeal; just a description of the state of things in Vietnam, better expressed, perhaps, by Maj. Gen. Edward T. Lansdale (retired), now in Saigon as an Embassy civilian trying out some theories:

"The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money, and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated * * *. The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam and it will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways."

So wrote General Lansdale in October 1964; it hasn't changed much since.

Those who would argue against these propositions should first explain why the most super-super-powerful military force this world has ever seen, capable of arranging a triumphant vehicular rendezvous in space, cannot arrange a victorious military rendezvous on land; and why this superforce cannot beat back an insurrection of black-

pajamaed peasants and hard-core soldiers, average height barely 5 feet 4 inches.

We are not yet serious about the war in Vietnam because of a decade of official dissimulation—but we soon will be. For all these years, three Presidents have protected us from a sense of involvement, so much so that most Americans have been shocked by the overpowering passions of that minority of protestants demonstrating against the war; why are these boys with beards and girls with low-heeled shoes so engaged when nobody else seems to be? Even those Americans, particularly our literary intellectuals, who don't think it is inherently evil to resist communism, have little faith in the war and are really moral neutrals.

FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND

Unlike Korea and Cuba where everything was visible and understandable, Vietnam represents the first time America has fought a so-called "war of liberation," a type of confrontation whose politics our culture simply does not comprehend. The smalltown Clausewitzes in Congress who insist that saturation bombing of the North can win will never understand the politics of "liberation wars."

I am unsure that, after years of being kidded, the American people will understand:

1. From October 1954 (when Mr. Eisenhower told President Ngo Dinh Diem that in return for American aid he would be expected to undertake "needed reforms") until 1960 it was, "Do nothing and the Vietnam will go away"—frightened at the mere presence of Americans.

2. From 1959 to the end of 1960, there was the odd assassination of a village chief, the odd ambush and the fortified hamlet concept, another miracle which didn't work. No sweat; if Hanoi acts up, we'll lean on them a little and they'll go away.

3. From 1961 on, the slogan is "We're winning." As late as June 1964, Gen. Paul D. Harkins was saying: "The military situation is coming along fine now." Mr. McNamara, the Defense Secretary, on October 3, 1964, said: "The major part of the U.S. military task in Vietnam can be completed by the end of 1965." In fact, this is the year—1966—we were to begin withdrawal of our troops at the rate of 1,000 a month.

4. Since we were winning, it was silly to suggest realistic military-political planning and budgeting. Underestimating Hanoi was a good thing because you could then honorably underestimate the cost of the war. Today the daily American expenditure, military and economic, is at the rate of \$20 million a day—\$7 million. It isn't enough now, it won't be enough in 6 months and even the proposed \$60 billion defense budget won't be enough in 1967.

FANTASY AND FACT

5. The naughtiest fantasy of all was the belief that the overthrow of Diem would end the rot. By late 1962, Diem was a lost cause and whatever qualities of statesmanship could be imputed to him in the mid-fifties had crumbled into paranoia. Yet what did the anti-Diem coup accomplish?

6. Then came the trumpeted American manpower increase intended to cow the enemy. It didn't. Each time we sent in more men, hoping to take the offensive, Hanoi infiltrated a couple of combat regiments south of the 17th parallel and the ratios remained the same.

7. Now we stand on the brink—either the President goes for broke or else the "liberation war" strategy is proven successful.

Asian communism as well as Soviet communism have made a huge investment in this "liberation" war for southeast Asia. If America is in deep water, so is Hanoi. That may be America's only hope.

It is clear by now that Hanoi's strategy for victory, since it has ruled out face-to-face

combat, is the "nibble-them-to-death" strategy, which at this stage calls for intensive political and paramilitary activity in the provinces and terrorism in the cities; encouragement of the international "peace" campaign and, lastly, fashioning some formula by which the United States can withdraw without losing face.

Beyond the problem of miscalculation is the ultimate question: does the Johnson administration by now understand the politics of "liberation wars"? If they don't, and the Korean mentality takes over, then half a million men and a formal declaration of war against Hanoi will not be enough to avert the peril of an all-out land war.

This peril stems from the clash between the Communist policy of rollback, a cruder word for "liberation," and the American policy of containment. Can containment stop a rollback ideology? Thus far containment has failed in South Vietnam, despite the escalation.

So * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business authorized under the unanimous-consent agreement is closed.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the subject matter that most people in the country think is pending before the Senate; namely, the bill that seeks to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I shall discuss it under the general title, "The Repeal of Section 14(b), Fact or Fiction."

The repeal of section 14(b) is not pending before the Senate, although many people think it is. The people of our country are still not fully aware of the fact that what is pending before the Senate is the procedural question: "Shall the Senate proceed to consider the bill calling for the repeal of section 14(b)?"

Ordinarily when the majority leader makes a request that a bill on the calendar be made the pending business of the Senate, it takes about 30 seconds to make the measure the pending business of the Senate.

It is my belief that the majority leader is entitled to such procedural cooperation from the Senate at all times, and that Senators who are opposed to a measure should base their objections to it in the form of discussion of the substantive legislation.

I am keenly disappointed that we are confronted in the Senate with a filibuster on the issue of taking up the measure. I am sure that the American people are not aware of the procedural reality which confronts the Senate at this time.

I am of the opinion that the American people would want us to proceed to the

consideration of the bill on its substance and to vote the measure up or down.

I have no doubt that if we took the measure up on its substance, there would be Senators who might use whatever parliamentary rights the rules permit to prolong the debate and seek to prevent a vote on the bill by way of a filibuster. Under the existing rules of the Senate, that is their privilege.

As the Senate knows, since 1946 the senior Senator from Oregon has introduced from time to time the Morse anti-filibuster resolution, which would modify rule XXII so that a filibuster could not be conducted which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on a measure.

There are those who, not knowing my record in the Senate, are always a little surprised when I offer the Morse anti-filibuster resolution, because they well know that I do not hesitate to filibuster in the Senate if I think the fact situation in the Senate justifies a filibuster for a period of time.

However, I have never participated and never will participate in a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring on a measure.

It is that type of filibuster that I have sought since 1946, to declare "outlawed" in the Senate because the majority of the Senate is entitled to work its will, if certain fact situations are complied with, on any piece of legislation. Those major fact situations, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, illustrate why from time to time I have engaged in a filibuster, and will engage in a filibuster again, when I think it is necessary to gain sufficient time for the people of this country to be afforded an opportunity to be apprised as to what is going on in the Senate in connection with a given measure.

I will filibuster under those circumstances to gain time so that the eyes of the public can be focused on the Senate, and so that the Senate may be prevented from taking precipitate action on a piece of legislation on which public opinion might be different if public opinion knew the facts.

My colleagues have heard me say before that a good example of this type of filibuster is the filibuster which I initiated in 1951 when the Eisenhower administration brought to the floor of the Senate in the middle of one afternoon the atomic energy bill which had passed the House earlier that day after less than 2½ hours of debate.

