

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A45

We have lost our capacity for outrage in this country. We have become so anesthetized with the gassy drugs of moderation and tolerance and take it easy that nothing of honest wrath remains. The strong, compulsive emotions seep away: Patriotism, religious faith, pride in the achievements of honest toil. Our houses of worship are packaged with people who go to church but miss the meaning of religion. On holidays, who flies his country's flag? We can manifest irritation, or vexation, or a fretful sense of annoyance. But sustained anger? The anger that moves and transforms? It has vanished. New Yorkers are not essentially different from other men: Most of the country would rather switch than fight.

At its peak, the transit strike was costing this great city an estimated \$100 million a day. Theaters were closed. Retail sales were off. The movement of vital supplies was disrupted. Thousands of innocent and unoffending citizens were grossly inconvenienced. In the afternoons, 33d Street was jammed with strike victims, waiting to push into Pennsylvania Station. Within New York, nothing moved by public transit. An essential public service has collapsed, rendered impotent by the uncheckable arrogance of a few willful men.

If the transit workers had been genuinely oppressed, or underpaid, or overworked, it might have been a different story. If their demands had been reasonable, public opinion might have taken the workers' side. But here was a union with demands for a \$680 million package over a 2-year period, a 4-day, 32-hour workweek, a 30-percent hourly pay increase, a 6 weeks' vacation after 1 year's employment, retirement at half pay after 25 years regardless of age. Mike Quill never began to negotiate seriously. Contemptuous of law, contemptuous of the public welfare, contemptuous of the rights of other men, he sought to whip the city to its knees and make John Lindsay crawl.

But who will remember all this a month from now? New York newspapers would not stick up to Bertie Powers; he whipped them singly and in combination. For the past 5 years, the country has been fed on a diet of Jimmy Hoffa. Has the Congress been moved to action? We suffer from a paralysis of the will, a flabbiness in the national guts, and we spin in rudderless circles eternally inspecting all sides of a question.

It is not a matter of organized labor alone. While the transit strike was on, the steel producers undertook to raise some of their prices, and the President responded, in effect, by using the massive powers of his office to fix a price on steel. He would agree to an increase of \$2.75 a ton, but not \$2.80, or \$3, or \$5. His will was to be substituted for the actions of the marketplace. Yet the whole incident provoked no spirited public response—not against the steel producers, as a bunch of profiteers; and not against the President, as an economic czar. The national ambivalence found something to be said on both sides, and meanwhile, the Packers and the Browns were in the third quarter, and how about another can of beer?

The Supreme Court of the United States hands down a series of opinions that deny even the most voluntary exercise of religion in the schools. The first opinion produces a wave of resentment; the second produces a smaller wave; the subsequent decrees provoke no ripple of dissent.

The High Court tosses aside a century of restraint, and undertakes to impose its novel construction of the 14th amendment upon the composition of State legislatures. Frankfurter protests. Harlan cries out in alarm. Senator DIRKSEN waves his arms. But now half the States have docilely abandoned old systems of check and balance, and no more is heard of the States' right to be masters of their own assemblies.

In almost every major city in the Nation, crime rates have climbed out of sight. Nowhere has public resentment been manifested in genuine anger or in an overwhelming demand that the public safety be restored. Traffic clogs our streets and destroys our central cities: Who is sufficiently wrought up to compel reforms? Every day brings some new account of the waste of public funds, in foreign aid, in the Job Corps, in the poverty program; and we yawn. The United States willingly supports Great Britain in imposing sanctions on Rhodesia, but last month the British increased the number of United Kingdom vessels in active trade with Cuba. Who cares?

No one denies that ours is a great and powerful country, capable of sudden generosity, of occasional sentimentality, of spontaneous sympathy or affection. But ours would be a still greater country if now and then we lost our national good humor, got fed to the teeth, and acted out of national fury to right some national wrongs.

### Marines' War in Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 26, Mr. Richard Critchfield wrote an article on the civic action programs being carried on by the Marines in Vietnam. During the congressional adjournment, I visited in Vietnam and had the opportunity of visiting with most of our combat units in that part of the world. The work all of our people are doing in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is short of miraculous.

I believe the following article is a tribute to these men and the work they are doing and I commend its reading to all in this body:

#### THE MARINES' WAR IN VIETNAM: A MICROCOSM

(By Richard Critchfield)

DA NANG.—To most young American soldiers in Vietnam, this country is a nightmare of mountains, marsh, and hostile villages. There are paddies and jungles where they can wade knee deep for days through searing sun or lashing rains and be shot or blown to bits at any moment without even seeing the invisible enemy.

Many GI's naturally come to feel it is a war where the frontlines are everywhere and no man with slanted eyes and a yellow skin can be trusted.

And yet as the marines here have learned from hard-won experience, it is precisely on building mutual trust with the local Vietnamese peasantry that defeating the Vietcong depends.

Now nearly 8 months after they landed in Da Nang as the first U.S. combat troops in Vietnam, the mission of the 37,000 marines is still to defend the three big airbases at Phu Bai, Da Nang, and Chu Lai. The old aim was to gradually push out their perimeter and link up all three bases in a coastal pacified zone.

#### VIETCONG TERROR

But today many senior Marine officers maintain that such talk of winning terrain is meaningless until someone comes up with a better formula, more money, and a lot more

manpower to win over the loyalties of the Vietnamese peasants behind their lines.

The marines have now pushed about 12 miles north, south, and west of Da Nang airbase; but sizable numbers of Vietcong have begun infiltrating back behind them. By kidnaping and assassinating those who speak out for the Saigon Government, the Vietcong are trying to regain the villagers' support through terror. In this manner, they get information on Marine movements and some of their intentions as well.

On October 28, Vietcong infiltrators attacked Da Nang East airstrip and destroyed and damaged 47 helicopters, mined 2 jeeps, dynamited 7 buildings of the new, partly constructed naval hospital, and barraged a battalion of Seabees with fifty 60-mm. mortars. It seems no accident that the local village chief disappeared a few days before and that 3 weeks earlier the nearest hamlet chief was found mutilated and stabbed to death.

Such incidents have brought the Marines to the hard conclusion that as much as three-fourths of their battle ahead lies in civic action, that is, building the confidence and respect of the villagers with the aim of winning support for the government and gaining military intelligence for themselves. An imaginative civic action effort by the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment, at Le My, north of Da Nang, has been so successful the Vietcong can no longer plant even a road mine without the Vietnamese villagers reporting it to the Marines.

Elsewhere around Da Nang, the going has been tougher. How tough was brought home to this reporter this week in a visit to the little hamlet of Nui Kim Son, which lies at the foot of Marble Mountain, just south of the Vietcong's October attack.

As we drove out of the headquarters of the 9th Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, and headed for the sand dunes toward Marble Mountain, I asked Lt. Mike Cox, the 24-year-old battalion civic action officer, how he thought the Vietnamese peasantry could be won over to the Government's side.

Mike, a redhaired Irishman from the Bronx, said, "My personal opinion? Well, it's strange, almost anything pleases these people. Seems to me whoever gives them the most will win. These people are awful ignorant but you can't judge them by our standards."

Along the rutted road we passed a series of familiar looking red and white signs:

"Don't bunch up  
As you patrol about  
Or you'll be picking  
The fragments out.  
Burma Shave."

I asked Mike what he wrote his parents about Vietnam.

#### WRITE VERY LITTLE

"My mother is a little old gray-haired lady and I don't want to make it any grayer. I don't write much. Dad's an old Irishman; he thinks it's all a big mess. Blames it on the French for failing to leave a government behind."

Lance Corp. Roger Michalk, 22, of Boise, Idaho, who rode along with a rifle just in case, said he wrote home as little as possible. "Just enough to keep 'em from writing the commanding officer to find out whether I'm dead or alive."

The biggest concern the marines had, said Mike, were the university student demonstrations back home in the states. "I dislike the group that does it," he said. "They're looking for some kind of moral absolutism, to wash their hands of these people's troubles. They're trying to go back to the Middle Ages, turn the university into a sanctuary and shut out the world. That's no good." Mike said he graduated in philosophy from a small college in New Jersey.

Marble Mountain, a jagged out-cropping of white rock rising about 1,000 feet out of the sandy coast and covered with lush green vegetation, loomed just ahead of us. An immense staircase of discolored white marble curved up the mountainside through dense foliage with strange crimson and yellow blossoms and huge waxen leaves.

#### MONKS TEND SHRINES

After a strenuous climb, we reached a Buddhist monastery where several monks were pruning rose bushes in a walled garden. All but one had pallid, ivory complexions; the marines said the monks spent most of their time tending religious shrines in the underground network of caves and grottos that led deep into the mountain. The single exception was a tall, ruddy and vigorous-looking Vietnamese in a maroon monk's robe who was smoking a cigarette. He said he was a disciple of Thich Tri Quang, the Buddhist leader of Hue. He motioned for us to follow him down a forested trail which led up to the mouth of a giant cave. Outside was a huge statue of Buddha's mother, gray and eroded with weather and green with moss. A group of six Vietnamese men came out of the cave and passed by; they were unsmiling and looked steely eyed. "Vietcong?" "Probably just tourists," said Mike.

We followed the monk into the cave and after a short walk forward through the damp darkness stepped down into a huge cavern. "It's beautiful," Corporal Michalk exclaimed.

The cavern was immense, perhaps 60 feet high; shafts of sunlight fell from cracks in the marble ceiling above; the marble floor glittered like water. Dragons with lionlike heads and huge bearded stone warriors with scimitars guarded the entrance. Across the gloomy shadows and the haze of incense a giant Buddha sat, green and silver as the cavern walls, grinning and empty handed, like all Buddhas. Water dripped from above and was echoed from falling water deep within the series of black caves that led off the central chamber.

Mike whistled. "Shangri-la. Ronald Colman will come out any minute." The drip, drip, of the water, the cloying odor of incense and the silence of the tall monk were unsettling. "We'd better give the old padre a couple of piastres and go," Mike said.

#### FEARED AMBUSH

We hurried down the mountainside fairly rapidly since the lush foliage along the winding staircase provided perfect cover for an ambush. The corporal said that in the evenings back at battalion headquarters you could hear the monks beating a big gong from somewhere inside the mountain. "It's an eerie sound and in an irregular pattern. I bet it's some kind of signal."

Two little boys, stonecutters who made their living carving pilgrims' initials into the marble steps, talked the corporal into having his name immortalized on the mountain. As we paused Mike said: "These kids are fabulous. The VC came into Nui Kim Son one night and wanted to know how many marines were up at the outpost on the mountain's peak. The kids said more than 100, too many for the VC to handle. When the VC found out they had lied, they came back and beat the kids until their legs were black and blue; they could hardly walk afterward."

As we walked down into Nui Kim Son, Mike explained that almost all of its people made their living sculpting little figurines out of marble from the mountain. Even though it was Sunday, groups of men and women squatted on the dirt floors of their huts, chipping away. Their wares were arranged on shelves in front of each hut—lunging tigers, reproductions of the Virgin Mary, and grinning little white marble Buddhas.

Mike said the people of Nui Kim Son sold the figures in Da Nang for cash and then bought their food from the farmers to the south.

A Vietcong battalion had been garrisoned just south of Marble Mountain until the Marines reached there in August, and the 7th Vietcong Regiment just 3 miles to the south. Now several Marine companies had routed the Vietcong but these still had to be resupplied by helicopter or with an armored convoy of tanks; the roads in between were mined and everything south of a bridge just below Nui Kim Son was still pretty much Vietcong country.

"Nui Kim Son just got caught between the VC and the government and couldn't move. The VC told the villagers south of here not to come in and trade and to keep away from the Marines. They'd like to choke off the people from us so we won't get intelligence. But the people come into the market from VC territory anyway. We spray the market with DDT and keep the flies away and they like that. It seems to me if you can open an economy in a place the people will respond to it, no matter what the VC say."

I suggested we stop for a coke at one of the village teahouses but Mike said, "We can't trust them. One minute they're smiling from ear to ear and the next selling pop with acid or ice cubes with glass slivers. One guy's still in the hospital."

One shack had a life-sized cardboard figure of a buxom girl draped against a harp propped up outside as advertising. Someone had torn the nose off. Inside two pretty Vietnamese girls in slacks were waiting for customers. The single room was sparsely furnished with cheap lawn chairs, a table, and wash bucket and some cases of beer; a red curtain hung across an alcove. When I asked what was behind it, Mike said "probably a bed" and the girls giggled something about "Mama san."

#### CHANGE ARMY OUTFITS

We lifted the curtain aside; it concealed a Buddhist memorial shrine to the dead. The faded photograph of a thin little Vietnamese boy in spectacles was set above the altar. The girls volunteered, "Boom, boom, die." Pull back almost any curtain in Vietnam and you'll find human suffering.

"All these girls pay VC taxes," Mike said as we walked down the street again. It's hard to tell people back home what the war in our area is really like. Pan Am stops in Saigon not Nui Kim Son. The national government to these people is nothing; they've never heard of Saigon. We want the Vietnamese to come in here. Get the government to come back with nurses and civil affairs people.

"ID cards don't mean a damn thing out here. Many people carry both VC and government identification. Then a lot of the government's NCO's get their training and go off and join the VC. And some of the VC join the government army. These guys change outfits like a suit of clothes.

"Another problem you've got to overcome is being a white man. These people were all Viet Minh, many of these men knocked off French soldiers. They didn't like the French. One old man told me, 'You're better than the French, you treat us better. But I don't like you Americans. You have too much money, you're rich, you think we are stupid and undeveloped.' But its something when they start telling you stuff like that. It means they have the freedom to criticize and they know it."

#### NEED MEDICAL AID

Mike said three of the village chiefs from the area to the south lived in Nui Kim Son.

"Actually the chief of this village was captured 2 weeks ago. He went south of the bridge and didn't tell anyone. His uncle was supposed to be a big VC. Trinh, the chief of Hoa Hai village, lives within our battalion's perimeter now. About a month ago two VC came in and threw a bomb in his house. Trinh saw him and shot at him. He's got more guts than Superman. He says the VC was a hardcore terrorist who chopped off the right hand of a number of children from pro-government families in the neighborhood."

Mike said one big need, he felt, was medical aid; a good program might be to take thousands of Vietnamese back to the States or to secure areas and give them crash courses in basic medicine.

"These people need so much. We got books from the Embassy and I wrote home for some maps, you have to scrounge around. These kids here had never seen a geographical outline of their own country. But each area is different. You just can't have a formula for everywhere. For instance, these people south of the bridge sometimes use North Vietnamese money with Ho Chi Minh's picture on it."

We had reached the end of the hamlet and crossed the road into an old long-abandoned French fort the Marines were using as a supply dump. If the grotto on Marble Mountain had been Shangri-la, this was Beau Geste. Carved on the weather eroded stone walls were ghostly messages from its successive occupants, "March Forward, Comrades" and "Brave Men Died Here" in Vietnamese; the single word, "fear," scribbled in French by some forgotten Legionnaire and "San Antonio, Tex.," the latest addition.

#### PLAYS CLASSICAL RECORD

"Good living," said Mike, "but nothing like the Air Force up on Monkey Mountain; they've got flush toilets and movies."