It was a bill that sought to give away to the private utilities of this country and to the vested interests the entire taxpayer investment in the atomic energy program developed during the war. It was a bill which amounted to more than \$14 billion, and for which the taxpayers would receive not 1 cent in return.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. In just a moment, when I finish this thought.

So I objected to a unanimous-consent request that was made by the Republican majority leader of the Senate at that time to agree to vote on the atomic energy bill that day. When I objected to it, I said that I thought there should

January 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1371

ple issue, which should be considered on its merits, with the mature judgment and calm reason for which this body is so justly famed.

Those who attempt to becloud the issue are seeking only to disrupt its calm and factual consideration; and I say they are using these methods because they know their cause is otherwise lost, and deserves to be. Let us look to the truth, and let us act on it.

Mr. President, let us recognize what section 14(b) really is. It is a device to impose a compulsory open shop on the workers in the so-called right-to-work States.

The section should be repealed in the interest of common fair play and constitutional justice in respect to the constitutional right of workers and employers everywhere in the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the guidance of Senators, it was agreed that I should have the floor about this time—that is an informal agreement—and it is understood that I shall expect to be through about 2:30, and at that time I shall ask for a quorum, which will be live. It is again my understanding that that is to be the only live quorum call of the day, other than the one already had. I say this, Mr. President, for the guidance of Senators, and so that if any Senator understands differently, I may be corrected in my understanding of the situation.

A REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I propose today to analyze the monumental struggle in which we are engaged in Vietnam, and to state the results of a visit which I made there from January 6-15 as a member of the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, with the authority of the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] accompanying me on this visit was Richard R. Aurelio, my administrative assistant and Lt. Col. Robert L. Sickler, U.S. Army escort officer. Also joining my party, on authority of the House Government Operations Committee, was Congressman OGDEN R. REID, of New York.

I do not wish anyone to assume that after spending a week in Vietnam, I pretend to be an expert on that country. This was a relatively short trip. But it did give me some feel of the situation. I was able to travel throughout South Vietnam, from Danang to the Mekong Delta, and to talk with out commanders on the ground; with officials of the Vietnamese Government, including the Prime Minis-

ter and the Deputy Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, and other officials; with American officials, both civilian and military; and with Vietnamese citizens themselves. I spent an evening on the U.S.S. *Hancock*, visited a number of military installations and visited a number of villages and met with several village chiefs. I also had the opportunity of inspecting a very important series of camps, in which leadership material for the Vietnamese villages and hamlets was being developed.

The conclusions which I have drawn, and my reasons for those conclusions, are not based alone upon this trip, for I have been engaged in long study and consideration of the matter.

It will be recalled that I have been a most ardent advocate of a full-scale congressional debate on Vietnam, to be preceded by hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I introduced in June of 1965 a resolution, suggesting that it be the focal point for such debate.

We also know, however, that no such debate will have any real focal point unless the President comes to us seeking a resolution such as the one he obtained in August 1964. Then, and then only, will we be able to get the relevant committees to "zero in" on this issue.

I have asked the Foreign Relations Committee time and again for a hearing on the resolution introduced by Senator RANDOLPH and myself, and it has been denied. I can perhaps understand why, because on a matter as sensitive and delicate as war and peace, members of the Foreign Relations Committee may quite properly feel that they should not proceed to engender a hearing followed by a debate unless the President wishes it.

Mr. President, I feel very keenly that everything that has occurred so far represents a confirmation of the fact that such congressional debate is urgently required in the interests of the country. It would result in answering the concern of millions of Americans, and it would result, in my judgment, in solidifying and crystallizing the support of the country for our basic policy in Vietnam, with perhaps some improvements.

I am convinced that, although the country overwhelmingly supports the President, there is a deep disquiet in the hearts of many Americans who support the President as to where we are going, and why. I believe that if Congress is brought into partnership with the President on this issue, it is likely that the country will be very much more in favor of our policy.

So, as I start my observations and give my views and recommendations, I again urge the President to seek a congressional debate.

The reason I express my views today in a crystallized way, instead of waiting for that debate, is that life marches on, and decisions must be made, whether or not the President seeks a congressional debate. Therefore, if any Senator wishes to have any effect on those decisions, we must take the only way open to us to express ourselves, and that is what I am doing today.

Mr. President, with that background, and without in any way derogating from my conviction concerning congressional debate, I come to the following conclusions:

First. Vietnam is not simply a local conflict but a war of aggression by North Vietnam backed by Communist China and the Soviet Union with the design of establishing a Communist dictatorship in South Vietnam. We are in this conflict because we are a world power with world responsibilities.

Second. The war in Vietnam is another phase in the struggle of freedom against totalitarianism and its outcome will have a profound effect on the fate of all Asia. This is the confrontation. We did not choose this confrontation; history and circumstances have forced it upon us, and we must make the best of it.

Third. The military effort in the south, centered as it is on the coastal enclaves, shows some hopeful signs. These signs have convinced me that the commitment of future resources in the magnitude proposed by the President will enhance our main purpose—giving the Vietnamese people a fair chance to determine their own future. Meaningful elections cannot be held until the country is pacified; people cannot vote freely from fear.

Fourth. The big deficiency in U.S. activities is not military, but economic and social. We have failed to sufficiently identify ourselves with those who favor economic reform and with the social revolution in South Vietnam. I, therefore, urge the President to appoint a Special Representative for Civil Affairs to Vietnam in order to enlarge, accelerate, and coordinate the U.S. civil affairs program in South Vietnam.

Fifth. United States and South Vietnamese forces can turn back North Vietnam militarily within a reasonable period of time, perhaps even within not more than 2 years. What will take time is the construction of South Vietnam sufficient to enable its people to freely choose their own way. I am speaking of construction in terms of land reform, health, education, housing, communication, and markets. These tasks are not impossible. They were accomplished in the Philippines at the turn of the century, with our aid. This was accomplished in Malaya by the United Kingdom with equal success.

The situation in North Vietnam, as I see it, is an aspect of the whole problem concerning Communist China. Indeed, it may prove to be only a small aspect in the corridor of history, but it is an aspect of a policy which is still developing. I refuse to agree with those who see the Vietnamese action as being the first step in some kind of atomic arms showdown with Communist China. I do not agree with that point of view at all. I am optimistic enough to believe that ultimately we shall find some way of living with Communist China. Indeed, we must, in the interest of all mankind. We will have to come to that situation, either by negotiation, perhaps through some kind of concessions, and even by showing a little steel when the situation requires it. It would be a mistake, in my opinion, for the American people to look at this

situation except upon that broad canvas.

It is said in Asia that relations among nations are composed of two factors: Face and patience. Let us never forget that, as the American people appraise our Vietnam situation.

Let me also suggest to all Americans who have any illusions about the detente which we are undergoing with the Soviet Union at the present time, that I believe the Soviet Union is ambivalent about it. On the one hand, they would like to have a detente with us, resulting in better relations, more trade, and cultural exchanges; and they have made some moves in that direction. But, their once overriding desire is that they be the leaders of the Communist world. Hence, I believe that they will incur serious risk, including the risk which they are incurring now in backing and supplying North Vietnam—which they are doing to the full, in my judgment—but they are incurring that risk because of their priority desire to be the leaders of the Communist world.

America had better understand that situation, and be under no illusions, at one and the same time that we seek to better our relations with the Soviet Union in various areas, whether it be a nonproliferation treaty, trade, cultural exchanges, and so forth.

Mr. President, at this particular moment, attention is focused on the President's decision regarding resumption of the bombing of military targets and supply lines in North Vietnam or, as an alternative, a continuance of the bombing pause, which began over a month ago.

The President's decision is said to be imminent.

Mr. President, I feel—as I have felt before on other issues—that the President and the people are entitled to know where the Senate stands on this issue.

In stating my views as to the bombing pause, I refer only to the same ground rules under which the bombing was conducted until the pause took effect. I am against escalation of the bombing to include large population centers such as Hanoi and Haiphong under present conditions. The President, I believe, should decide the question of the bombing pause based on two criteria: First, has the peace offensive failed to elicit a positive response from Hanoi; Second, does the security of U.S. Forces in South Vietnam require a resumption of the limited bombing carried on until the pause?

Let me make one point clear at the outset. I have favored the U.S. peace offensive and the bombing pause in the North in order to underscore to the world our objectives and our desire for peace. But everything we can see indicates that the peace offensive seems to have failed. What remains is the continued impact of world opinion on Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. It is true that the mission to Moscow of Prime Minister Harold Wilson is scheduled for February 21 to 24; and, based on information as to this mission, I am sure the President will consider it as a factor in determining whether to end or continue the bombing pause. But for practical

purposes, the President will have every right to consider the peace offensive to have been rebuffed as of now.

Hanoi has had 35 days to consider coming to the peace table, and nations all over the world have made unsuccessful appeals in one form or another seeking a positive response. Instead, Hanoi has publicly vowed to intensify the war, has urged the destruction of U.S. "aggressors," and has called for the annihilation of the South Vietnamese "puppets."

Coupled with these belligerent statements has been the hard evidence that Hanoi has used the lull in bombing to repair bridges and roads and to accelerate its infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam. When I say hard evidence, I may say that I have seen it.

Under those circumstances we must face the military consequences. This is the key point, and the key point which faces the President, in deciding whether or not to continue the pause. Somewhere or somehow, we must face the military facts.

No one familiar with Vietnam denies that the past bombing along the supply routes in North Vietnam has had an adverse effect on Vietcong military operations in South Vietnam. There are only differences of degree on this matter. The fact that the bombing has had an effect, whether decisive or not, is supported by the judgment of our commanders in the field and by my own observation, as well as that of many others.

Let us also remember that only last year the Vietcong could live off the land in South Vietnam and off the people. Now, because of the American presence, the Vietcong must receive most of their supplies from the north.

In sum, it is the President who has the necessary information in his hands to answer the question of the security of our forces. Every American, however, must remember that in this debate on bombing we are talking about the lives of American troops and of exposing them to the hazards of even greater casualties than they need to be exposed to. This week alone, the figures show 21 killed and 193 wounded among American forces, and the ARVN—that is, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam forces—have suffered even greater casualties; 209 killed and 404 wounded.

There is much speculation as to whether, if the bombing is resumed on the North Vietnam supply routes with the same limitations as in the past, it will bring in Communist China. Let us remember that the Communist Chinese could have come in at any time in 1965; but they did not. Moreover, I do not see any new reasons for the Communist Chinese to change their minds now. We must always remember that they have the capability to intervene.

I am impressed by the fact that our commanders understand that fact well. It is one reason why we have always taken the position—and I agree with the President on this—that we should not repeat the Korean war strategy of sending our troops beyond the main theater of battle, in this case, South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is hundreds of miles away from the Red Chinese bases, and our commanders tells us that the problem of logistics, of supplies and aircraft would present such tremendous obstacles that we would be able to handle their intervention.

Let me emphasize that we are not trying to bait Red China. We want them to stay away, and that is why our actions to date have been limited.

Under all these circumstances, based on the criteria I have given, I feel that the President is entitled to know now who will support him if he ends the bombing pause. And I believe that, using the criteria which I have set forth in making his decision, the President would and should have the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people if he decides to resume the limited bombing; and he would deserve my support, and I shall support him.

In many ways, it is regrettable that our discussions in the Vietnam situation have become so obsessed with the question of bombing North Vietnam's supply lines. This is really an ancillary issue. But it is symptomatic of a problem we in this country have had from the beginning in discussing the Vietnam crisis—the interest tends always to generate around the military aspects of the struggle, when in fact the political aspects will be far more decisive as to realizing the objectives for which we and the Army of the Republic of Vietnam—ARVN—are fighting.

The military effort is not the end, but the beginning of the process.

On my recent visit to South Vietnam, I became convinced that many of the fears and apprehensions which have been expressed in connection with our military operations are in fact unwarranted.

Our military commitment there—generally in the presently contemplated order of magnitude of 190,000 to 350,000 personnel—is justified by the nature of the struggle and the issues which are at stake. Some have expressed concern in this country that our military forces are seeking to secure every acre of real estate in South Vietnam from the Vietcong. But this concern does not square with the strategy in Vietnam. I found that General Westmoreland and other officers under his command are quite conscious of the danger of getting involved in a "bottomless Asian land war."

I do not believe there is any such danger so long as we continue to confine our major operations, as we are now doing, to within 30 to 50 miles of the major coastal Mekong Delta and Saigon areas of South Vietnam. These areas encompass most of the population, some 70 to 80 percent, and they are within convenient reach of our air and naval forces.

I found our military command in South Vietnam also recognizes that in a political war, the struggle is for people, not real estate, and that this is the strategy to be pursued.

The defeat of main force Vietcong units and North Vietnamese forces is certainly a necessary objective, but our purpose in waging the struggle must be to establish the security of these major population areas and to begin the process

January 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1373

of economic and social construction within these secured confines.

I do not find our military situation there so "open-end" as to engender the gloomy and pessimistic feeling one finds in the report of Senator MANSFIELD's special committee. Militarily, the situation is at least encouraging. Much is made of the fact that the enemy is no weaker today relatively speaking than before the U.S. military buildup in South Vietnam. Since 1965, when it looked like the South Vietnamese Government would fold, we have had an accelerated and a new military approach to the situation.

So what this argument overlooks is that the impact of our buildup is just beginning to be felt. We have not yet overcome all logistic, billeting, and supply problems—but we are in the process of doing so.

To say that the Vietcong today are as strong as they were a year ago is also questionable. There are indications, brought to my attention on my recent visit to Vietnam, that while a year ago the prevailing view among the South Vietnamese was that the Vietcong would win, the prevailing view now is just the opposite.