The present commander of the fort, Marine Lt. John N. Rogers of Washington Grove, Md., a graduate of George Washington University, told Mike he had a new Antonio Vivaldi record and invited us up to one of the ruined towers to hear it. One of the radio men was shipping a new stereo home from the Da Nang PX and we could play it on that. The lieutenant put on Vivaldi's Concerto in C Minor for Flute."

As the sound of mandolins, flutes, violins and a harpsichord burst into the tower, Lieutenant Rogers grinned, "This movement sets the mood for the third; it comes out with all its joy."

Mike sank into reverie. "It's almost a year since I heard music like that. It takes you back to listening midway through the book review section on a Sunday afternoon with a cup of fresh coffee, lighting up a good cigarette."

For a moment the music seemed to wash away the constant tension and the treacherous world of enigmatic monks, soda pop that could mean painful injury, and terrorists who mutilated little children.

The slit in the stone wall was like a postcard in an 18th century Venetian landscape: great towering cumulus clouds, cobalt blue sky, pine trees, white sands, glittering marble cliffs, a golden little Buddhist temple with pink arched roofs, children bathing in a green pond, the wind rippling the water's surface, transparent dragonflies against the dim blue outline of the Annamite Cordillera's lumpy peaks. Then two whirring helicopters, like monsters out of science fiction, flew into the postcard and the present came rushing back.

"Don't stick your head up too much near that slit," Mike said. "There's VC snipers out there."

January 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A51

competition. They are willing to take their chances with their competitors. Their plea is to be freed from Government regulations written with big business in mind, which overburden them but are taken by their bigger competitors in stride as part of overhead.

In recent months I have received several letters from small businessmen in my district making this plea. Among them is a letter from Fred Koning, a restaurateur in Douglas, Mich., within my congressional district. The Saugatuck-Douglas area is one of Michigan's fine summer resorts, and Fred Koning, in a long-established business, has been successful thus far. But he writes me as follows:

During the last three decades, we have seen fit to subsidize the world, the farmer, the laborer, the Negro, the poor, including the ones that could work but won't. There are families that have prospered on relief.

On the other hand, the Government has guaranteed big business a profit by letting contracts on a cost-plus basis.

Have the powers that be ever considered the little businessman? I don't mean the small businessman; I mean the little ones, like myself.

We have never asked for nor wanted any subsidies. All we want is a chance to survive. How many of the legislators who are so concerned with the welfare of the masses have ever been in a competitive field and have had to earn a living by competition, let alone meet a payroll?

Wouldn't it be possible to think of all of us instead of the select groups they have seen fit to sponsor?

As little business people, all we ask is the right to run our own business—sink or swim—and pay our taxes.

Respectfully,

FRED KONING.

Mr. Speaker, we would do a better job at lawmaking, and the bureaucracy would write fairer regulations, if the concerns of little businessmen were taken into account. All big business started small. The man or woman who has an idea and the ability and courage to venture it in competitive enterprise still contributes much to our progress; and Government should take care in its laws and regulations that an economic, political, and social climate encouraging small business is fostered.

### A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of the magazine *Navy*, published by the Navy League of the United States there is an article which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. This article consists of excerpts from a speech by Capt. James E. Heg, U.S. Navy, and is entitled "A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight."

Captain Heg, in his speech, calls upon the public to awaken to the facts about the critical state of our merchant marine. He astutely points out the fact that the Soviet Union is planning a modern automated merchant marine and that it is ironic that we as a nation compare all of our forms of power to that of the Soviet Union with the exception of our merchant marine power.

Mr. Speaker, within a few years, Captain Heg points out, the Soviet Union will be in a position to dominate the sea lanes and he leaves it to his readers' speculation as to what such a situation could portend for the United States. He goes further by pointing to the great amount of money that is being spent in other areas of transportation.

This article points out that since the Merchant Marine Act was passed in 1936 that the United States has spent more on the development of one single aircraft than it has in all 29 years in the area of merchant marine development. As a matter of fact, during 1966 the U.S. Maritime Administration is slated to spend no more than the minuscule sum of \$250,000 on research and development toward advanced ships and systems. Compare this with what we are spending for air transportation and other means of defense.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

### Reagan's Top Secret Wasn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. JAMES B. UTT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the *Washington Post* on January 11, 1966, regarding the efficient spy apparatus operated by Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown of California.

While all may be fair in love, war, and politics, it would seem to me that there should be a limit to the complete disregard of ethics. I feel that Governor Brown breached all ethical standards in this feat of political espionage and that he showed a lack of morality in this undercover operation.

[From the *Washington Post*, Jan. 11, 1966]

REAGAN'S TOP SECRET WASN'T

(By Gerry Robichaud)

LOS ANGELES, Jan. 10.—It will never go down as any great shakes in the annals of California crime. But as a feat of political espionage, it left the Ronald Reagan camp severely shaken and the forces of Democratic Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown somewhat smugly self-satisfied.

The fact is that one or more of Brown's undercover agents managed to infiltrate the Reagan security apparatus.

The agents surreptitiously obtained an advance copy of the top-secret television scenario in which Reagan announced his candidacy for the Republican gubernatorial

nomination. This enabled Brown's own campaign organization to issue a point-by-point "refutation" of what Reagan had to say several hours before Reagan's half-hour political show, which had been taped in utmost secrecy, was presented to a 15-station California audience.

How the security breach was engineered remains a mystery. But those who tried to reconstruct what happened feel that it would require at least 24 hours for the Democratic Coordinating Committee, which is pushing Brown's third-term bid, to prepare its detailed analysis of Reagan's script and its answers thereto.

If the "crime" did occur as early as is now generally supposed, that would rule out an inadvertent leak to the Brown forces through the news wire services or other media—for none had the full text of Reagan's TV speech until a short time before it was aired.

Indeed, most reporters had received the Democratic commentary on Reagan's remarks considerably before getting the Reagan text from his campaign handlers.

### Who Wants To Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk of "hawks" and "doves" and thousands of self-appointed "experts" expound on U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

In the January 9, 1966, issue of *Our Sunday Visitor*, Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., expresses some important historical facts and excellent conclusions which I commend to the attention of the Members of Congress:

RIGHT OR WRONG: WHO WANTS TO WIN?

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD praised the cease-fire on Christmas Day, expressing the hope that "perhaps it could be stretched further." House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK expressed the hope that "the cessation will restore reason to the Communists."

We hear a great deal about a cease-fire, about negotiations, about ending the war, and about getting out of Vietnam. Unfortunately, all four of these can be treacherous. The cease-fire, for example, has been a major Communist weapon in the cold war for a generation. When the Communist armies in China were weak, after World War II, Mao Tse-tung arranged for a temporary cease-fire on the mainland, with the United States serving as the moderator. Of course, the Communists could not be controlled, but General Marshall insisted that the Nationalist troops observe it.

When Chiang Kai-shek complained that the Communists were not observing the cease-fire, George Marshall replied: "Never mind, you keep it, so you can come to the conference table with your hands clean." Chiang's hands were clean, but the Chinese were cleaned right out of their country. The phony cease-fire enabled the Chinese Reds to arm themselves with former Japanese weapons, and to keep on conquering.

LEARN FROM MISTAKES

When the Communists faced defeat in Korea, they asked for truce talks. Because of the talks, the United States halted its big

drive to the north. The Chinese talked and talked until they had built up their forces and reinforced their positions. The buildup meant that it would have been much more costly for the United States to resume fighting. Uncle Sam had been put in a much weaker bargaining position, and we ended up with an agreement so weak that the Communists broke it at will. One of the keenest and most experienced military minds in American history, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, had said repeatedly that there is "no substitute for victory," but our diplomats refused to listen.

How often must the American military shed their blood and give their lives in the defense of freedom throughout the world, only to have American statesmen fumble the peace through timidity and fear? Of the 33,000 American soldiers who died in Korea, two-thirds were killed after negotiations began. Yet our roving Ambassador, Averell Harriman, said he told the Russians last June that "we will not stop bombing the North until negotiations have started."

Shortly before Mr. Harriman went to represent the United States at the Geneva Conference over Laos in 1962, he told the Reverend Raymond J. deJaegher: "We have to give some places on the Lao Government to the Communists." Mr. Harriman was trained at Yalta and has reflected that training ever since.

The negotiations over Laos were used by North Vietnam to strengthen its military positions. Harriman agreed, for some strange reason, to remove Laos from the protection of the SEATO Treaty. Had we not forced a coalition government on Laos, just as we had done on Nationalist China, there might well be no war in Vietnam today. We must learn from our mistakes, or we will keep on repeating them.

During the last 20 years the American Government seems to have taken military decisions almost entirely away from the military. In these same 20 years America has lost sight of victory. When the Secretary of Defense remarked recently from Saigon that he was "surprised" at what the Vietcong are doing, it is because he is not a military man and knows so little about how to win a war. The administration never talks about having the aggressor surrender. We only want him to talk to us, and we hold out concessions to encourage the enemy to "negotiate." Our policy is still one of weakness, instead of strength.

People in foreign countries are astonished that America cannot seem to win a war against 180,000 invaders, even with the help of 600,000 South Vietnamese troops. Our civilian strategists tell us we are not winning because it is a totally different kind of war. But it is basically the same type of war we fought during World War II in the Pacific. Our enemy then was 50 times more formidable. The only real difference is that General MacArthur fought to win, and he had the authority to do so; something that was denied him in Korea, something that is denied to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today. For example, they wanted to blockade the harbor of Hanoi but were overruled.

#### WE CAN WIN

If MacArthur had been allowed to defeat the aggressor in Korea, the Communists in Asia would hardly have started another war so soon. They have never doubted we can beat them. They only doubt our intention to do so, and they have good reason to doubt it. In the past they have been able to influence us with their propaganda. Their approach has changed, but their propaganda is just as effective as ever.

A year ago our Commander in Chief made a statesmanlike decision when he decided to abolish our policy of sanctuary. His decision saved South Vietnam from being conquered, and for this he will go down in history. What

is needed now is a decision to win the war. Not a cease-fire based on mutual concessions, as Senator FULBRIGHT has suggested; not negotiations based on a compromise of justice; not a bargaining away of the rights of others; but a just and lasting peace based on the surrender of the aggressor. In the words of Gen. Thomas A. Lane:

"The idea that forbearance increases the prospect of a negotiated settlement is an illusion. American lives are being squandered in Vietnam, just as they were in Korea. As in Korea, the Communists are quite satisfied to chew up American forces in a protracted war of attrition."

Can we win? Of course we can, and the Communists know it. But we never even talk about winning, and the Communists are not convinced we really want to. America has never lost a war, but for 20 years we have been vainly seeking substitutes for victory.

### The Honorable Homer Thornberry

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 7, I had the honor of attending the annual Dallas Chamber of Commerce banquet and the guest speaker was our former colleague, Homer Thornberry who is now judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Fifth Judicial District of Texas.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Judge Thornberry's remarks:

REMARKS OF JUDGE HOMER THORNBERRY, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT, AT ANNUAL DINNER OF DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORING MEMBERS OF TEXAS DELEGATION IN CONGRESS TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1965

This is a significant day—significant for two reasons. First, it is the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, and we are reminded once again of the sacrifices made by a great many in order that we can enjoy countless privileges as Americans. Secondly, today marks the 125th anniversary of the founding of the city of Dallas, and you have chosen this day to honor some of the best friends I ever had.

Anyone who has been privileged to serve with this great Texas delegation would be pleased to be here tonight to join you in honoring them. That is why—when my longtime friend, Dale Miller, called me—I felt that everyone would understand it if I would lay aside the judicial robes and rejoin, for a while, the camaraderie this association calls to mind.

It is possible for me to do so because you have made this an entirely nonpartisan affair. You are gathered on a community and civic basis to pay honor to a great team of distinguished Texans who represent this State in the Halls of Congress. Such an occasion as this is in the finest traditions of a great State whose people have long respected public service.

It is tragic, but it is true, that not all State delegations in Congress can gather together or even rally together. This delegation can, and all of us are proud that it can.

It can gather and rally together because it is made up today of men who have the judgment and the capacity to work to-

gether for those things on which they are agreed and yet to take opposing views when their individual judgments dictate they must, without reflecting on the motives of those whose views are different.

It would be difficult to overstate the depth and the current of the friendships that service in this delegation generates. It is not an exaggeration for me to say that outside my parents' home and my own home, I have found no other association so rewarding. Let me hasten to add, lest I be misunderstood, that I am not announcing for office again.

The opportunity to serve in this delegation, to cast my talents with theirs, to represent my district and my State alongside my colleagues; to face, with these men, at times of crisis and the times of victory, to wait with them through the nights of sorrow and despair for the mornings of hope and the days of success—all these things have made me appreciate how richly a man is endowed when he learns to work in a partisan environment without rancor, when he is able to accept defeat without recrimination, and when he can share victory without jealousy.

For every occasion such as tonight, there are many occasions that are quite different.

There are those who always find fault. If a Congress writes into law a large part of the platform on which it ran and the recommendations of the Nation's President, some spitefully call it a rubberstamp Congress.

However, when it shows great independence and spurs the President's recommendations and rejects the party platforms, it is dubbed a "do nothing" Congress.

A Member of Congress works harder than do most of his fellow Americans. He is a statesman when his critics agree with him and a lackey of the pressure groups when they disagree with him. These days the blind critics of the Congress sometimes speak louder than do its judicious observers.

But the judicious observers are being heard, too. And they say that what the Congress needs is support, understanding, and appreciation. A Member needs his constituents' considered advice, not their veiled threats. He needs their judgment of what is best for the country, not their demands for what is beneficial to a few. He needs their rejection of attacks on the institution of the Congress when it strives to equip and staff itself to meet the demands of the times.

He needs your trust and support when he gives you honest and faithful service. In this way a State builds a tradition of service which in itself strengthens its delegation in the Congress and extends its influence in the counsels of the Union.

The late Speaker Sam Rayburn's wisdom and understanding were a legend in his lifetime. He left our State a heritage of many treasures. One of these is his record of the longest service in our Nation's history as Speaker. Consider that during his service in the Congress, Mr. Rayburn served with a Texan who became President, two Texans who were Vice President, two Texans, including himself, who were Speakers of the House, one Texan who was majority leader of the Senate, and two Texans who were leaders of the House. Our greatest pride is in having a native son in the White House. Our pride is not so much related to the fact that President Johnson is a Texan as it is to the faith and confidence we share in his masterful leadership.

I believe in the right to express our opinions, the right to differ, the right to petition, and the rights of the minority. As a matter of fact, I think, even more than we have in the past, as Americans we need to support these rights. At the same time I think we need to recognize that the Constitution of the United States names the President as the Commander in Chief and vests in him the responsibility to guide our foreign affairs.

January 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A63

more to pay him this tribute in the House of Representatives.

He is a truly outstanding and most inspirational American. I congratulate him on his award and I congratulate the Jaycees on the wisdom of their choice.

## Freedom of Speech and the Vietnam Protest Movement

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress begins, the issue which bears heavily on all our thoughts is the grave and complex situation in Vietnam. Many questions come to mind—the conduct of the war, the operations and aid programs of our Nation in the social and economic development of southeast Asia and the direction and role we are to have in underdeveloped regions of the world.

These are problems of how we are to proceed in our relations with other nations. Just as serious is this question: what effect is the war to have on our own national life. The formulation of the budget is one aspect. Another is whether we are going to allow the cold war atmosphere, intensified by Vietnam, to narrow and possibly choke off political debate. It is very easy to label dissent unpatriotic during periods of crisis. To have a national definition of all these issues, however, a vigorous and substantial debate is essential.

An excellent statement on the need for free speech and a climate of critical and unfettered discussion was adopted by the Jewish Community Relations Council on November 7, 1965. This statement is clear and concise and contains a number of important points. I recommend it highly to the attention of my colleagues:

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE VIETNAM PROTEST MOVEMENT

Americans across the political spectrum are now engaged in vigorous and at times heated debate over our country's role and purpose in southeast Asia. We are convinced that such probing of public issues, however shrill, however irritating and distasteful to those who may disagree, is in the highest and best tradition of our democracy. The American political system depends upon unfettered public discussion to test the wisdom of national policy.

The aims and directions of our country's actions abroad therefore are not merely a legitimate subject for national debate. They constitute an area in which the authentic national interest requires us to provide full opportunity for public speech and for the assertion of diverse points of view.

In the political realm there are no truths so absolute and no judgments so wise that they may be withdrawn from public scrutiny. Especially on such fundamental mat-

ters as war and peace, which touch upon the life of every American citizen, it is necessary for our country's position to be subject to the corrective influence of public review and criticism.

One would suppose this principle to be a truism of the democratic process. Nevertheless it appears to have been forgotten or at least temporarily set aside by some of our most influential national leaders of both political parties. The desire of administration spokesmen to mobilize public endorsement for U.S. military intervention in Vietnam unhappily has been accompanied by a corollary desire to discourage criticism and by an apparent willingness to countenance limitations upon free speech and free assembly inconsistent with the tenets of an open society.

We, therefore, believe it imperative publicly to reaffirm that the right of vigorous protest—including demonstrations, parades, rallies, peaceful picketing, and the distribution of literature—is protected by the first amendment; and further that this right of demonstration may not be limited by police on the ground that such behavior might incite others to retaliatory action. We believe that academic freedom requires that members of the teaching community be allowed the liberty outside the classroom to express their personal views on controversial matters without fear of punishment or reprisal. With respect to current protests over U.S. policies in Vietnam, the task of Government authorities and law enforcement agencies is to insure that all those seeking peaceably to express their views, no matter what they may be and no matter how extreme they may seem, are afforded the opportunity to do so without exposure to penalty, interference, or the threat of violence.

Recent actions by various Government officials do not accord with this understanding of the public responsibility. Government figures on all levels have contributed to the evolution of a public mood in which any criticism of American foreign policy in the Far East becomes hazardous. The Attorney General has threatened a full-scale investigation into the demonstrations and has warned that "we may have some prosecutions in this area." The Director of the FBI announced that the Communists are exploiting the protest against the Vietnam war. A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report charged that the demonstrations had passed into the hands of Communists and extreme elements—an obvious attempt to frighten off participation by Americans of moderate views who may nevertheless be genuinely troubled by our present course in the Far East.

Even more disturbing are threats by various State officials of the selective service program to revoke the deferment of student protesters, to "run down these people as their names appear in the papers" and generally to employ the selective service system as a vehicle for punishing political dissent. These plans have been announced with no word of disapproval from General Hershey, the national head of selective service, that would remind these Government officials they are empowered solely to administer the law and not to harass lawful political activity.

The atmosphere engendered by these pronouncements is best exemplified by the legislation hastily enacted last August to punish those members of the protest movement who have sought to dramatize their opposition by the public burning of draft cards. We do not condone the burning of cards but we do not believe this practice constitutes the kind of clear and present danger to our national security necessary to justify such new and drastic legislation. The fact is that the burning of a draft card in itself has no

substantial consequences and in any case was already actionable under statutes requiring those subject to the draft to carry their draft cards on their persons at all times. The burning of the card in no way releases, excuses or immunizes anyone from the operation of the Selective Service Act or from the obligation to serve. It is a minor form of agitation whose sole meaning is symbolic and hortatory. Under these circumstances it is a demonstration of legislative excess that those who destroy draft cards will now be subject to maximum penalties of 5 years imprisonment or \$10,000 fine or both. This punishment stands in absurd contrast to the penalty for those guilty of desecrating the U.S. flag, who face no more than 30 days' imprisonment or a \$100 fine or both. The dignity of this country—and we believe its ultimate safety—would have been better served if American officials had had the composure to treat draft card burning as a routine infraction subject to such sanctions as were already prescribed under existing law.

This growing intemperance has evoked a menacing climate intolerant of any expression of difference. This is manifest in the contrast in public demeanor at the two parades that recently marched down Fifth Avenue in New York City.

Whatever may be said of the arguments of those who marched in protest over current American policies, their conduct throughout was restrained, orderly, and peaceful. They were, moreover, subject to extreme provocation in the form of vituperative and obscene vocal attacks from the sidewalks and frequently to physical assault from onlookers who repeatedly broke through police lines in order to disrupt the assembly.

On the other hand, although the overwhelming majority of those who marched in the officially sponsored counter-demonstration several weeks later were similarly disciplined and orderly, the fact remains that any one in the vicinity of the march who dared murmur dissent or who carried a placard even remotely disagreeing with the established position was immediately set upon both by demonstrators who left the line of march and by zealous sidewalk patriots all too eager to help. It is noteworthy that none of the personages who sponsored the march or who occupied positions of honor on the reviewing stand found it appropriate to disassociate himself from these acts, to denounce those who perpetrated them or to call for better appreciation and protection of the rights of those who disagreed.

We are mindful of the difficulties posed by the participation of Communists and other extremists in protests against U.S. policies in Vietnam. But they represent only a small minority of the many who are concerned. The protest movement includes thousands of loyal and law-abiding Americans, including members of the U.S. Senate, who have sincere reservations about our Vietnam policies. At the very least therefore we believe it incumbent upon Government authorities to link any pronouncement they make on the Vietnam protest movement with an affirmation of the content and purposes of the first amendment, with the clear pronouncement that lawful protest and dissent are not disloyal, and with the assurance that no punishment or obloquy will be assessed against those persons who exercise their constitutional right to speak their minds.

We are deeply cognizant of the challenges our Government faces in Asia and in other parts of the world. We venture no simple solution to these complex, even agonizing problems. We urge only that great public debate that must ensue be allowed to proceed untrammelled and unafraid.

**The Young Marines****EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN**

OF CONNECTICUT  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, January 12, 1966*

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending and participating in the ceremonies in which Burton P. Daugherty, national commandant of the Marine Corps League, presented the first National Young Marines Charter to the Young Marines of the Valley Detachment at Ansonia, Conn.

I want to pay a very special compliment to all of the men and women of the Naugatuck, Conn., Valley who have worked with the commanding officer of the Ansonia detachment, Steve Zuraw, in the formation and development of this youth program.

The Ansonia detachment was initiated in 1962 and it draws its membership from Ansonia, Derby, Shelton, Seymour, Beacon Falls, Oxford, and Southbury. The charter ceremonies attracted nationwide attention focusing on an organized youth group whose purpose is the improvement of health, education, and citizenship of youngsters ranging in age from 8 to 17 years.

The January 1966 edition of the *Leatherneck*, the magazine of the Marines carried a feature article entitled "The Young Marines" by Sgt. George Broadley, with photos by Cpl. Gary Scarbrough, on the Ansonia detachment.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include the article here in order that this deserving and developing program may properly be called to the attention of my colleagues:

THE YOUNG MARINES  
(By Sgt. George Broadley)

The sounds of boot camp vary little between Parris Island and San Diego. The same gruff voices give the same deep commands, and the same boots scramble to obey the orders.

Older marines with "time in" usually stand by and smile, remembering their own experiences at the hands of D.I.'s. Then, with memories intact, they go about their daily routine.

Now the San Diego or Parris Island atmosphere is present at other boot camps and stations throughout the Nation.

Working under the direction of the Marine Corps League, its members have started a youth group called the Young Marines.

Youngsters ranging from 8 to 17 years old are now wearing the forest green utility uniform. They wear it with as much pride and neatness as do their older counterparts in the regular Marine Corps.

While still too young to serve their country in the armed services, these young men work hard at being better citizens, and possibly future regular marines.

They are learning the meaning of personal pride, integrity, and faithfulness to their fellow man. Also, they have a headstart on other boys their age, for they are learning the meaning and value of discipline.

The Marine Corps League is sponsoring the program and has given the first National Young Marines charter to the Young

Marines of the Valley Detachment at Ansonia, Conn.

Steve Zuraw, the energetic commanding officer of the Ansonia detachment, said that the boys get a shock treatment similar to that of a new recruit at either Parris Island or San Diego. They soon get to know the words "Yes, sir," "No, sir," "Double time" and the meaning of military courtesy.

Their boot camp usually lasts for about 20 weeks. The 2½-hour class sessions are held on Friday nights. Upon completion of boot training, the youths are "graduated" into the regular unit.

While the rank structure is the same as the regular Marine Corps, their promotions entail far more than having the required time in grade and passing the current GMST. The League's Young Marines are marked on church attendance, personal cleanliness, post attendance, physical health and school marks. If a Young Marine's school marks fall below average, he is asked to leave the organization.

This seems to have its desired effect because the Young Marines are well above the average in scholastic markings. Teachers credit this fact to the training that the youngsters receive from their D.I.'s, and an avid desire to learn.

The lads also have a physical fitness program in which they are instructed in boxing, simple judo and wrestling. They are also taught craftsmanship, model building, outdoor survival and some military subjects, including drill, inspections, national history, and pride in Corps and county.

Mr. Burton P. Daugherty, National Commandant of the League, presented the Young Marine charter. He said, "there can be no better way for the league to demonstrate its determination to fulfill its purpose than to sponsor a program for American youth designed to preserve and perpetuate our Nation's heritage of a free society."

The Ansonia detachment was started early in 1962, and it serves the cities of Ansonia, Derby, Shelton, Seymour, Beacon Falls, Oxford, and Southbury.

The first formal presentation of the Young Marines, in a parade, took place at the Marine Corps League national convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1963.

Due to this particular performance, League members decided to adopt the program and form other units throughout the country.

Units are presently in operation in Connecticut, Florida, California, Missouri, Washington, Louisiana, New York, and Illinois.

"Our Young Marine program is definitely one of the finest and most worthwhile projects the league has even undertaken," said Marine Corps League Commandant Daugherty. "We're giving it everything we've got."

**Morris Weinberg****EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF****HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Wednesday, January 12, 1966*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Morris Weinberg will celebrate his 90th birthday. At the same time, he and his gracious wife, Dora, will celebrate their 65th wedding anniversary. It gives me great pleasure to salute these fine people who have contributed so much to the enrichment of American life.

Morris Weinberg is the founder of the

Day-Jewish Journal, a paper which has been an important voice in Jewish-American affairs since 1914. But even before that, Morris Weinberg was a dynamic force. Since the turn of the century, he has been a man who has devoted himself to noble causes. His is a name that evokes the warmest feelings of admiration and respect. He has served his people and his country very, very well.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberg are currently enjoying in Palm Beach, Fla., a retirement which they have both earned. I am certain that my colleagues, of whatever faith they may be, join me in extending their salutations and best wishes to Morris and Dora Weinberg. I wish them many, many more years of fruitful and happy life. They are a wonderful example of fine Jews and fine Americans.

**The Late Prime Minister Shastri, of India****EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF****HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Monday, January 10, 1966*

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, twice in less than 2 years, India has suffered the loss of its leader.

Each death has been a tragedy and a crisis of major magnitude, not only to India, but to the world.

Each has also marked a turning point and an awakening to reality in this new—yet old—land after centuries of slumber.

The first death was Prime Minister Nehru, the Kashmir aristocrat who led one-sixth of the world's population along the dangerous and difficult path of self-government for 17 years.

The second death was Prime Minister Shastri, the tiny man from near the holy city of Benares, who attempted to weld India into a cohesive whole in the face of crises.

Nehru was a man of strength who believed passionately in peace, a world leader who saw his dreams of a neutral and economically strong India surrounded by peaceful neighbors exploded by Red Chinese attacks on Indian soil.

Shastri was a man of compassion who believed in strength in the face of threats from outside its borders and who turned inward toward domestic problems rather than outward toward the world.

Shastri was also a man of courage, who negotiated a ceasefire with neighboring Pakistan on the day of his death, even though such negotiations were dangerous to him politically.

Prime Minister Shastri's time in office was short. But his accomplishments may well prove to be among the greatest in Indian history.

His efforts to bring peace to Kashmir, to feed the people of India and find the means by which India could defend itself from Red Chinese aggression are deeds which many thought impossible of achievement.

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A65

Out of the death of this man so small in physical stature but so large in heart and mind could come peace and stability for India and the subcontinent and a richer life for its people.

### Why Should Open Dealing Be Suspect?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, every American President since 1954 has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. Over the years, we have made a national pledge to help that country defend its independence.

President Johnson also took up this task. Indeed, he expanded the American involvement by many times believing that to withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next. We are no longer losing the war in Vietnam—nor, however, are we really winning it. We are at least in a position where we can seek peace terms with honor and without surrendering South Vietnam to the aggressors.

President Johnson has launched an all-out peace offensive to achieve a cessation of the hostilities. He was immediately attacked for his "grandstand play" and his "insincerity." Previously he was severely criticized for his so-called indifference to enemy peace feelers, and now he is being attacked for taking the initiative in this area.

Perhaps this is just an element of our American democracy. Whatever our leaders do, we mistrust their motives and make the most of our freedom to criticize.

A recent editorial by Loudon Wainwright in Life magazine deals with this very subject. I submit this excellent article for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article follows:

#### WHY SHOULD OPEN DEALING BE SUSPECT?

(By Loudon Wainwright)

It has been interesting during these days of President Johnson's peace offensive to hear the bleats of those who are opposed to it. The President is variously accused of participating in worldwide vaudeville, of practicing amateurish diplomacy, of negating gains we have won in Vietnam, of polishing up his own image as a man of peace before he advises the Congress and the people that we will have to escalate the war.

Certainly Mr. Johnson thrives on theatricality, and he delights in taking devious routes to hidden objectives. Yet I am astonished that more people have not interpreted this dramatic, high-level missionary assault around the globe as evidence that he sincerely seeks an honorable end of the conflict. In fact, I think the skepticism about his methods and his aims not only demeans the man but renders to the enemy a full measure of the same sort of comfort they get from our peace marchers. See, it might well be said in Hanoi, the Americans themselves have little faith in this diplomatic stunting; it is a sign of trickery or weakness, and we will have nothing to do with it.