Moreover, there are signs—based on the interrogation of prisoners—that the Vietcong has been strained by the increasing mobility and firepower of the American and ARVN forces, that its discipline and morale have suffered, and that it is having increasing difficulties in recruitment and in providing supplies to its troops.

Mr. President, I did not wish to overestimate this point. I know, having myself served in the Armed Forces, that although the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong might be weakening in their capability and determination, they cannot be counted out. But it would also be a mistake to underestimate the impact of our military operations on the Vietcong. I found the Mansfield committee report overly gloomy on this point.

Also, I believe that we in the United States must not make the mistake the administration made a year ago. At that time, the administration presented to us many optimistic reports. I am sure they were made in good faith and based on information that Secretary McNamara and others thought was reliable. We did not "win the struggle" in a year. Our troops are still there and there will, unhappily, be more to go.

I have further observation on ground action. I am not an expert on this matter, but I believe the morale of our troops is very high. The caliber of those in command of our military establishment in Vietnam impressed me greatly. And I was greatly impressed also by the excellent relationship between officers and men.

I saw many New Yorkers out among the troops. I personally talked with 500 soldiers, sailors, and marines from New York. I found among them, with one exception—499 to 1—a clear understanding of our objective and mission, which was a source of great pride to me as an American and as a Senator.

I wish I could say the same with respect to parlor conversations I have had in the United States about the understanding of the reasons we are in Vietnam and what it is about.

Mr. President, in this connection I wish to say a word to my fellow liberals. I have been frequently called a liberal, and I have always been proud of it. But what I have just said in support of our military operations in Vietnam finds me obviously at variance with some part of the liberal community, a community to which I am proud to belong.

I have given long and studied consideration to their point of view. But I cannot agree with it. I believe the struggle in Vietnam is worthy of the United States. I believe it is worthy of the cause of freedom. I believe it needs to be waged and I believe it deserves the support of the liberals.

South Vietnam is the zone of contact in the struggle for the freedom of Asia. And those who see it as anything else are fooling themselves.

The issues are no less vital to our national interest than were the issues involved in our aid to Greece in 1947, when the Truman doctrine was proclaimed, when, as a freshman Representative from New York, I had the privilege of working for it and voting for it.

The liberal community's reservations were overcome at that time, because of the realization that it was an example of internal subversion, directed, supplied, and controlled by external Communist forces seeking to hasten a dictatorship. It was in our national interest to meet such Communist aggression in Southeastern and Eastern Europe, and to contain such Communist expansion; and we did it with bipartisan support.

We faced another example of Communist aggression in South Korea, when it was invaded by organized Communist units from Communist China, and we again met the threat.

We met this threat at great cost. It was the same basic threat as we now face. We had reasonable enough success. No one can concede that Korea is perfect, but it is better off than it would have been. I believe we have a good prospect for doing the same thing in South Vietnam, to justify the cost.

I should like to say, again parenthetically, in connection with my remarks, one other thing: I think the sense of nonassurance among many of the people in the country with respect to the situation in South Vietnam has tended, in a most unfortunate way, to depreciate the sacrifices of our troops there. If there is nothing else that is remembered from what I say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, I hope that the country will be roused in its conscience to recognize that every one of the men and women who fall or are wounded in South Vietnam is as heroic as any soldier of the United States who fought in any war of the United States—the War of the Revolution, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II. These men and women are entitled to the deep gratitude of every American, because they are fall-

ing in a cause. We may be right or we may be wrong, but it is a cause which is dedicated to the well-being of a nation, to some rule of law, to some rule of order in the world, and to the fact that people cannot get away with naked aggression. We do much talking after the fact about the Munichs and the Ruhrs and the Manchurias. We are fighting to prevent repetitions of these.

Today, whatever may have been the errors of commission and omission in our policy in southeast Asia in the past, the incontrovertible fact is that the confrontation between freedom and totalitarianism in Asia is now in Vietnam. We did not choose this battleground; history chose it for us. It is clear to me—and I think it is clear on the evidence—that the Vietcong is directed, supplied, and controlled by a Communist state—North Vietnam—that seeks to expand Communist-controlled area, to destroy the chance for freedom, and to humiliate the United States, freedom's most effective defender in Asia. Even if the action began as a local insurgency, which is questionable, it certainly is not one now.

While I am convinced that it is within our capability militarily to secure within a period of a few years the major population and rice-growing centers of South Vietnam, I am not so optimistic that our Government and our people are prepared for the tremendous task facing us over a much longer period to make certain that the purpose of the war is not lost.

I reject the word "victory," which I think is not appropriate to what we are doing in Vietnam. Much needs to be done to identify our country more dynamically with the social revolution which the people of South Vietnam so fervently desire, and on which they have spent so many lives.

So much needs to be done to win the people over to democratic ideals, to self-determination, to bring about truly representative government through free elections, to shake up the vested interests which for so long have exploited the peasants, and to get underway meaningful programs of land reform, medical care, education, housing, markets, and roads.

Our efforts in the political, social, and economic areas seem to me to be far from adequate. We seem to be doing many little things, but none of them very well. We have there a number of highly capable individuals who have an impressive understanding of Vietnamese problems, and all of them are working hard in diversified areas, but none of this work is being done on a highly urgent basis, nor on a large enough scale; and beyond all else, whatever else may be said about it, the work is uncoordinated.

The real question, then, is that if we prevail—and, indeed, I believe we shall—in the military struggle, can we do something with our achievement? Can we do something with the fruit of pacification of major parts of the country? Can we do something about the development of the Republic of Vietnam worthy of the effort we have put into the struggle

something which will be geared to the purpose for which we have fought in Asia?

I point out that there are special conditions in South Vietnam which might conceivably enable it to be a beacon, like West Berlin, in Communist land. For one, Vietnam is a country which is essentially concentrated on the coast. That is a very important point, because the country is within reach of sea and air power. For another, Vietnam has a relatively small population, about 14 million. There is plenty of land, and thus plenty of room in which to move around.

Third, it is a country which is not only self-sufficient in food, which is a very important point in trying to make something of a viable and model state out of it; it has a surplus of food for export to other Asian nations. Vietnam has been traditionally a granary for other nations.

Fourth, as the President pointed out many months ago in his speech at Johns Hopkins, the Mekong River Delta is capable of very important power, reclamation, navigation, and industrial development, and the United States is prepared to put large aid at the disposal of Vietnam—the whole area, including North Vietnam—in order to bring about economic improvement in that area.

So there are real possibilities in South Vietnam, and we should emphasize the positive as well as the negative.

That brings us to a question in which I was much interested when I visited Vietnam, and upon which I should like to say something now: that is, the will of the people of South Vietnam. Let us never forget that we are there not because this is America's show, but because we are trying to help the people of South Vietnam retain their freedom if they wish it. I should like to emphasize that—if they wish it. Therefore, to ascertain what is their will becomes a critically important factor in the American presence, for I feel that the United States should not be there unless the United States is really wanted. But I feel also that having given the people of Vietnam an opportunity, without fear, without terror, to choose their own course, we shall have to abide by their decision. If there are a few members of the Vietnamese Government whom we do not like, that is just too bad. That is endemic in the kind of society we want. All we seek is the opportunity; we cannot dictate the terms. I think it is appropriate that the world understand clearly that that is the American attitude.