The reason for the skepticism lies, I think, in a national trait we don't boast about or even really believe we possess. If we are cheerful, generous, and courageous, we are also highly suspicious a good bit of the time, especially about a situation where the cards appear to be out on the table. On occasions where there is some room for bargaining, like buying an automobile, most of us, I suspect, go into the deal with the feeling we are going to get clipped and wind up the negotiations sure of it. In the field of diplomacy, Americans have become conditioned to suspect that nothing really worthwhile can be arrived at openly, and that all meaningful activities must take place in secret. We sift a bucket of innuendo for a drop of truth. Like the man in psychoanalysis who is puzzled by his friend's "Hello," we often wonder what is really meant by the simplest things. Used to the notion that big things are brought off in whispers, we doubt the honesty of a loud, clear voice. Of course, the North Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russians all share this characteristic of suspicion, so there is a lot of mutual distrust. But must that rule out bare truth as a tactic of international communication?

There has been a considerable amount of speculation about the factors that might have impelled the President to undertake this personalized, global expression of his and his country's aims toward peace. Some of this speculation holds that Mr. Johnson was driven to this extreme in order to confound and silence the critics of his administration's policies in Vietnam. The peace marchers, the draft card burners, the self-immolators, so this notion goes, have forced the President into a new and unusual stance.

I very much doubt that this is so. There can be no question that the President has been disturbed by the current agitations of one sort and another, and certainly he must have been upset by the allegations that in the recent past the United States had been reluctant to find a peaceful settlement. Surely, too, he has been aware—though his favorite indicators, the polls, do not always clearly show such things—of the fact that the national conscience is troubled by the bloody dilemmas of Vietnam. Yet it seems more reasonable to me to believe that the President is not simply acting in response to these things, but rather that he is testing out direct truthfulness as a possible approach to the practical solution of a terrible problem. Why on earth does that have to be such a poor idea?

For one important thing, there appears to be no evidence that we have been getting any closer to a peaceful settlement through the techniques of a mounting escalation. The enemy simply increases his commitment, and it is decidedly unclear how much escalation it will take to bring Hanoi to what U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, in an interesting reminder that he was once a bigtime labor lawyer, referred to in Rome as "the bargaining table." I suppose that, if we ever reach that place, it will indeed be a bargaining table, with certain clauses tipped into the contract here and there to mollify the various parties. Assuming that our principal goal is peace, assuming also that we do not intend to betray our obligations to the South Vietnamese or to cut and run to achieve that peace, I cannot understand how we minimize our chances for it by saying so to everyone within jet range.

When I heard Pope Paul say in New York, "No more war, war never again," I believed that he thought such an astounding condition was possible. When I hear that a covey of emissaries named HUMPHREY, Harriman, Goldberg, Bundy, and Williams has fanned out all over the world, I find myself believing that the man who sent them means what he says. And from the strident tone of the squawks now coming from Hanoi, I'd guess

that some powerful quarters are whispering to them that he means it, too.

Virtually wherever one finds himself in the spectrum of American opinion—unless he is in favor of all-out assault or, on the other hand, total withdrawal from Vietnam—most people, from the peace marchers to the Pentagon, should be able to take some encouragement from the peace offensive. Among other things, it has clarified our aims to a great part of the world. If some remain unconvinced we are at least emphatically on the record. Whatever the results of this offensive are, it seems to me entirely worthy of us.

Which raises, of course, the question of failure. What if the North Vietnamese refuse to take the lull in the bombing or the President's peace talk as an opportunity to move toward a settlement? Do we then—our honest intentions spat upon—fall back on the cruel logic of escalation and an expanded war? Do we, our worst suspicions apparently proved out about the uselessness of straightforward diplomacy, return quickly to the upward spiral of death? On precisely that matter New York Times Columnist James Reston asks a very good question: "What's the rush?" What, indeed? The peace offensive has been a good effort and I believe we should not easily abandon it just because it does not immediately work. The stones grind slow.

### "Maggie" Higgins

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enclose this editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star titled "Maggie Higgins" in the issue of January 7, 1966.

The article follows:

#### "MAGGIE" HIGGINS

Fragile, blond Marguerite Higgins wore mud like other women wear makeup while she was covering the Korean war.

But as she told the general who ordered her to leave the combat zone, she wasn't working in Korea as a woman. "I am here," she said, "as a war correspondent."

She was, and a good one, who slogged through the thick of it with the foot-soldiers, wearing slacks, khaki shirt, sneakers, and a fatigue cap.

She was 24 when she had her baptism of fire with the 7th U.S. Army on the Austrian front. She accompanied the liberating forces in their surge across Hitler's dying empire. Her dispatches on the horrors of the concentration camps at Dachau and Buchenwald were detailed, crisp and strong. So, also, were her stories from Korea, which won her a Pulitzer Prize.

She had the superior reporter's habit of refusing to accept the surface picture as the true one. Her sixth and last book, "Our Vietnam Nightmare," boldly traces the intrigues in the upper echelons of the Kennedy administration which led to the overthrow and assassination of President Ugo Dinh Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

"Maggie" traveled light at the front—just carried a toothbrush and towel. But she traveled far. It was a tropical illness picked up during her travels that cost her life. But not before she had made her special contribution to help her country understand the kaleidoscopic events of a violent time.

**Where Does Space Fit in a War Budget?****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 12, 1966*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Sunday Star of December 19, 1965, is a most thoughtful analysis of the role of our space program in a wartime situation. This editorial clearly identifies the essential features of the NASA effort and its place in meeting our national commitments in the Vietnam struggle.

**WHERE DOES SPACE FIT IN A WAR BUDGET?**

There is more than a little irony in the fact that a cutback in space spending, at least in some degree, is almost certain to follow close on the heels of last week's splendid achievements by our astronauts. Even so, and however incongruous it may seem, the demands of the war in Vietnam are bearing down hard on a beleaguered President.

The outlook in this respect has been somewhat clouded by the peace-feeler from Hanoi. If Ho Chi Minh was serious, this overture might have led to a ceasefire and peace negotiations. Any such hope, however, seems to have gone down the drain as a result of premature publicity and the obvious ambiguities in the proposal itself. Hanoi is now saying, untruthfully, that the whole thing was an American "fabrication."

This probably means that the war will go on and that its costs can be expected to rise by billions of dollars. And if we are to avoid budget deficits of very dangerous proportions the Government will have to retrench in the area of the nonessentials or push through a major tax increase.

No easy choices are in sight. A tax boost in an election year, especially after all the self-serving applause which followed the most recent tax reduction, will be a bitter pill for Congress to swallow, particularly for those Members who will be up for reelection. Significant retrenchments can and should be made in some of the Great Society's massive social programs. But this, too, will be politically difficult. The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has already served notice that if the President tries to take this way out of his dilemma "we will have no alternative but to use our lobbying and protest activity to get Congress to reverse it." The President, with his keen ear for the political nuances, will need a great deal of fortitude to stand up to this threat.

So, quite naturally, the budget pruners are taking a hard look at prospective space spending. What NASA projects can be canceled, stretched out, or pushed back? Realistically, what is the outlook for significant economies in this area?

Space spending in this fiscal year, which ends June 30, will be about \$5.17 billion. NASA would like an additional \$500 million for next year, but probably won't get it. A halt in further work on the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory has been announced. A nuclear power unit for the Voyager project, envisioning an unmanned journey to Mars in the 1970's, may be in danger. And other as yet unidentified exploratory undertakings are expected to get the ax.

Development of a nuclear power unit would be expensive. This is not generally true, however, of unmanned space exploration. Consequently the opportunity for economies in these projects, at least in the short run, are not great. For practical purposes this leaves as areas of possible substan-

tial savings, the remaining Gemini flights and the forthcoming tests of Apollo, the spacecraft which has been counted upon to land Americans on the moon by 1969.

The lunar project is the big dollar consumer. Estimates of the eventual cost range from \$20 to \$30 billion.

The moon program grows out of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, strongly backed by the then majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, and a proposal in 1961 by President Kennedy which looked toward a manned flight to the moon and back by the end of this decade. Among the considerations was the prospect that we might beat the Russians to the moon, and thereby offset some of the prestige they had won through their sputnik flights and the great power of their launching rockets.

Support for a crash program to get to the moon has been considerably less than unanimous. One of the dissenters is Dr. Warren Weaver, a distinguished mathematician and former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In a copy-righted interview earlier this month with U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Weaver said that if we are doing this as some "ridiculous race" against the Russians it is "just plain stupid." The moon, he added, is going to be there, and "I think we are utilizing at the present time altogether too much money," \* \* \* too much of our Nation's technical competence and too much strategic material. Dr. Weaver believes the really important questions which may be answered through a \$30 billion moon project could have been sensibly answered at a cost of \$500 million over a 5-year period. Presumably, what he had in mind was the landing of instruments, not men, on the moon.

Quite a different view is held by Dr. George E. Mueller, NASA's associate administrator for manned space flight. In an address to the National Conference of Editorial Writers a year ago, he said the principal goal of the manned space program is not to beat the Russians to the moon, but to make the United States first in space. Apparently calculating that the 8-year Apollo program will cost about \$20 billion, Dr. Mueller said: "We found that if the remaining 6 years of work were stretched out over 12 years the total cost of the presently approved manned flight program would increase by about 30 percent, or about \$6 billion. Thus, the economic considerations support the maintenance of the present well-paced schedule."

What this seems to mean is that a cutback over the next few years, assuming this to be feasible, would increase the final bill by the very large sum of \$6 billion. And if an eventual higher cost is thought to be worthwhile for the sake of reduced expenditures in the immediate future, the problems of a stretch-out still remain formidable.

The financial commitments already made for the Apollo program, not to mention the remaining Gemini launchings, cannot be dishonored. The first Saturn rocket, the 1B, is ready for its initial test. The Saturn V, expected to produce 7.5 million pounds of thrust, is far advanced. So is work on the vehicles which these powerful rockets can hurl into space. It is difficult to see how this work can be stopped or significantly slowed down without losing more than would be gained from a temporary dollar savings. Then there is the problem of holding together the space team we have so carefully built up, including not only the astronauts themselves, but also the 300,000 highly trained technicians who back them up. To let some or most of them go could have disastrous consequences on our whole future in space.

The very existence of this space-and-the-budget problem rests, of course, on the assumption that we are in for a long war, a war which will make increasing demands on our men and our resources. If the new

peace-feeler report should prove to be the real thing, if indeed we get to the conference table before much longer, the President will not have to concern himself unduly with budget cuts in the nonmilitary areas. But Mr. Johnson as of now cannot bank on such a happy issue out of all his afflictions. He must plan to cut spending where he can cut. And while the space program can be trimmed here and there, the really big item in that program—the journey to the moon—does not seem to hold much promise for the pruners.

Which means that the squeeze must be applied elsewhere.

**A Supertrain****EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 12, 1966*

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying legislative achievements of the first session was the high-speed ground transit act. Many hope—and I am one of them—that this program will help railroads regain the popularity and prosperity they once enjoyed in the passenger field.

I am proud that one of the test projects of this program will take place in late 1966 between New Brunswick and Trenton, N.J., because of the area's unique rail facilities and physical qualities.

It was satisfying to read in late 1965 that the Department of Commerce awarded a contract to the Budd Co. for the cars that will conduct the experiments and tests. And service on the Boston-New York-Washington run is expected to start about April 1967, with train speeds ranging to 150 miles per hour. Because of the many merits of New Brunswick and the surrounding area, I hope that this "Hub City" will be one of the stops on the run.

In short, notable progress is being made on this historic and challenging rail program. As one of its several co-sponsors and as a resident of Middlesex County, where part of the tests will be held, I submit an editorial by the New Brunswick Daily Home News of December 15, 1965, entitled "Next Year, a Supertrain."

The editorial follows:

**NEXT YEAR, A SUPERTRAIN**

You won't be on it but by this time next year you'll see a shiny four-car supertrain whooshing along the Penny mainline between here and Trenton at a cool 150 miles per hour. That's 2½ miles per minute, and that's pretty fast.

The Department of Commerce's Northeast Corridor project has awarded the Budd Co. of Philadelphia a near-million-dollar contract for a crash program to get the four new cars on the rails late next year.

The cars are not strictly new. They'll be basically the shiny self-propelled Budd cars that a lucky traveler occasionally finds on the Philadelphia-New York run. A streamlined new design and a souped up powerplant (more than 60 percent more powerful than the existing ones) will raise the train's speed from its present 90 miles per hour to the desired 150 miles per hour.



January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A67

The project people say this stretch of track between New Brunswick and Trenton has been chosen because it has welded rails which give a smooth ride. It is likely another factor leading to locating the experiment here is the fact that this stretch is virtually curveless.

While this test of high speed rail equipment is being made here with electrically powered units, the project will conduct another experiment on a stretch of nonelectrified track somewhere between Boston and New York on the New Haven Railroad. The power in this second experiment will be gas turbines. Contracts are expected to be let soon for this experiment.

The results of the two tests will be evaluated, and then it is expected that the Department of Commerce will chose the better system and order 50 cars at a cost of some \$10 million and put them into service between Boston and Washington.

The benefits which 150 miles per hour speeds will bring to different communities will vary. A key factor will be the choice of stops for the high speed trains. Obviously they can't stop at every station or they will never attain the terminal-to-terminal speed which is the chief reason for establishing the service.

We would hope and expect that New Brunswick would be a regular stop for the high speed trains. Our area is growing rapidly in population. Rutgers will continue to generate more and more passenger potential. Some of our largest industries are headquartered in cities on the Boston-New York-Washington run and their executives will find the high speed service convenient if there is a stop here. New Brunswick would also be the logical stop for travel between Princeton and New York and the Northeast.

While the new service is being tested here, New Brunswick will be a center of interest for all people interested in railway progress, and the refurbishing of the Pennsylvania Station here for the Rutgers bicentennial will come at a time appropriate in railroad history too.

## Wyoming VISTA Week

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging fronts in the war on poverty is VISTA. The Volunteers in Service to America have asked and answered the question of what they can do for their country. VISTA initiated a program in October at Fort Washakie in Wyoming. The understanding and assistance of VISTA volunteers has won the respect and gratitude of our entire State. In this regard, I am pleased to enter the statement of Gov. Clifford P. Hansen in proclaiming this week as VISTA Week in Wyoming.

The proclamation follows:

## PROCLAMATION

Whereas the war on poverty is the concern of all citizens and its successful waging can bring new hope and opportunity to those fellow Americans who do not share in this Nation's promise; and

Whereas one of the most effective means of eradicating poverty is through the efforts of individual persons who live and work with the poor; and

Whereas the Volunteers in Service to America are fellow citizens who have chosen to devote 1 year of their lives to this nationwide effort and are now seeking others who join their ranks; and

Whereas many people in Wyoming are eligible to join VISTA—retired teachers, technicians, young college graduates, husband and wife teams who are seeking new programs to offer encouragement and assistance, can work with people in 1 of the 50 States and U.S. territories; and

Whereas the Wyoming courage and experience in fighting hardship is an important asset for VISTA volunteers; Wyoming people can carry their spirit and skill to the poor people of America, in rural and urban communities wherever poverty exists:

Now, therefore, I, Clifford P. Hansen, Governor of the State of Wyoming, do hereby proclaim the period of January 9 through January 15, 1966, as VISTA Week in Wyoming and urge all who can to explore this opportunity to serve America on its diverse home fronts.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wyoming to be affixed this 4th day of January, 1966.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,  
Governor.