What is the will of the people of South Vietnam? It is quite clear to me that it is absolutely impossible to determine the will of the people at this time, either by election or otherwise.

While we must seek to get a free and genuine expression of that will at the earliest opportunity—and in that respect, some kind of a plebiscite or other vote under the auspices of the United Nations might prove very useful—we must realize that we cannot get an honest expression from the people of South Vietnam until we reduce certain impediments to an honest expression—namely,

the fear of the Vietcong terror tactics, the fear of their leaders, and even the fear of the American troops.

We must understand that this is a people who have suffered the scourge of war for something like 18 years, since the end of World War II, and even before by Japanese occupation. We must remember, too, that, in addition the Vietcong terrorists have killed as many as 11,000 village officials and hamlet officials in South Vietnam in 1 year, 1965. Translated into U.S. population figures, this would be 350,000 municipal officials.

This is the impact which those people have suffered.

If the South Vietnamese were to vote today, they would vote in whatever manner they believe would be the least likely to get them injured or killed.

Nor can we achieve an honest test for freedom until the proper economic and social reforms are established. One study, which has been called to my attention, indicates that most of the South Vietnamese who are attracted to the Vietcong do so for mostly economic and social reasons, while they pointedly agree that the Vietcong has little or no relation to freedom. In other words, conditions are such that many people in Vietnam prefer security to freedom and even bread. That is our challenge. We must see to it that South Vietnam, with our assistance, brings about a substantial change in conditions that will give freedom an honest chance.

Our strategy for doing this has been a pacification program. Hence, when the military has made a hamlet physically secure from Vietcong attack, the Government should be able to move in, and bring about necessary economic and social reforms. We are told that of the 15,000 hamlets in South Vietnam, about 3,800 are now pacified. Many regard this figure as an exaggeration, but even if true, the dimensions of the problems are great indeed.

The matter of pacification is so urgent that our Armed Forces in the areas in which they operate, the perimeters in which they are established, are now making it a practice to move out into the villages in those perimeters in an effort to bring about pacification, reform, and better conditions.

That is one of the reasons why I said this part of the effort in Vietnam is most uncoordinated, but it is the most important, in my judgment. That is what we are there for, and it is an effort in which there is little efficiency. The individuals are not working 20 hours a day, but that is because we have not seen fit, in a governmental sense, to recognize the need for giving that effort a high priority and making it our No. 1 effort.

Our pacification program has operated somewhat in a haphazard way, in the hands of a number of agencies. For example, it is being carried on by the military formations themselves. The effort is being carried on by the U.S. Operations Mission—USOM—which is the aid agency for South Vietnam. It is being carried on by an organization called JUSPAO—Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office—which includes the USIA, and it is being carried on by other agencies in

South Vietnam. However, none of these has the priority or the financial ability to get the job done.

To tie these efforts together, and to give them purpose, urgency, and direction, the President should appoint a Special Representative, analogous to the title given to Averell Harriman in connection with the Marshall plan in 1948 and 1949. This Special Representative would have the final authority in coordinating all of the activities in aid and information of the United States which is being pursued by the various agencies, including the military.

This Special Representative would also have the mission of bringing about the establishment of an in-country advisory committee on aid for coordinating mechanisms broadly representative of the Government and the people of South Vietnam.

It is extremely important to have self help and participation of an indigenous character. There should be complete authority in coordinating American civil affairs efforts. There should be authority to bring together a representative committee of the government and people of South Vietnam to help in respect of the matter. The American voluntary organizations and the general private U.S. sector, ought to be brought into the effect, thus giving the American people a more direct interest in the success of economic and social reconstruction of the Republic of Vietnam.

In short, I recommend that we expand pacification efforts dramatically, that we place them under one overall director, and that a major effort be made to enlist U.S. citizens and business participation in the program.

Mr. President, to indicate what can be done, I report to the Senate on one of the most encouraging efforts in this pacification field which I inspected on my visit to Vietnam. This concerns the establishment, with the U.S. assistance, of a political-action training school at a place called Vung Tau, southeast of Saigon.

I personally inspected three camps which are concerned in this effort. Almost 3,000 students are being trained now to become pacification cadres in the various hamlets.

There are said to be 23,000 men already—and some women—being trained in nursing and medical care, operating as cadres at this time.

A cadre consists of 40 persons and they are really a kind of armed paramilitary peace corps. They move into a hamlet for a period of months, 3 or 4 months, to protect and to buck up the local people, and also to serve them in any way possible.

They will help the people gather crops, run a health clinic, put through a road, a drainage ditch, and do whatever else may be required in an attempt to awaken in the people a consciousness of nationhood which, in the main, they do not have now.

The goal for this year is to achieve a force of 43,000, with the hope of pacifying another 1,000 or more hamlets in 1966.

Given a figure of roughly 15,000, with a claimed 3,800 amenable to some gov-

January 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1375

ernmental control, and a thousand expected to be added in 1966, it is very clear that this is not an American-sized type of effort. It certainly does not have the priority which the situation requires.

I point out, also, that there are some 600,000 refugees in that part of Vietnam under the control of the South Vietnamese Government, rather than under the Vietcong control.

It is highly significant that when people have fled from their homes because of Vietcong terror, they have not moved in with the Vietcong. No one ever looks to the Communists to give them a helping hand. Even the most illiterate peasant knows that if he wants bread, shelter, or security, he must go to the American side or to the side of those with whom we are working. They never go to the Communist side.

It is a fantastic thing, and yet somehow or other we are unable to make this count as the great political fact that it is. But there are some 600,000 Vietnamese refugees who have moved over to our side, and they, in terms of the pacification program, represent a great opportunity. Those 600,000 have the potential for becoming a vast cadre. They are within our perimeters, where we can give them the same kind of concern, training and interest that we are giving the cadres which I have already described. I hope very much we will attack that job in the massive way which it deserves.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I read carefully the Senator's talk, which I had the good fortune to see yesterday, and thank him for his wise and thoughtful discussion of the Vietnamese problems.

I was especially interested in what he says about the Political Action Teams. I, too, went down to see them at Vung Tau. It is difficult to believe that those relatively unschooled youngsters, men out of the various villages could have the interest in national and international affairs that they have.

In one class, while they were all squatting on the concrete floor, a student was criticizing the instructor for not giving them the truth about General de Gaulle. The student felt he was playing for time, and opposing us because eventually he wanted to come back and run Vietnam. The instructor disagreed.