## Invocation for Navy Day Luncheon

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the invocation for the Navy Day luncheon celebration, given by the Reverend Howard Dalton of the First Methodist Church in Santa Rosa, Calif., was unquestionably one of the most impressive opening prayers I have had the privilege of hearing.

In observing the comments and reactions of the Navy personnel in attendance at this luncheon, I was convinced that they were equally impressed. Therefore, I take this opportunity to include Reverend Dalton's prayer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress.

## INVOCATION FOR NAVY DAY LUNCHEON

Dear Lord and Father of all mankind. We come unto Thee with gratitude in our hearts and words of praise upon our lips. Receive our thanks for the good earth, upon which we are privileged to live, and all the blessings that come unto us from Thee.

We praise Thee for the ideals of our forefathers who lived dangerously, fought heroically, and served courageously to gain and maintain our freedom. Give us a renewed vision of the true meaning of freedom and a determination to preserve and extend it unto all Thy children.

May Thy richest blessings be upon the Commander in Chief of our Nation and all others who guide the policies and destiny of our Nation. Endow them with divine wisdom that in all decisions made Thy will shall be done on earth.

As our attention centers upon the Naval personnel who have and continue to serve so faithfully, we give thee thanks for each of them who have given so much for us. Graciously bless the officers and men of our Navy. Guard the ships that plow through the waters of the seas in their efforts to pre-

serve peace, relieve the oppressed and maintain freedom in our world.

Bless all nations of mankind on the face of the earth and hasten the time when the principles of holy religion shall so prevail that none shall wage war any more for the purposes of aggression and none shall need it as a means of defense.

Bless the food of the hour and strengthen our bodies to do Thy will in all things, we pray in Thy Holy Name. Amen.

## Gemini 7 Nearing Final Laps

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas Times Herald featured an article by Alvin B. Webb, Jr., on December 17, 1965, which catches the flavor of the final laps of the flights of Gemini 6 and 7 and the total dedication of our astronauts reaching the objective of landing on the moon by 1970. The dialog between the Houston control and astronauts Frank Borman and James Lovell typifies their dedication to fulfilling our national objective. I commend the reading of this dialog in the last hours of the flight:

GEMINI 7 NEARING FINAL LAPS: PICTURES  
TAKEN AT RENDEZVOUS ELATE SPACEMEN

(By Alvin B. Webb, Jr.)

SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Space kings Frank Borman and James Lovell, joking and cheerfully recalling their tremendous experience of rendezvous with Gemini 6, sped today toward their 14th and final day in orbit and an Atlantic splashdown tomorrow.

While earthlings viewed the first spectacular film of that nose-to-nose formation flight, the Gemini 7 crew fought off problems with a pesky fuel cell electrical supply system and received a "go" for their 14th day.

Their space buddies, Gemini 6 Pilots Walter Schirra and Thomas Stafford, returned today to Cape Kennedy. Gemini 6 brought back the first pictures of a spaceship in orbit—a fantastic view of Gemini 7 close to within 6 feet of it Wednesday.

Astronaut Elliot See told Borman and Lovell the pictures "are remarkably clear \* \* \* just every little detail as clear as a bell. You look just great sitting up there."

"Well, thank you," the obviously pleased Borman replied. "It was a tremendous experience.

"We're really in pretty good shape." Borman reported. They were in their 195th orbit.

They were also told the filmstrips were shown over television networks, to which Borman quipped in jest: "And we are in our underwear."

Borman also had a word to say when ground stations told them Schirra and Stafford stepped from their capsule Friday as if they had been up for a brief jet plane ride: "That's all they did, for crying out loud."

Flight Director John Hodge said he was "very happy" today with the erratic fuel cells on the Gemini 7.

"All the systems we have looked at are going extremely well," Hodge said. "There's no reason why we shouldn't just go straight on downhill from here on."

Hodge said Gemini 7 had about 8 to 10 pounds of fuel left and would have half of that Saturday for reentry.

The fuel cell problems were considered so serious Thursday that it seemed possible the 14-day flight might be cut short. But there was no talk of that today either at the space center or in the spacecraft where Borman and Lovell, cheerful and relaxed, chatted with ground controllers.

Both astronauts awoke chipper and responded crisply when See radioed an updated flight plan to them.

"Hi, there, Houston, how are you this morning?" Borman said "Did you sleep well last night?"—turning the tables on ground controllers, who have been asking continual questions on the astronauts' condition.

See filled Borman in on Schirra's pinpoint landing near the carrier *Wasp* Thursday, and Borman said:

"Get that right. There's a lot riding on this." He and Schirra made a bet Wednesday during their historic rendezvous flight as to which would get the closest to the carrier on landing.

Lovell asked about his wife Marilyn, who is expected to give birth to their fourth child this month. Flight Surgeon Dr. Charles Berry told him there was "a little bit of a scare the other night but it didn't amount to anything."

He said Mrs. Lovell was sorry she didn't have the baby while Lovell was in orbit.

The first photographs showed the Gemini 7 spacecraft looking brandnew and gliding over the brilliant blues and whites of earth 185 miles below.

(The dramatic pictures, believed taken by Schirra, showed straps dangling from a thermal blanket attached to the rear of the adapter section to protect it from the bitter cold of space.

(The straps were left when the spacecraft separated from the launch vehicle.

(The object which Gemini 7 astronauts said hit their windshield shortly after launch December 4 apparently was one of the straps.)

The Gemini 7 spacecraft was also having troubles with two of its maneuvering rockets, but the problem was not serious and the fuel cells were receiving most of the attention.

Space agency officials denied they were gambling on the troublesome fuel cell electrical power supply units. They said the fuel cells would carry through with plenty of margin.

"I think nothing means more to Frank Borman and James Lovell than to complete this mission as planned" said Astronaut Eugene Cernan at a midnight news conference.

If all goes as planned, the champion astronauts will fire their four powerful braking rockets at 8:28 a.m. e.s.t. (7:28 a.m. Dallas time) Saturday and end their record-smashing cosmic journey with an Atlantic Ocean splashdown at 9:05 a.m. e.s.t. (8:05 a.m. Dallas time).

### Ski in Pennsylvania

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Sponsoring Committee, I call your attention to the first annual Pennsylvania Ski Ball which will take place next Saturday evening, January 15, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in this city. The affair is designed to promote our State's rapidly growing recreation industry, particularly the out-

standing ski resorts, as well as to make a contribution to assist in financing the U.S. ski team at the next Olympic games.

Winter sports enthusiasts in this area should be especially interested in the excellent winter sports facilities now available in Pennsylvania. It is a long day's trip to New Hampshire or Vermont, but Pennsylvania's winter wonderlands are between 2 and 4 hours by car from the Nation's Capital. Many groups and families leave Washington on Friday afternoons to enjoy full weekends of winter sports in our State.

Gov. William Scranton and Senators HUGH SCOTT and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., are honorary chairmen of the Pennsylvania Ski Ball sponsored by the Pennsylvania Society of Washington. General chairman is Attorney William D. Patton, of Johnstown, who is vice president of the society. We all invite you to take advantage of the healthy recreational facilities that are in such easy reach of this area.

### German Government Statement Supports President Johnson's Vietnam Peace Effort

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1966, the Federal Republic of Germany issued a statement which gives strong and unequivocal support to President Lyndon B. Johnson's effort to bring peace to Vietnam.

I am personally pleased that the German Government at Bonn has endorsed this U.S. diplomatic initiative.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED ON JANUARY 7, 1966, BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY IN BONN

At the end of the past year, President Johnson announced that the bombing of Vietnam has been temporarily discontinued. At the same time, he repeated that the United States is ready to enter discussions or consultations with any government at any time, and without preconditions.

The sincerity of the American efforts for peace, and the desire to reach a negotiated settlement, become clear from the 14-point program in which the American Government points out that the Indochina Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 could well form the basis for peace in southeast Asia.

The German Government has always maintained that the defense of the freedom and independence of Vietnam, by the United States, is of the greatest importance for the entire world. It supports all efforts toward a peaceful conclusion of the conflict, aiming at the maintenance of a free and independent Vietnam. It especially welcomes the declaration of the American Government that the Vietnam question must be solved by the people of Vietnam on the basis of their own freely arrived at decision.

Within the framework of a far-reaching diplomatic initiative, the United States has demonstrated its will for peace. Its efforts deserve the concurrence of all who love peace. The German Government and the

German people welcome and support this position of the United States of America, borne as it is by a high sense of responsibility.

### Private Foundations and Community Funds

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence M. Stone, tax legislative counsel, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, recently delivered a most incisive speech on taxation and charitable giving before the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles.

Mr. Stone's remarks provide a most valuable analysis of public policy concerning the tax status of publicly supported and privately supported foundations. His speech points out both abuses and benefits of our present tax laws. The operation of foundations is an area of deep concern to all Members of Congress and I commend Mr. Stone's speech to their attention as a fine contribution in this field:

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS AND COMMUNITY FUNDS

(Address by Lawrence M. Stone, Tax Legislative Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department, Before 3d Biennial Seminar on Taxation and Charitable Giving of the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles, Beverly Hills Hotel, Beverly Hills, Calif., Dec. 2, 1965)

Neither charity nor organized community charitable enterprises are new to the Jewish people. Indeed, such endeavors are among our most ancient traditions. They are, perhaps, one of the reasons for the stubborn survival of the Jews through centuries of hostile environment.

The modern notion that the poor have a right to assistance is deeply imbedded in Jewish tradition. The Hebrew word "mitzvah," frequently used to connote "good deed," means "commandment." The common term for charity, "tsdkeh," can be defined as "social justice." In the meanings of both of these words one finds a clear sense of the obligation which charity carries for those who can do it and the entitlement which it establishes for those who need it.

The Jewish people have, moreover, looked upon the obligation to do charity and the right to receive it as principles to be enforced by the community. Community leaders are charged with responsibility for conducting charitable campaigns. The community as a whole judges the ability of each of its members to give. Those who fail to give according to their resources must answer to the community. In these very real senses, Jewish tradition makes charity a plain and important public matter.

Yet charity is not necessarily performed only through community action; good works do not always spring from such public sources. Indeed, one of the more remarkable phenomena of American society in the last 25 years has been the growth of the so-called private foundation. Charitable organizations of this type are ordinarily established, endowed, and directed by a single individual or a family; and, in that sense at least, they are private. Today a number of such foundations have assets worth many millions of

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A79

from the general fund. This was indeed a great victory.

Believe me, we have every reason to accelerate the construction programs now before us. We must meet whatever requirements are necessary to complete the system, but in the meantime, it behooves all of us to expand the cooperation and coordination of highway planning. We must restudy our highway needs with particular attention given to a functional reclassification of our highway systems.

During the past few years, we have concentrated on the critically needed Interstate and Defense Highway System. However, in my opinion, we should not concentrate solely on freeways and expressways—more attention must be given to the farm-to-market and secondary road systems. The Interstate System is a model achievement of what can be done with proper and coordinated planning. And yet, the Interstate System is only expected to carry 20 percent of the estimated 1 trillion miles that will be driven by 1976—10 short years from now. That other 80 percent—800 billion miles—will be driven on the primary and secondary highways.

It seems only logical to me—that our goal must be a balanced highway system. With transportation and highways recognized generally as the economic lifeline to a community, one can only conclude that a “balanced highway system” would mean a “balanced economic development” throughout our land.

With the acceleration of funds and a new emphasis on secondary roads, a comprehensive system could be developed that will speed motorists to their destinations in the safest possible manner.

And then one day, perhaps, we can minimize the slaughters on our highways that cost more American lives over one weekend than have been lost during our entire involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I thank you for the privilege of being with you.

### Parrots of Penance

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. DON EDWARDS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, what constitutes loyalty is an age-old question—the answer varies from nation to nation and within nations, from era to era. Our own Nation, with constitutional and historical guarantees for the freedoms of speech, press, and association, is subject to wide variations in the level of tolerance to critical discussion and dissent. Too often, the “loyal” American is the orthodox, the quiet, and the unquestioning American.

In verse form Dr. Gene Gordon brilliantly describes the relationship between loyalty, the social and political atmosphere, and “the very perfect model of a member of the faculty.” Dr. Gordon wrote this poem in the midst of the loyalty oath controversy at the University of California around 1949. He was, at the time, a clinical instructor in neurology and studying neurology and psychiatry. “Parrots of Penance” has been printed anonymously in a Journal of the New Mexico Association of Pro-

fessors, the Northern California Civil Liberties News, and the magazine *Monocle*. Its wit and message commend it for all to read and ponder and so I include “Parrots of Penance” in the RECORD:

#### “PARROTS OF PENANCE”

(Tune: “I Am the Very Pattern of a Modern Major General”—Sullivan.)

I am the very model of a member of the of loyalty,  
Because I'm simply overcome with sentiments of loyalty.

I daily think of reasons why I'm glad to be American,  
And thank the Lord I've always been a registered Republican.

The thoughts I think are only thoughts approved by my community.

I pledge allegiance to the flag at every opportunity.

I haven't had a thing to do with Communist conspirators,  
And neither have my relatives, descendants, or progenitors.

I try to keep away from propositions controversial;

I've no opinions social, politic, or commercial.

And so you see that I must be, with sentiments of loyalty,

The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

#### CHORUS

And so you see that he must be, with sentiments of loyalty,

The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

#### II

I'm qualified to educate in matters of heredity,

Unstilled by the taint of any doctrinaire rigidity.

I teach the Darwin theory with valuation critical,

Uninfluenced by dogmatists religious or political.

I understand the economic forces that have made us great;

The system of free enterprise I do not underestimate.

I'm well equipped objectively to point out flaws in Marxist thought,

Because I've never read his work; and rest assured that I will not.

I freely follow truth in ways which I am sure will satisfy,

The Board of regents, William Hearst, and Hoover of the FBI.

And so you see that I must be, with sentiments of loyalty,

The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

#### CHORUS

And so you see that he must be, with sentiments of loyalty,

The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

### Big Red 1

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN BUCHANAN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Birmingham and of the Sixth

District of Alabama, which I am honored to represent, have selected a most dramatic way to demonstrate their support of our military effort in Vietnam and the unfailing courage of our fighting men there. By official proclamation of Mayor Albert Boutwell, the city of Birmingham has adopted the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army, more affectionately known as the Big Red 1.

Like so many other loyal patriotic Americans, the good people of Birmingham were disturbed and angered by the demonstrations and draft card burnings of a small misguided minority in this country—actions which have perplexed and even undermined the morale of U.S. Armed Forces engaged in a difficult and exhausting struggle thousands of miles from home. The citizens of Birmingham determined to show in a concrete and convincing way they were behind our men in Vietnam all the way.

The idea of “adopting” the 1st Infantry Division, now stationed in Vietnam, was first conceived by retired Brig. Gen. Edward M. Friend, Jr. It was an apt choice. The Big Red 1 is this country's oldest division and has an outstanding and much decorated history. It was first to shed American blood in France in World War I and first to land in North Africa in World War II. It sparked the conquest of Sicily, stormed across Omaha Beach in the D-day assault on Normandy, and was first in Germany with the capture of Aachen. The 1st Infantry Division also swept across the Rhine into Czechoslovakia—the farthest advance by U.S. troops in Europe in World War II.

The idea became reality through close and effective cooperation among the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Birmingham News, and the officials of the city of Birmingham. A special committee of distinguished citizens was formed by Mayor Boutwell to work on behalf of the city with the chamber of commerce. Those members are:

General chairmen: Mayor Albert Boutwell, Cooper Green. Cochairmen: Donald Stafford, Crawford Johnson III, Brig. Gen. E. M. Friend, Jr., USAR, retired.

Steering Committee: Tom Bradford, Miss Evelyn Walker, M. E. Hackney, John A. Jenkins, Dr. John Nixon, Dr. Lucius Pitts, Drew Redden, and Vincent Townsend.

The support of the Big Red 1 took tangible form at Christmastime when hundreds and thousands of gifts and letters were sent from Birmingham to men in Vietnam who would not be home for the holidays. That support continues and will continue as long as U.S. forces must remain in Vietnam to combat communism and defend freedom.

A Birmingham roll of honor has been organized, saluting organizations, companies, churches, schools, and other groups that have adopted units of the 1st Infantry Division. Here is the list of sponsoring organizations and the units of the Big Red 1 adopted by them, as of January 1, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, here is, I know, the real mood and spirit of America: resolute and eager to support the fight for free-

dom in Vietnam. I salute the action of the city of Birmingham in adopting the 1st Infantry Division and I hope that other cities and towns across this great country will follow its inspiring example and let our men in Vietnam know that the overwhelming majority of Americans support their stand for freedom and against tyranny there.

**BIG RED 1 ROLL OF HONOR**

Alabama Bridge Association—1st Platoon "C" Co. 1st Engineer Battalion.  
 American Legion Post No. 35, Ensley--Headquarters Company 2-18 Infantry 1st Infantry Division.  
 Andrews Appliance & TV Center--701st Maintenance Battalion, Company "E".  
 Birmingham B. P. W.—Headquarters Company, Headquarters 2nd Brigade.  
 Birmingham Holy Name Union—"B" Company 1-16 Infantry.  
 Birmingham Jaycees—Company "A", 1-28 Infantry.  
 Birmingham P.T.A. Council—Headquarters Company 1-28 Infantry.  
 Birmingham Real Estate Board—"A" Battery, 1-7 Artillery.  
 Birmingham Retail Druggist Association--Company "A" 1st Medical Battalion.  
 Birmingham Rotary Club—Headquarters Company 2-18 Infantry.  
 Brownie Scout Troop No. 159 and Junior Scout Troop No. 683--242d Chemical Platoon.  
 Boy Scouts, Troop No. 94, Vulcan--1st Platoon "A" Company 2-18 Infantry.  
 B'nai-B'rith—Headquarters Company 2-16 Infantry.  
 Birmingham Committee of 100 Women--Company "C" 2-18 Infantry.  
 Birmingham--Southern College--D Battery 1st-5th Artillery.  
 Birmingham Trust National Bank—"A" Battery 2-33 Artillery.  
 Birmingham Association of Life Underwriters—"C" Troop 1-4 Cavalry 1st Infantry Division.  
 Birmingham Labor Council--2d Platoon "C" Co. 1-11 Infantry.  
 Blach's—"A" Battery 1-5 Artillery.  
 Berry High School "Hope Club"—Headquarters Company 1st Brigade 1st Infantry Division.  
 Birmingham Elks Lodge No. 79—Headquarters and Service Battery 2-33 Artillery.  
 Communications Workers of America—A Company 121st Signal Battalion.  
 City Salesmans Club—C Company 1-28 Infantry.  
 City National Bank--266th Chemical Platoon.  
 Chapter No. 1 Licensed Practical Nurses--B Company 1st Medical Battalion.  
 Civitan Club of Birmingham--B Battery 1-7th Artillery.  
 Church of the Advent--B Battery 8-6 Artillery.  
 Downtown Optimist Club--3d Platoon, C Company 1st Engineer Battalion.  
 Downtown Exchange Club--B Company 1st-2d Infantry.  
 Downtown Action Committee--Headquarters--Headquarters Company 1st Infantry Division.  
 Milton B. Stephens & Associates--Headquarters Company "A" 701st Maintenance Battalion.  
 Eastern Area Chamber of Commerce--1st Platoon "C" Company 1-18 Infantry.  
 East End Council of Garden Clubs--Company "A" 2-28 Infantry.  
 Binsley High School--Company "A" 2-16 Infantry.  
 Binsley Kiwanis Club—"B" Battery 1-5 Artillery.  
 First National Bank of Birmingham—"A" Company 1-18 Infantry.  
 Forestdale Lions Club—"B" Company 2-18 Infantry.

First Methodist Church—"D" Transportation 1-4 Cavalry.  
 City of Graysville--Headquarters Transportation 1-4 Infantry.  
 Grace Methodist Church—"C" Company 1-2 Infantry.  
 Hayes Management Association--Headquarters Company 1st Engineer Battalion.  
 Homewood Lions Club--Company "A" 1-16 Infantry.  
 Huffman Business and Professional Women's Club--4th Platoon "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.  
 Independent Presbyterian Church—"A" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.  
 Insurance Women of Birmingham--Company "C" 1st Signal Battalion.  
 Irondale Methodist Church—"A" Company 2-18 Infantry 4th Platoon.  
 Jefferson County Sheriff's Department--1st Military Police Company.  
 Jefferson County Medical Society--Company "C" 1st Medical Battalion.  
 John Carroll High School--2d Platoon "A" Company 2-18 Infantry.  
 Kiwanis Club of Birmingham--Headquarters Company 1-2d Infantry.  
 Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668--Headquarters and Service Battery 1-5 Artillery.  
 Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668--Company "A" 1-2 Infantry.  
 League of Women Voters--Headquarters Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.  
 Liberty National Life Insurance Co.—Headquarters Company 1-26 Infantry.  
 Metropolitan Business & Professional Women--4th Platoon--C Company 1-18th Infantry.  
 Mountain Brook Jaycees--3d Platoon "A" Company 2-18 Infantry.  
 Mountain Brooks Lions Club--Headquarters Company 1-16 Infantry.  
 Mount Carmel Methodist Church--2d Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.  
 Mountain Brook Exchange Club --"A" Battery 8-6 Artillery.  
 Men of the Church, 76th Street Presbyterian Church—"C" Battery 8-6 Artillery.  
 Nu Ta Sigma Sorority—"A" Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.  
 Owens Cumberland VFW Post No. 3492--Headquarters Company 1-18 Infantry.  
 Parisians, Inc.—1-7 Artillery "C" Battery.  
 Phillips High School—"C" Company 2-16th Infantry.  
 Pizitz Department Store--Headquarters Company 2-2d Infantry.  
 Roebuck Business & Professional Women's Club Headquarters Battery 1-7 Artillery.  
 Ruhama Baptist Church--1st Military Detachment.  
 Ramsay High School--1st Company "B" Company 2-16th Infantry.  
 Roebuck Camera Club--Headquarters Battery 3-6 Artillery.  
 South Avondale Baptist Kindergarten--1st Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.  
 Sirote, Permutt, Friend & Friedman--3d Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.  
 Sertoma Club East--Headquarters Company High 3d Brigade.  
 Shades Valley Jaycees--1st Military Police Company.  
 Shades Valley Kiwanis Club—"C" Battery 2-33 Artillery.  
 Tarrant Rotary Club—"B" Company 1-26 Infantry.  
 Temple Emanu-El—"A" Troop 1-4 Cavalry.  
 United Steel Workers Local No. 1489--3d Platoon "C" Company 1-18 Inc.  
 University of Alabama Town & Gown Theater--4th Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.  
 Woodlawn High School--Company B 1-28 Inc.  
 Western Birmingham Jaycees--1st Aviation Battalion, "B" Company.  
 8th Avenue Branch YWCA--Company 1-16 Infantry.

Young Men's Business Club--Company "D" 1st Medical Battalion.  
 Zonta Club of Birmingham--Company "B" 121 Signal Battalion.  
 Gadsden has adopted the artillery brigade attached to the Big Red One, and Roadruck Tool Engineering Co. of Guntersville has adopted the 2d Platoon of "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

**Service of General Wadsworth  
Outstanding**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DON FUQUA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 12, 1966*

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 16, 1966, will mark the retirement of Brig. Gen. Louie C. Wadsworth from the National Guard.

With his retirement a chapter closes in Florida National Guard history and his place will be difficult to fill. His has been a record of dedication and service, and I join with his friends throughout the State and Nation in paying tribute to him as he concludes a distinguished military career.

Ceremonies Sunday will see General Wadsworth promoted to Major General and retired.

So closes a career that began when he enlisted in Company E, 154th Infantry, Florida National Guard in Live Oak, Fla., April 18, 1923.

General Wadsworth rose through the ranks, being commissioned a second lieutenant in 1936. He held this rank when called to active duty in November 1940. He served with the 124th Infantry as platoon leader, company commander, battalion executive officer, and battalion commander at Camp Blanding, Fla., and Fort Benning, Ga., in January 1944.

He later served as regimental executive officer and regimental commander of the 3d Student Regiment, the Infantry School.

He served in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater as G-3 with general headquarters, Armed Forces, Pacific, from June 1945 until December of that year.

Released from active duty at Camp Blanding, April 26, 1946, with the rank of colonel, he accepted an Organized Reserve Corps appointment prior to release from active duty, and served in this capacity until named battalion commander, 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry Regiment in grade of lieutenant colonel. He was promoted to colonel and July 29, 1962, was promoted to brigadier general and served as assistant division commander until reorganization in 1963 when he was redesignated as deputy commander of the division, the position which he held upon retiring.

His decorations and awards include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Forces Reserve Medal and two hourglass devices, Philippine Liberation Medal, Florida Dis-

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A83

No, our country didn't begin with quitters and get where it is today by quitting. So we owe it to those who struggled before us to keep this country strong—and free. We can only do this by keeping our education and learning ability on top. That is why I will complete my education and stay in school.

ERNEST BESSETTE, PLAINFIELD HIGH, FIFTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because \* \* \*." I was 18 when I graduated from the eighth grade. That was when I realized that an education meant more to me than anything else. In my family not one has completed 8 years of grammar school and 4 years of high. The reason why, was that they had to quit to help support their families. I feel that I have to finish school for my parents. I already have a job at 16 working after school and on Saturdays. But working after school doesn't affect my studies.

It's my handicap that is stopping me. My handicap is going into a class and sitting down and really put my mind to work. If I can overcome this problem, I feel I can go through my 4 years of high and even more. I feel that I am overcoming the problem very nicely. With this accomplishment I know what I want and what I am going to do. I now know I want to finish high and I know now I am going to do it. With the backing of my parents I will go ahead and finish high.

KATHLEEN CHASE, KILLINGLY HIGH SCHOOL, SIXTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because \* \* \*." I am of a low-income family as my father and mother never had the chance to even graduate from grammar school.

My oldest brother was a dropout, but when he entered into the service he took a special course in order to graduate from high school. My other brother stayed back once and in later years received extra help, so he graduated too.

I have stayed back in school twice but I still have faith and trust in God that He will help and guide me in trying to graduate.

Last year I stayed after school almost every night for extra help and I just barely made it in credits for the next year.

Since I'm the only girl in my family I feel that it is my duty to try to the best of my ability and to graduate from high school so that my mother, father, friends, and relatives might someday be proud of me, and that I might have a good, clean job for my reward after I have finished high school.

CHARLES G. HOFFMAN, ELLIS TECH, SEVENTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because \* \* \*." I work after school in a mill making about \$1.30 an hour. This would or might be the biggest pay if I drop out. I worked there now for almost 1 year. I work real hard really for nothing. I had a big troublesome matter since I've been working.

I lost my finger. Sure I am not the only one who did but if I would have graduated this might never have happened in my case.

Other people older than myself have no hands, fingers and in some cases legs.

I am minus a finger, and minus a brain, without a diploma, it will all stay the same.

JOSEPH W. WOJCIK, ELLIS TECH SPECIAL AWARD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This valued commentary could not be judged with the other contest entries because of its length.)

I suppose you think I'm going to start this letter off with the same old reasons, which are, better pay, more promising future, self-satisfaction, and for better wants and needs of life. Well, I just did, and what did it prove? Nothing that's what, absolutely nothing. Now I'm going to tell how it really feels to drop out of high school. First

of all, you feel very insecure, that is, you don't have a thing to turn to, anything that is half decent anyway. Now then, I'm going to get very frank and down to earth on an excellent example of why you shouldn't leave high school, "Me." I'm the example, I dropped out. I made the big mistake and most of all I asked for it and in a way I wanted to leave school. I actually was a real down to earth troublemaker, and I've got the 34 detentions to prove it. I might as well be honest about the fact that I detested every single day, hour, minute and second. It seemed like all the teachers were against me, and were just waiting for the chance to jump at my throat. I never did homework or hardly ever studied, well I never did to be truthful.

As time went on things began to change; that is, they got worse. Oh, pardon me for giving you a let down. But it did get worse. I got to a point where I was actually scared stiff of the place. I'd have a cold unwelcome air of being unwanted and neglected. Things got so bad I even picked the habit of slang talk and I mean slang. At home I would fight with my folks and in a real sense a 16-year-old brat or Frankenstein.

When I knew I'd never make it through high school, I went to the guidance office to get information on going to the Berklee School of Jazz. I couldn't make it in there because I didn't go far enough in school. Well to be truthful again about the only subject I could really pass was shop. Especially the mechanical drafting. I would get A's and B's. One night at home I thought about myself and that wasn't much to think about. I finally sorted out the things I could do well, play music and draw. Boy sometimes I'd sit outside and draw all day, anything that was in seeing distance. And when it came to music, we'll put it this way, I'd blow that lousy, no good sax till I cried. And sometimes I'd just look at it and cry. Not because I hated it, but because I loved it, it was the closest thing to me I had. Wanting to master that horn is one of the reasons I failed out of school. But I would not let nobody take it from me. It became my only chance to become somebody. I started to play in nightclubs, not at the age of 16 but 15. Some of them were all right but some were as holy as the devil himself. All this kind of work brought me in front of people I even towered over. This gave me the feeling that I still had class and brains, and all that other important sort of stuff. This made me put my thinking cap back on. I thought my other natural talent, drawing. I found that I respected and appreciated a single line as much as a 9/8 time on a sax. I also thought of the future and how secure I wanted it. The horn was OK but not reliable enough. So the drawing was left. I remembered going to the first open house at Ellis Tech. The part that fascinated me most was drafting. All those little lines and figures that were so intricate and detailed. And the idea of knowing that the person who drew them had a heavy responsibility on his shoulders. So immediately I knew what I had to do—beg. Yes, beg, beg, and plead, and ask please. I know I couldn't by all facts be admitted into Ellis Tech, but I had to try.

Well it was this way. I remember being told in high school that I probably wouldn't get past first base in trying to get it. But it was the other way around. I was accepted under a trial basis.

Believe me, if you know what it is like to come to the surface when you're almost dead out of breath in deep water, you probably know how I felt and how relieved I was. It was like morning all over again. But, I couldn't get into drafting. My marks, weren't anywhere near good enough. But I managed to squeeze myself in general construction trades. It was OK but I didn't love it. To do something good you've got to love

it and worship it, and I didn't feel that way about GCT. Even though I tried my best, still looking forward to what I really wanted, drafting.