In another class, where two of the students themselves were arguing among themselves—Captain Mai was my interpreter, as I am sure he was the Senator's—one student was asking whether it was not true that England dominated the Afro-Asian bloc. Another said, "That not true. Prove it. Give us the name of the Englishman who leads the domination." I mention these two incidents because it shows their tremendous interest in world affairs as well as their own problems in their own country. I consider one of the most constructive and interesting aspect of my recent trip was the opportunity to observe the training of these Political Action Teams.

Let me again congratulate the Senator on his fine address.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my friends from Missouri, and must tell him that my ability to see so much of Vietnam was largely because of the fact that he left word, before he left the country, to trust me completely.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator puts it a little differently than would I. I did say "There is a voice in the United States which has great weight, not only on his side, but also on ours. If you will tell him the story, he will tell it well to the country."

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should also like to congratulate the Senator from New York for his learned, sincere remarks on the situation in southeast Asia.

As senior Senator from Maryland, I also visited Vietnam in the latter part of October and November, and reached similar conclusions.

I should like to comment upon one aspect of the remarks made just a moment ago by the Senator from New York, namely, the morale and the training of our people there. As an old soldier myself, and as one who had the opportunity actually to spend a week in the field with the 3d Marine Division, commanded by Gen. Lewis Walsh, I found that the morale and purpose and training of our people there was as good as I have ever seen under any circumstances heretofore. The men knew what they were doing; they were well-led by NCO's and officers, by and large, far more experienced and older than the officers and NCO's we had in World War II.

From time to time, they asked me two questions. The first: "Are the people at home proud of us? Do they understand why we are here?" And second: "Why do some of our young men oppose us, and burn their draft cards or dodge the draft?"

I answered, "All America is very proud of you, and only a very small but at times vocal minority try to evade the laws of our land and burn their draft cards."

But it gave me a feeling of great pride in the men of the Marine division I visited, the 1st Cavalry Division that I visited, and the 173d Brigade, to see how well trained and proud these men were, and how well they understood why the United States was there.

Mr. JAVITS. I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Maryland for his constructive intercession. I know that he would wish to add two additional units, which perhaps have arrived there since my colleague was there, namely, the 1st Infantry Division—the Big Red 1—and the elements of the 25th Division which are now there. I assure the Senator that everything he says about our military personnel is borne out by those additional units as well as the others, which I also visited.

I now bring my remarks to a conclusion. There is no question that we have never labored under the illusion here that there is a representative government in

South Vietnam. Therefore we must accept the fact, and live with it, that the United States is likely to be the dominant influence in South Vietnam for a considerable period. Thus our efforts must be directed toward building up those institutions which can make self-determination—and that is all we seek. I do not believe we can ever emphasize that enough. Our job must be to build up those institutions which can make self-determination viable and visible; and the way to do that is not merely to talk about it or to nibble at the problem. It must be done by giving the country a chance to have peace and more security to produce the personalities and conditions which will improve its opportunities for a representative government.

A grave deficiency in the American attitude toward Vietnam is the fact that while we have emphasized the grimness of the military struggle and its anti-Communist nature, we have failed to emphasize the opportunities of really achieving a success for free institutions in combination with social and economic reform. The American people, and the Congress, must be prepared for difficult decisions and long-range commitments. The Vietnam conflict must be understood as the beginning of the struggle for Asia.

I hope to address myself soon to a review of our China policy, of which Vietnam is but a facet. We must be ready to journey along a very long road, well worth it because it is in pursuit of our national security and the survival of freedom.

Mr. President, I say to the millions of Americans who are deeply concerned about casualties, that in this grim world the question of casualties is relative. The question of casualties is, Shall we have hundreds or even thousands today, or millions tomorrow?

I am no child, and I know that we do not necessarily lead to a world which is relatively free from war by waging war. But I do not believe, either, that we can fail to face the issue on occasion. We do our utmost to minimize it, but sometimes there is no other answer, whether it is against a mad gunman on some city street, or whether it is against a nation which has gone slightly mad, or whether we are faced with frustration, or whatever it may be that is causing the Communist Chinese to act as they do.

Mr. President, the irresistible tide of world events at this time requires, in my judgment, that our action in respect to endeavoring to win the world to a condition of peace and freedom necessitates a continuing deep involvement in Vietnam. I know that all of us—I think there is no exception in the Senate—understand that this is not the way in which we would seek to achieve the great result to which we are dedicated for all mankind, but that it will require a variety of means, mainly the arts of peace, and construction, and economic and social development, and the love of those values which are the values of freedom; and that at some time, somewhere, we must be prepared to face the issue of life itself.

If the Communists count on the fact that whenever casualties are involved,

we are going to run, then we are through.

Sometime, somewhere, somehow, they must understand that they have to face the same thing they are always bragging about; namely, a love of the ideal which is superior to life itself. That is the confrontation which is forced upon us by the circumstances of history. I have described the means as accurately as I can within the competence of this Nation, consistent with its other responsibilities, which I believe are worth the national interest to devote to its purpose in South Vietnam.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for what I believe to be a splendid isolation and definition of the decision which now faces the President of the United States on the question of the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

I agree with the statement of the late distinguished Senator Vandenberg, which I paraphrase, when he declared that everyone in the Senate wishes to be consulted at the time of "takeoff," but we will stand with the President at the "crash landing." I also agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who stated, "Our flag is committed; and when our flag is committed, we must support it."

Second, I believe the conclusion which has been drawn by the Senator from New York so very well is an accurate one; namely, that the decision facing the President on resumption of bombing in North Vietnam is essentially a military decision and not a political decision.

As the framers of the Constitution properly recognized, military decisions cannot properly be made in the Senate, but are decisions to be made by the constitutional Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, although we are not precluded, of course, from serving in an advisory capacity. But, we must understand that this is a military decision. The Senator from New York has very well set out the criteria which must be in the mind of the President, and which are in the mind of the President; namely, one, he must first assess the kind of response we have received to our peace offensive; second, he must assess the military situation, whether it is necessary militarily to resume bombing in order to support our commitment to our men who are in Vietnam. Only the President has the complete facts and the daily intelligence reports.

Consequently, I conclude, as I believe the Senator from New York has concluded, that if the President does make this decision, it will be a military decision which I am sure the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the people of this country will support.

I would think that that would have to be our position, if such a decision were

made, and I would think that it would be our proper responsibility in the Senate, under the Constitution, to devote ourselves, both privately and publicly, to exploring all sorts of methods by which the war might honorably be brought to an end, and how, once it had been brought to an end, we should act thereafter.

I believe that is our proper sphere; and the Senator from New York has very well risen to his responsibility as a Senator in that respect, to say to the President, to the people of this country, and to all the people of the world, what we might do once peace has been brought about, and how it might be brought about.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated on the floor of the Senate on countless occasions a point which I believe is a very good legal point; namely, that the United States should make a formal motion in the Security Council of the United Nations, for the United Nations to take over, in some way, the responsibility in Vietnam. As I say, I believe it is a good legalistic point; and I admire and respect the Senator from Oregon as one of the ablest men I know of in the field of international law.