I found the school and teachers different, and every teacher seemed to care, or have a personal part in what I did. I again was relieved. I made it through all the way. I passed all my subjects. I felt more intelligent and more dignified. And held my head up again, which was larger now because my brain grew, and had added additions. Now, I figured I could get into drafting. I knew I had to be at the mercy of my superiors once again. And as last time I pulled through. I am now in architectural drafting and I'm proud of it. I felt a little more superior myself because of the fact that I did what many people told me I couldn't do. I still bawl my head off when I can't get a certain song or run on the sax, and cuss a little when my 2-H lead breaks in the middle of an object line.

But who cares now, I'm half way up that ladder of success. And take my word about dropping out of school, it isn't worth it at all. I came close to being a dropout all the way and when I think about it now it makes me shiver all over. So don't be foolish, stay in school. I was lucky.

### Korean Aid in Vietnam—An Earned Dividend

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed aid being given by South Korea to the South Vietnamese by the 17,000 troops committed to that country's struggle against communism.

Since their part in this fight for freedom from Communist domination is little known, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, 1966:

HERE IS THE RECORD: DIVIDENDS FROM KOREA NATION'S AID IN VIET NAM  
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is 13 years since the nightmare of the Korean war. And what did it all mean?

Was it wasted strife or incalculable boon? What is the answer from South Korea today?

The answer is that the American people can be proud of what the United States did for South Korea and has reason to be grateful for what South Korea has done for itself.

This is the record:

With the help of a dozen other nations, but primarily on its own, the United States turned back the aggression to the 38th parallel which divided the two Koreas.

Today, South Korea is secure, tranquil, and progressive.

It has a democratic government ruling by the consent of the governed.

It is carrying forward significant social reforms.

It is stable—so stable that, despite some demonstrations, it was able last year to establish diplomatic relations with its once hated enemy and occupier, Japan, which is now providing it with \$800 million in grants and loans over a 10-year period.

South Korea is proving itself resourceful and increasingly self-reliant. It is making steady economic progress and, while U.S. aid has been substantial, the South Koreans have been showing what self-help can really be. Their gross national product has been rising at the rate of about 8 percent a year; industrial production is up 15 percent.

Grievously short of land to enable its people to be self-sufficient in food, the government of Chung Hee Park, by literally carving terraces out of mountains, is doubling its arable land.

South Korean industry is making rapid strides. Exports are up from \$20 million in 1959 to \$170 million today.

But this is only half of it. These are some of the things South Korea has been doing for itself. These are the ways South Korea has been using its security from aggression.

And now what is the other dividend besides a free people secured from oppression? What is the earned dividend, which has not been asked, but which is now so welcome and so helpful?

South Korea's dividend to the United States is in South Vietnam today.

Defended against Communist aggression by the United States, South Korea is today helping the United States repel the Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

Not just with truck drivers and medical supplies and behind-the-lines support.

But with 15,000 battle-hardened South Korea freedom fighters trained for action in the jungles and rice paddies where the Vietcong are deadliest—plus 2,000 combat engineers.

Little South Korea, with a population of 28 million, is doing far more than any other country except the United States and is contributing more fighting men per capita than even the United States.

And why did the Government and Parliament of South Korea make this tremendous decision to commit 17,000 men to the defense of South Vietnam?

They know from their own experience the crucial need to defeat aggression in South Vietnam—and are doing what they can to help.

### Railroads Are of Vital Importance to the Economy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**  
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads has raised many questions in the areas formerly served by each of these great companies, including the city of Baltimore which I represent.

It is important for us to know how these railroads plan to solve some of the long-range problems of the Eastern States and there have been recent reports which have caused grave concern regarding the future plans of the combined Pennsylvania and New York Central.

However, two recent articles in the Baltimore Sun shed light on these plans and I include them at this point in the RECORD. The statements made by Mr. Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, at a meeting in Baltimore last Monday indi-

cate that the merger will be of great benefit to the city of Baltimore as well as to our great port, and his statements are reassuring to us.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 11, 1966]

#### MR. SAUNDERS EXPLAINS

Stuart T. Saunders' statement in Baltimore yesterday was pretty much what the lawyers call a plea in confession and avoidance. Yes, said the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, he did say the things in a recent speech at Newcastle which seemed to threaten Baltimore railroads with substantial losses of ore and grain traffic. But he misspoke the Pennsy position because he was talking extemporaneously. In avoidance of the impression thus created, he read from a carefully prepared text to make several points including these:

1. When he spoke at Newcastle of diverting freight from railroads, he really meant that railroads could divert freight from other transport modes, having in mind, no doubt, water traffic on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

2. Shippers control shipping destinations in any case, and so select the railroads employed. Those who prefer the port of Baltimore will designate railroads serving that port.

3. The examiners assigned by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Pennsy-New York Central merger plea concluded the merger will benefit Baltimore. The prospective partners have no new plans. As of now, that is.

4. The ICC examiners specifically underwrote traffic agreements by which the Pennsy and the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie (New York Central) will cooperate with the Western Maryland as a channel to Baltimore. (The Western Maryland has, however, already secured a reopening before the ICC of argument on one point in its relationship with the Pennsy and other reopenings in general would be possible under the law.)

5. The Pennsylvania is planning new investment in the port of Baltimore of some \$17 million and—announced for the first time—a Pennsy-Central merger could well require a new tunnel through Baltimore to cost \$125 million.

Mr. Saunders did not expand in any degree on Baltimore's special geographical and institutional advantages as against the northern ports. That is for Baltimoreans to do. Mr. Saunders did indicate the obvious—that sound management would require full exploitation of special port advantages by all parties concerned. That is all Baltimore expects and the expectation conditions the support Baltimore interests have given to the Pennsy-Central merger proposals.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 11, 1965]

#### PENNSY ENDS LONG SILENCE—RAILROAD DISCLOSES PLANS FOR CITY AND PORT (By Helen Delich Bentley)

For the first time in decades, the Pennsylvania Railroad—through its board chairman—yesterday made public commitments as to what it intends to do for the port and the city of Baltimore.

The pledges were made by Stuart T. Saunders at a public meeting in the board of estimates room yesterday morning. The session was called by Hyman Pressman, city comptroller, after it was disclosed last week that Saunders had stated in New Castle, Pa., that he intended to divert 1 million tons of ore and 15 million bushels of grain annually from the port of Baltimore to Philadelphia.

#### OFFICIALS PLEASED

After the 90-minute meeting, which Pressman described as "clearing the air," top port officials commented that "this is the first

time we've been able to get on the record what the Pennsylvania intends to do in Baltimore. It sounds good."

Among the commitments made by Saunders were:

1. The railroad has a backlog of projects amounting to more than \$17 million in store for Baltimore.

2. The board of directors has authorized structural and electrical improvements to the Pennsy's Baltimore coal pier which will permit the handling of 100-ton capacity hopper cars and enable it to handle a greater volume of coal through Baltimore.

3. The Pennsylvania is working out a "mutually satisfactory arrangement for giving Rukert Terminal Corp. all the space it needs in Baltimore in order to continue to develop business."

4. As the new high-speed railway along the eastern corridor between Washington and Boston is developed, the Pennsylvania will invest about \$25 million of its own money in upgrading right-of-way and high-level platforms in its Baltimore station.

5. With the city's cooperation, the Pennsylvania is prepared to push studies immediately on developing air rights and other property on the "good many acres" adjacent to the station which could be included in Baltimore's "fine urban redevelopment program."

6. The Pennsylvania grain elevator will continue to be operated as a public grain elevator. The railroad has recently rejected "several very attractive offers for sale or lease" of its elevator.

Saunders did not deny that he had made the statements attributed to him regarding the traffic diversion from Baltimore. Mr. Pressman described the hearing as "clearing the air."

Mr. Pressman said afterward that although he had not intended to make any statement, all of the testimonials in behalf of the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central indicated that it would be beneficial to the port of Baltimore. He also noted that the tone of the hearing was "one-sided" in favor of the railroads.

Saunders admitted that he had made the statements in New Castle, but attempted to ease the concern created by saying he had no idea of getting into a discussion of port situations when he went to New Castle to talk.

### Section 14(b) Analyzed

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GEORGE M. RHODES**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, confusion and deception have clouded the controversy over legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

A public service was performed by the Reading, Pa., Eagle in an excellent editorial throwing light on the controversy and on the fundamental issue involved.

This is one of the most important issues in this 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The Eagle is the largest circulation paper in the Sixth Congressional District and one of our State's leading newspapers.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include this informative editorial with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A89

the Seaway would undoubtedly be unable to meet its annual debt service, so that tolls should be established at levels sufficiently high to make up the losses during the early years, as well as to meet the operating costs which were certain to increase with time and as traffic volumes increased. It was also pointed out at that time that further improvement would have to be made if the Seaway turned out to be successful, such as twinning the locks and otherwise increasing its capacity, and suggested that tolls be established at a high enough level to "include the additional capital and operating costs and any others which could reasonably be foreseen."

This history is significant because most of the recommendations contained in the recent report of the Senate subcommittee repeat many of these arguments which were, at least, theoretically disposed of when the legislation was passed, requiring the Seaway to stand on its own two feet in free competition with other ports of the country.

The subcommittee's report reflects the general idea that if the Seaway could be given preference and favored treatment, sufficient tonnage could be generated to make the project self-supporting. Most of the points raised were discussed fully 10 years ago. The present Seaway advocates are apparently trying to forget that many of the same questions were raised by opponents of the Seaway at that time and that the legislation finally adopted made mandatory a self-supporting Seaway.

## CONCLUSIONS OF THE REPORT

Following a comparatively accurate accounting of the history of the Seaway and its current operational and financial situation, the committee's report summarizes the problems cited most frequently by witnesses appearing before the subcommittee into five major problems.

1. Failure to achieve a 27-foot depth for all major Great Lakes ports and connecting channels.

2. Scarcity of American ships using the Great Lakes.

3. Discrimination by the railroads against the Lake ports, particularly through section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by means of inland freight rated discrimination.

4. A wide variety of suggestions for improved operation, greater promotion of the Seaway and the effect of higher tolls.

Recommendations of the subcommittee's report concludes with nine specific recommendations as follows:

1. The report recommends that funds should be appropriated to enable the Army Corps of Engineers to deepen and clear Great Lakes channels and harbors to 27-foot depths.

Although it was not specifically stated, there is an implication that funds for this purpose should receive a special appropriation. If justified on a reasonable basis, there is no reason why ports along the Great Lakes should not be dredged to 27 feet, but they should be required to go through the same procedures as other channels and ports in getting authorization from the Army Engineers and appropriations from Congress in competition with all other requirements for similar port improvements.

2. The report recommends that there should be a program to utilize American ships for Seaway trade.

The report cites many reasons for the fact that only 4 percent of the tonnage on the Great Lakes is carried on American ships, including physical limitations of locks on the Seaway, which is, of course, a built-in handicap, the issue of which was stressed 10 years ago during preliminary discussions of the Seaway. The idea of separating the

Great Lakes from the North Atlantic ports in terms of availability of American ships for Government shipments and creation of specific trade route also implies specialized treatment for the Seaway.

3. The report recommends that section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act should be examined objectively and remain unchanged.

The report criticizes Government claims that section 22 saves the Nation as a whole some \$50 million per year when it also results in the Seaway being forced to default its obligation of \$2 million annually to the Government.

4. The report recommends that the shipping season on the Seaway be lengthened.

The report carefully points out that "an all year open Seaway is not now contemplated," but recommends that the season be extended by 30 days and that future studies should be made as to ways of keeping the Seaway year even longer in the future. In passing it should be noted that the recently passed omnibus bill authorizes a \$75,000 study of possible methods of delcng the Seaway.

5. The report recommends studies for Seaway improved lock facilities and for waterways related to the Seaway such as the Champlain Waterway "which would provide for much shorter and direct ocean passage."

The idea of expending further funds to correct deficiencies in the existing locks to provide easier access for vessels by means of an improved Lake Champlain Waterway is recommended, but nowhere is any suggestion made as to how these additional costs could be met.

6. The report recommends that the continuing growth of the Seaway will overtax its present facilities in the next 10 years and that studies should begin for the planning for expansion of locks and other facilities before capacity is reached.

Again the question presents itself as to how such expansion could be justified until the present Seaway is made self-supporting.

7. The report recommends several alternative refinancing methods such as extending the amortization period to 100 years at an interest rate of 2 percent, and which would not begin until the 27-foot depth is available in all major lake ports.

In connection with the financing, the report tries to carry water on both shoulders. In various places it has stated that the growth of Seaway traffic will make it become self-supporting in a few years, but in other places the point is made that in order to be self-supporting, changes should be made in the debt structure. The idea of increasing tolls to make the project self-supporting is dismissed by the committee members as entirely unrealistic because of its alleged effect on future growth on Seaway traffic.

8. The report recommends an expanded program of information and promotion to be carried out by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The impropriety of using Federal funds for the promotion of one series of ports at the expense of other ports has been discussed many times before.

9. The report recommends that funds for promotion should come "from tolls alone and not from appropriated moneys."

This provides a variation on the above in an attempt to prove somehow that money collected by the Seaway and not sent to the Federal Government in repayment of debt is somehow less of a Federal subsidy than a direct appropriation.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The NAPA St. Lawrence Seaway Committee therefore recommends that:

1. The committee be authorized to take a prompt and active role in working with

such organizations as the National Committee for a Self-Supporting Seaway to create substantial public interest in the question of the Seaway and the importance of the forthcoming decision as to the future tolls structure.

2. The committee be authorized to develop specific testimony to be presented at any hearings by Federal or other agencies and by congressional committees dealing either with the tolls structure or of any of the recommendations developed by the Senate subcommittee.

HAYDEN B. JOHNSON,  
Chairman.

PETER SCHAUFFLER,  
CHARLES R. SEAL,  
EDWARD J. KANE,  
GREGORY HALPIN.

## The Case Against Declared War

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a dangerous trend has begun to develop among certain observers of the Vietnamese conflict. Briefly stated, they are trying to play both sides of the political street concerning the American commitment to the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Their call is "Escalate the war or get out." Their irresponsible appeal is designed to gather political support both on the far left and on the far right. Part of this campaign is the proposal to formally declare war. The Los Angeles Times has effectively stated the case against such an action at this time and its reasoning should be carefully studied by Members of this House.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 23, 1965]

## THE CASE AGAINST DECLARED WAR

A formal declaration of war by Congress would appear, within the context of American history, to carry an implication of finality, of all-out effort, and—in the light of past experiences—of a great moral crusade serving both to unite the country and to foster a sense of implacable determination for seeing through the task at hand.

Perhaps this is why support for such a declaration, against Communist North Vietnam, has recently been voiced by several prominent political figures, Representative GERALD FORD, the House minority leader, was the first, and he has been supported by Representative MELVIN LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin.

In view of the many frustrations the Vietnam conflict provides, this attitude may, perhaps, be understandable to some. But this doesn't mean that it is either desirable or practical. For, in the case of North Vietnam, the advantages of a declaration of war are minimal, if indeed they exist at all, while the disadvantages are immense.