However, I believe it to be an impractical suggestion, because I believe that we well recognize that with the veto power in the Security Council, such a motion would surely be ineffective; and, furthermore, would force a nation such as the Soviet Union to take what I am certain would be an unequivocal and unfavorable stand on that motion.

We must explore the possibility of living up to our commitments under the United Nations Charter by making a formal motion in the Security Council for what might be done by the United Nations after pacification had been brought about, and that we would make a formal motion and engage in discussions within the Security Council and the United Nations for what the United Nations might do in the way of keeping the peace and serving in a supervisory role in South Vietnam governmentally and in elections eventually to be held, recognizing, as the Senator from New York has, that free elections in South Vietnam, because of the terrorism, murder and kidnapping, being carried on at the present time by the Viet Cong, are not now possible. This would put all nations on notice of our peaceful intentions and our equally strong resolve to end the aggression there and assure South Vietnam of the right of self-determination.

Last, let me say that I commend the Senator from New York for so clearly defining what the President's decision will be; namely that it will be a military one. Our responsibility is to follow the President if that decision is made on the criteria which I am sure the President has in his mind.

I pay tribute to the Senator from New York for speaking out as a Senator with suggestions as to what might be done after the pacification of Vietnam has been brought about and also making suggestions as to how peace may be achieved.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma. He does my soul good. I do not enjoy uttering words which may lead to more struggle. I feel this situation very deeply. I have never been a foxhole hero, although I served in World War II for a number of years. But I have seen how other men suffer, and it has hurt me just as deeply. I do not take these things lightly.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for his approval.

This gives me an opportunity to add one further point. I believe it would be the greatest mistake to assume that if the President, in the interests of military security, did resume the limited bombing in which we have been engaged, that would be the end of the peace offensive. By no means. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the peace offensive should be pushed even harder with brilliance of execution everywhere in the world, using the United Nations to the full, and any other agency that we can use.

I see no reason why there should be any difference in our attitude if, because of stern military necessity, we can no longer allow North Vietnam, with impunity, to move and supply its forces in South Vietnam.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate my esteemed friend and colleague the Senator from New York, for his most enlightening remarks and the suggestions he has made.

Lately, we have heard a great deal concerning division—a synthetic division, I believe—about the hawks and doves. It occurred to me that the American bird is the eagle, which is neither a hawk nor a dove. I am therefore glad to hear, for the first time in several days, this reflection of the wisdom, the strength, and the purpose of this great Nation.

We must remember that there are thousands of American boys halfway around the world fighting and giving up their lives, suffering all the hardships of war.

For what purpose?

They are in southeast Asia to preserve the basic principle of freedom and the right of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam—a people who cannot preserve it for themselves. Our boys are there to help them.

I am pleased to hear about the morale—I am pleased to hear from my distinguished colleague the fact that our boys in Vietnam know exactly why they are there.

I also would wish that all Americans would understand why our boys are there, and that we could cut away some of the confusion which seems to be widespread around the land.

I wish further that the people of America could understand the character of the people of Vietnam and their willingness to fight to preserve their freedom. Their record on the battlefield

January 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1377

amply demonstrates their determination and desire for freedom.

We must not fail them.

My distinguished colleague is correct in pointing out that we must face the realities of life. Nobody wishes the terror of war—but there are times when we must stand up for principle and deal with the situation as it exists, and not always as we would have it exist.

We have come to this crossroad. I believe there is no one in this Chamber within sound of my voice who would not stand with the President once the decision had been made.

One of the things which has bothered my constituents is that civilians have been making decisions that should be made by the military, with the military being denied the right to make such decisions.

I concur in what my distinguished friend has said, and I congratulate him.

I am very much pleased that he has brought back to us the message that he has given us today, of combined military and economic strength, and of extending it, together with the great strength of the friendship of our country, to help other people. This is the character of America that I have known for a half century.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend from California. With his usual brilliance, he has capsuled what I have tried to say this afternoon.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from New York, who, in his usual articulate way, has told us the facts as I understand them to be, and has made constructive suggestions, which I believe will help to bring about an accelerated pacification of that troubled area.

If I may use the word "consensus," I believe that the Senator has, today, on the floor of the Senate, expressed the consensus, not only of those of us on the floor, but also of the Congress and the American people.

The Senator has done it in six pages, which undoubtedly took a great deal of time in preparation. He has done it succinctly, but completely.

The Senator's contribution to this debate today is one of the most constructive, and can become one of the most helpful on the subject.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my very good and old friend from Kentucky and colleague in the Senate for his kind and gracious words, which are very precious to me, particularly in terms of leadership of our own party.

I conclude on a note which has been supplied to me by these intercessions. It may be hard for the world to realize it, but there is one nation that the good Lord has put upon the earth which seems to have the resources, material and spiritual, to wish to secure for mankind the rule of law and justice. It may be hard to get the world to accept that as a reality, but we must try. I hope that

everything I have said today is in accord with that great effort.

Mr. President, pursuant to the understanding I had with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 19 Leg.]		
Alken	Holland	Muskie
Anderson	Inouye	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Pell
Boggs	Javits	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Case	Mansfield	Smith
Clark	Metcalf	Symington
Cooper	Morse	Young, Ohio
Gore	Morton	
Hart	Murphy	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Sen-

ator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has appropriately suggested that the remarks made in reference to the pending motion to consider H.R. 77 be entitled "The Second Battle of Section 14(b)." Since we will allude many times to remarks made on a similar motion during the 1st session of the 89th Congress I suggest that the debate of last year be entitled "The First Battle of Section 14(b)."

During the first battle of section 14(b), I spoke on October 12, 1965, at considerable length with reference to the right-to-work law of the State of Florida, and I would like at this time to recapitulate those remarks as I believe them to be important to this debate.

Mr. President, Florida was the first State to adopt a right-to-work law protecting individual workers in the exercise of their free choice to join or refrain from joining a labor union. Section 12 of the Declaration of Rights of the Florida Constitution was adopted in the general election of 1944 by the people of Florida to provide as follows:

The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization; provided, that this clause shall not be construed to deny or abridge the right of employees by and through a labor organization or labor union to bargain collectively with their employer.

Suffice it to say that 18 other States which followed suit by adopting constitutional provisions or statutes protecting the basic right to work of their residents still have their right-to-work laws.

There are 19 States in all which now have that provision either in their constitutions or by way of statutory action.

As so ably pointed out by the distinguished minority leader at the outset of this debate, Mr. George Gallup, who has a faculty for measuring public opinion through his polling formulas and devices, has statistically shown that, nationwide, those in favor of retention of section 14(b) certainly are not in the minority. Other polls have produced substantially the same result.

Mr. President, I am opposed to H.R. 77 to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act because, first, it sanctions and encourages compulsory unionism, a concept contrary to the fundamental principles of individual liberty and freedom of choice; and, second, because it is a wrongful and unjustified Federal interference with the right and obligation of the individual States to protect their citizens and to maintain public order.

I am also opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) because the people, the electorate of Florida, the people who are responsible for electing and returning me to the Senate on four different occasions, have by their vote expressed their will to adopt the right-to-work provision in the Florida constitution, and various efforts to have our legislature submit proposals to repeal our right-to-work law have failed abysmally. So long as this is the will of the majority in the State that I have the honor to represent, I will as vigorously as possible oppose any attempt

to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

I might also add that subsequently Florida adopted by an overwhelming majority of our legislature a law in 1947 barring strikes and requiring compulsory arbitration in public utilities. This law was adopted by a vote of 33 to 0 in the State senate, and 74 to 12 in the house. However, as a result of the ruling of the Supreme Court in a Wisconsin bus strike that the Congress has assumed full authority over such labor disputes in passing the Taft-Hartley Act, a ruling which I regard as wholly unsound, the Florida statute is unenforceable. In this connection, I would like to remind the Senate that in the 1st session of the 82d Congress, which was in 1951, just after the decision in the Wisconsin case, I joined Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, in introducing a bill which was also cosponsored by Senators ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in local public utilities. In the 84th Congress, I again proposed this legislation which was cosponsored by Senator ROBERTSON. I introduced this measure again in the 85th, 86th, 87th, and 88th Congress, and again at the outset of this 89th Congress on January 6, 1965. I regret that I have never been able to secure any action on this measure by the Senate Labor Committee.

Mr. President, as I read the numbers of the Congresses in which I have introduced this legislation, it was noted, I am sure, that in one Congress, the 83d, I did not introduce this separate legislation. The reason for that was that there was pending in that Congress, a general bill for the revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, and one of the provisions of that bill was broad enough to cover this same objective. That fact was clearly brought out and stated by the sponsors of that bill in the course of a colloquy between the distinguished then Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Smith, and myself, as will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In other words, constantly and consistently since the Wisconsin decision, I have been endeavoring to make it clear by affirmative action of Congress that Congress intended to do what I know it intended to do in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, that is, to leave it to the States, in their own judgment, to handle disturbances within their own bounds which were caused by stoppages or threatened stoppages only of public utilities affecting the welfare and the peace, and even the lives, of their own communities.

Mr. President, I wish briefly to relate a situation, and I do it because of the fact that I found only yesterday that no printed record was made of a hearing which was held by the late President John F. Kennedy when he was a member of the U.S. Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I attach no fault to anyone in connection with that matter, as I shall state later; but there were some things that came out in that hearing which I believe

should be preserved, and I am still hopeful that the transcript of the hearing can be found, though I am told today by the clerk of the committee that it cannot be found, and that no printing of the hearing record was made, though it was quite a substantial record, taking 2 or more days of the time of the subcommittee.

In order to permanently preserve the statement which I made at that time, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks my prepared statement which I made before the committee.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, IN SUPPORT OF S. 632 BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, U.S. SENATE, MAY 28, 1959, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee in support of S. 632, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws which seek to prevent strikes in public utilities. S. 632 reads as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) (1) Nothing in this Act or the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, shall be construed to nullify the provisions of any State or Territorial law which regulate or qualify the right of employees of a public utility to strike, or which prohibit strikes by such employees.

"(2) As used in this subsection the term "public utility" means an employer engaged in the business of furnishing water, light, heat, gas, electric power, sanitation, passenger transportation, or communication services to the public, or of operating a gas pipeline or a toll bridge or tunnel."

This bill was introduced in the earnest hope that at long last, needed legislation will be enacted in this Congress to fill this particular legal "void"—or labor-management "no man's land"—which fails to supply any method, Federal or State, to assure the continued operation of local Public Utilities. This dangerous and unexpected situation was created February 26, 1951, by a strained interpretation by the U.S. Supreme Court in its divided decision in the so-called Wisconsin case construing the legislative intent in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In less than 3 months after that divided Supreme Court decision was handed down, a bipartisan effort was begun in the Senate to correct the unfortunate situation created thereby when Republican Senators Wiley, of Wisconsin, and Hendrickson, of New Jersey, together with Democratic Senators ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and myself, introduced on May 23, 1951, S. 1535 of the 82d Congress, which was identical to the measure now being considered. Unfortunately this bill never saw the light of day and died in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee without being accorded a hearing.

In the following Congress, the 83d, a corrective proposal was again before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in an omnibus labor bill, S. 2650, which was considered by the committee and favorably reported. The present chairman of this subcommittee was present when Dr. Archibald Cox, professor of the Law School of Harvard University, and who has been recognized by this committee as one of the leading experts

in the field of labor law, testified on S. 2650 with reference to this public utility problem as follows:

"Second, it would seem clear to me that the States should have power to deal with strikes in gas and electric utilities and in other situations that may create a serious threat and imminent threat to public health and safety.

"Today apparently the States do not have that power. There is a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States invalidating the Wisconsin law providing for compulsory arbitration in public utilities. Some of the other States, like Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, have a slightly different law and we have continued to apply them, but I think everyone agrees there is a real question whether these laws would not be invalidated if they were taken to the Supreme Court. I think that decision should be changed by legislation so that the States can deal with those true emergencies which are nevertheless too local to be handled under the Federal statute. Somebody ought to be able to deal with them." (P. 2412, hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, 83d Cong. 2d sess., on proposed revisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.)

However, you will recall that due in large part to the fact that three FEPC amendments were pending—under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate—the Senate by a vote of 50 to 42 recommitted the bill. Although I found much to approve in S. 2650—particularly the section dealing with strikes in public utilities—I voted with the majority to recommit the bill because of the unfavorable parliamentary situation which required the consideration of FEPC legislation under a gag rule.

The bill, S. 2650, as reported from the Senate Committee contained the following language:

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to interfere with the enactment and enforcement by the States of laws to deal in emergencies with labor disputes which, if permitted to occur or continue, will constitute a clear and present danger to the health or safety of the people of the States."

During the debate on that measure, I questioned at length the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Smith, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, concerning the purpose of this proposed language. I asked the distinguished Senator from New Jersey specifically if it were his understanding that that provision was designed effectively to return to the States the power, authority, and jurisdiction to deal under State laws and under machinery provided under State laws, with work stoppages, strikes, threatened strikes, lockouts, or anything which would tend to bring about a stoppage of the rendition of services by public utilities to the people of States or communities within States. The Senator from New Jersey replied: "In preparing this particular paragraph the committee felt that utilities certainly would be included, because utilities usually could affect the health or safety of the people."

In his January 11, 1954, message to the Congress on labor-management relations President Eisenhower called attention to the problem at hand and recommended correction in the following manner: "The act should make clear that the several States and territories, when confronted with emergencies endangering the health or safety of their citizens, are not, through any conflict with the Federal law, actual or implied, deprived of the right to deal with such emergencies. The need for clarification of jurisdiction between the Federal and the State and territorial governments in the labor-management field has lately been emphasized by the broad implications of the most recent de-