Thus far, in fact, no declaration of war advocate has really spelled out what he expects might be gained. Ronald Reagan has suggested that a war declaration would mean the current crop of anti-Vietnam demonstrators could then be treated as law violators. But if ever a case existed of using a cannon to smash a butterfly, this is it.

Both domestically and internationally a declaration of war essentially means a change in legal condition. At home, for example, it might mean invoking sweeping Presidential powers, say in control over the economy.

A state of war with a foreign nation affects economic, political, and cultural relations with that country. But the United States doesn't even recognize North Vietnam. Our only area of contact is on the battlefield. And that contact, needless to say, requires no formal state of war.

The Vietnam conflict can be—is—pursued just as much as may be necessary under present conditions of undeclared war. A declaration, on the other hand, has these disadvantages among others:

It could, as Richard Nixon warned over the weekend, force both Russia and China into open intervention, and possibly lead to nuclear war.

It would ignore the fact that we are legally in Vietnam not as a principal party, but as an invited ally to help the South Vietnamese stop aggression. Nor can we ignore the fact that that aggression, though instigated and strongly supported by North Vietnam, has had and retains some indigenous support. We can't declare war on nameless peasants.

It would raise serious complications with our treaty partners in the Pacific, who, while they are already helping in Vietnam, don't want to face a full-blown war.

And, finally, it would virtually destroy any hope, however thin, for negotiating an end to the conflict. A war declaration is an irrevocable step. Whatever emotional appeal it might have to some, its legal, practical, and military appeals in the present case hardly exist.

### A Congressman Goes International

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last fall one of our distinguished colleagues, Representative PETER FREYLINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, was honored by an appointment to the U.S. delegation to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations.

As we expected, Congressman FREYLINGHUYSEN served with distinction. In fact, he is credited with a major diplomatic triumph in mediating a dispute on a resolution involving the Palestine refugee program. When the program was threatened with possible extinction due to a dispute between the Israeli and Arab delegations, Congressman FREYLINGHUYSEN negotiated a compromise resolution which passed the General Assembly.

If his hard work and persistence has been noted by at least two United Nations correspondents. Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Louis B. Fleming, which appeared in the Washington Post, and an article by Max Wiener, which appeared in the Newark Sunday News:

[From the Washington Post]

A CONGRESSMAN GOES INTERNATIONAL  
(By Louis B. Fleming, of the Los Angeles Times)

UNITED NATIONS.—A Congressman turned diplomat in order to rescue the Palestine

refugee program from a political disaster and possible extinction in the United Nations General Assembly.

Representative PETER FREYLINGHUYSEN, Republican of New Jersey, one of the two Members of Congress serving on the U.S. delegation to the 20th General Assembly, has won widespread praise from delegates for his work on the delicate problem.

The solution involved not only strenuous corridor negotiations but some extraordinary Assembly procedure. The final compromise, which made just about everybody happy, emerged from an earlier unexpected defeat for the United States, which has a deep humanitarian and a ticklish political stake in the question of the Palestine refugees.

As the country which has put up 70 percent of the cash, the United States has been anxious to fulfill humanitarian needs without frustrating progress toward a compromise that would permit the 1.2 million refugees to live normal, useful lives.

As a supporter of Israel as well as a country seeking influences with the Arab nations, the United States has sought to appear non-partisan and has fought for even-handed resolutions in the General Assembly. This year, the United States lost. Israel amendments were resisted. But Arab amendments, sponsored by Pakistan and Somalia, were adopted by the razor edge of 43 to 39, with 23 abstentions.

Adoption of the Arab amendments to a resolution introduced by the United States forced the American delegation into the peculiar position of voting against its own resolution, which had suddenly come to include what amounted to an endorsement of Arab military action against Israel as well as a liberalization of the relief rolls that would have compounded the already overtaxed and deficit-ridden U.N. budget.

Most of the big cash donors to the program joined the United States in not supporting the amended resolution as it finally cleared the Assembly's special political committee. Usually, a committee report is adopted by the Assembly unchanged, and the vote is about the same because the committees include every U.N. member. But in this case, a final vote in the Assembly, with the United States and the other cash contributors all voting no, would have jeopardized the future of the relief program.

So FREYLINGHUYSEN went into action. For 3½ weeks, he negotiated a new draft. Day after day, he met in the corridors and committee rooms with the delegates of the Arab neighbors of Israel, with the Israelis and with Ambassador Adnan Pachachi of Iraq, who coordinated negotiations for the Arabs.

There was one thing that helped FREYLINGHUYSEN. The Arabs were as anxious as anyone else to keep the relief program alive. And they realized the danger to the future of the program if the donors found the resolution unacceptable because of the Arab amendment.

An acceptable compromise resolution finally emerged. All groups agreed to draft a new resolution and give it priority in the voting so that the unacceptably amended resolution would die. Nigeria, which had been neutral, agreed to sponsor the new resolution. It passed the Assembly by a vote of 19 to 1, with 7 abstentions. Israel cast the negative vote because of disagreement with the indirect references to repatriation of the Arabs who fled Israel during the fighting in the late 1940's.

Dark as the picture may be, it would have been darker, if not hopeless, had not the new resolution won approval.

"The closest I have ever come to something like this in Congress was negotiating the conference bill on foreign aid last summer," FREYLINGHUYSEN said.

He found the U.N. approach curious. The committee working on the refugee problem was preoccupied with the choice of words,

"much more concerned than we are in Washington when we write a bill," he said.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Oct. 3, 1965]

FREYLINGHUYSEN LABORS FOR PRESIDENT AT U.N.  
(By Max Wiener, News U.N. correspondent)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Representative PETER H. B. FREYLINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey's Fifth Congressional District, is working here temporarily for the Democratic administration's executive branch—and finding it an intensive, arduous and fascinating experience.

There is nothing novel about this switch—from legislative to executive-diplomatic work. Every year, two Members of Congress—one Democrat and one Republican—are selected as members of the U.S. delegation at the United Nations for the annual session of the General Assembly.

This year the two are members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Next year it will be the turn of members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. FREYLINGHUYSEN's committee colleague and temporary copilot at this session is Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois Democrat.

Up to now, FREYLINGHUYSEN's main official contact with State Department diplomats has been to listen to them testify before his House committee. Now he's rubbing shoulders with them as a diplomat, "a member of Ambassador Goldberg's team," as he puts it, working to carry out the Democratic administration's policies at the world organization—at least while the Assembly lasts.

#### WORKING 11-HOUR DAYS

The Congressman is putting in an 11-hour day here at briefings, consultations, Assembly and the Committee of the Whole meetings, and at working lunches, dinners, and receptions. He is finding out at first hand, he says, how U.S. diplomats work and is also having the new experience of personal contacts and exchanges of views with foreign delegates.

And he disagrees with Representative WAYNE HAYS, Ohio Democrat, who said he wouldn't act as a Charlie McCarthy to Ambassador Goldberg's Edgar Bergen. FREYLINGHUYSEN feels it is a rewarding and patriotic assignment to represent his country at the world organization.

"You get new insight into U.N. problems up here," he said. "You're not at all a mere bystander. The demands on my time are far greater than in Washington."

His main job is to represent the United States on the fifth, or budgetary committee. A second important assignment is to the Special Political Committee. On both, he finds himself dealing with the crucial problem of how the U.N. can bail itself out of its huge debt—largely caused by refusal of Russia and France to pay for peacekeeping operations—and what to do in the future about peacekeeping and its financing.

As a legislator who took an active interest in the U.N. bond issue which Congress approved to help the world organization, FREYLINGHUYSEN finds it fascinating to hear the Soviets objecting to the U.N. paying off even interest charges on the ground that the peacekeeping debt was imposed by the Assembly instead of the Security Council, and is therefore illegal.

#### NEW INSIGHT

His Foreign Affairs Committee some time ago approved cutting \$1,800,000 from the U.S. contribution to the care of 1 million Palestinian refugees. This was designed to put pressure on the Arabs to agree to some permanent solution, instead of Arab insistence year after year that the only solution is for Israel to take all the refugees back.

Now in the special political committee, FREYLINGHUYSEN is discovering at firsthand the sentiments of the Arab delegates and of the representatives of other countries.



January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

105

ciety, such as educational facilities, housing, transportation, water resources, space exploration, and halting the deterioration in the heart of our great metropolitan centers where tens of millions now live.

Our international relations also constitute an area we need to reexamine constantly and critically. World leadership has brought with it responsibilities we had neither anticipated nor sought. The shattering of the great world empires following two world wars has resulted in the emergence of dozens of new nations with over 1 billion persons. This may be the single most important economic and political development of our time. In their struggle against poverty and ignorance, these people will constitute for years a continuing threat to the peace of the world. We cannot ignore this threat nor is there any assurance that we can adequately meet it.

With only 195 million people, can this Nation possibly solve problems of poverty, illiteracy, disease, inadequate tax systems, inflation, and land reform for almost 1½ billion people? Eight hundred million of these people live in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and southeast Asia, 50 million in the Middle East, 240 million in Africa and 230 million in Latin America. Today, African and Asian nations represent over 53 percent of the United Nations membership. The 36 African nations alone represent almost one-third. If current population trends continue for only 35 years, there will be 5 to 6 billion people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they will constitute well over 80 percent of the world's population. It is estimated that more than 500 million children of school age in the world are not now enrolled in any school. Are we to conclude that the opportunity of these nations to defeat poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease will steadily become less probable in the years ahead?

In India alone there are nearly 500 million persons, one-seventh of the world's population. The increase in population is between 10 and 12 million annually. The birth rate is among the highest in the world. Eight out of ten persons are illiterate. The overwhelming majority do not have enough income to feed themselves adequately.

An estimated 40 percent of the people must live on 10 cents or less a day. In New Delhi, it requires over 10 cents a day to buy even enough rice for a minimum diet. Many persons have bad water supplies and no sewage systems. Even in the large cities, only one-half the houses at the most have sewage disposal. An estimated 1 million people in Calcutta have no homes at all. Seventy percent of the people of India are engaged in farming. Over 90 percent of the 600,000 villages are without electric power.

With the exception of Red China, here in one nation of 500 million persons in an area about two-fifths the size of the continental United States there is the greatest poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and mass misery of any place on earth. India is engaged in a struggle for survival. There are major food shortages. Inflation is bad. Food, machinery, and raw materials must be imported on a large scale, resulting in heavy trade deficits. Large crash development programs by the government have resulted in substantial budget deficits and heavy borrowing from the central bank. No other nation has so many unemployed or underemployed. Some sources estimate that perhaps 40 million persons have work less than one-half day a week. The United States and several other nations are pouring many hundreds of millions of dollars of aid annually into India in a struggle to assure some economic progress for the nation at the same time it seeks to maintain the freedom of its people. Our total economic aid to India has probably exceeded \$6 billion. Counterpart funds, the Indian currency we

receive in payment of our large so-called sales of agricultural products, have been accumulated to our credit in India in amounts that run into the equivalent of billions of dollars.

However, India is only one country. Nearby is Pakistan with 100 million persons with comparable problems. To the southeast is Indonesia with 100 million people. There are other nations in the Far East—the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia—with equally difficult economic and political problems. With the possible exception of Israel, there are an additional 50 million persons in the nations of the Middle East—Iran, Iraq, Jordan, and others—who are struggling against illiteracy and poverty.

Two entire continents, Africa and Latin America, have come forward as areas whose economic and political problems require attention.

Historically, the greatest single event of the 1960's may be the political liberation of Africa. This continent is about four times as great in area as the United States, 50 percent larger than Soviet Russia and larger than all of North America. It is almost 5,000 miles long and 4,500 miles wide—with an area as large as the United States, Western Europe, India, and Red China combined. Ninety-seven percent of the 240 million people are of African origin and they speak 700 languages or dialects. Approximately 85 percent of the people cannot read or write, and 62 million of the 83 million children of school age are not in school. The average annual income of \$132 per person is less than that of any other continent.

This continent has over 40 percent of the world's hydroelectric potential and one-fifth of its forests. For some years Africa has provided the free world with nearly all its industrial diamonds, more than one-half of its newly mined gold, one-fourth of its copper and important quantities of lead, zinc, manganese, iron, cobalt, bauxite, platinum, uranium, and other metals. Practically the entire world's supply of columbite, a rare metal used in jet engines, comes from Nigeria. There are also important new discoveries of oil. The continent has nearly every mineral and can produce almost every crop. Here are great resources invaluable to the industrial expansion of the free world in the years ahead.

Today there are 56 nations in Africa. Although each of the 56 countries is at a different level of economic and political development, there is overall a potentially explosive nationalism. Unfortunately, as Arnold Toynbee has indicated, freedom came to Africa while the masses of its people south of the Sahara were still living in a pre-civilizational state of their development. They are therefore faced with the overwhelming problems of setting up governments with little or no experience to prepare them for this difficult responsibility.

Africa as a whole is one of the least developed areas of the world. The continent provides an unfortunate example of poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease and inadequate medical facilities, industrial skills, and capital. In 22 countries of tropical Africa less than one-half the children go even to the first primary grade in school. Moreover, in these 22 countries an average of 95 percent of the primary schoolchildren never enter a secondary school. To provide elementary school buildings alone might cost two or three times the total national budget of a country and this would not include the expense of running the schools.

Even if there had been no colonization, there is no reason to believe that Africa would have overcome its tragic poverty. There is also no assurance now that if Africa is left to itself it will enter a period of accelerated economic progress. Here then are the ingredients of political instability and revolution. Here also are 240 million persons we

hope will achieve economic progress peacefully within the framework of democracy.

In addition to these undeveloped areas of the world, we need also to evaluate the magnitude of our problems and new commitments in Latin America. Many Latin American nations have had independence for more than a century. There are in Latin America approximately 230 million people in an area about twice the size of the United States. Their average life expectancy is only 45 years compared with 70 years in the United States. The population is increasing at the striking rate of 2.3 percent each year, faster than any other major part of the world, and compared to 1.5 percent for the United States. The cities are growing at the remarkable rate of 5 percent a year, and 3 of the 10 largest cities of the world are now in Latin America—Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and São Paulo.

Over one-half of the labor force of Latin America is engaged in agriculture and yet less than one-fourth of the gross national product comes from this industry, indicating its backwardness. Less than 5 percent of the landowners own 70 percent of the land, and less than 5 percent of the land is cultivated, compared with 18 percent in the United States. In some countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela less than 3 percent of the land can be cultivated. Only 5 percent of the total land area of South America is suitable for agricultural production compared to 10 percent in the United States and 37 percent in Europe.

Over 50 percent of the adults in Latin America are unable to read or write. Despite Brazil's progress, the illiteracy rate is still over 50 percent. Argentina rates best with only 13 percent. Fifteen million Latin American children are without classrooms. Even in a Latin American nation as advanced as Mexico, it is estimated that more than one-third of the people have no formal education. Forty million of the seventy million children who are 5 to 19 years of age in Latin America do not attend any school. Moreover, the number of children to be educated is increasing at the rate of 5 million every year which is making the problems almost impossible of solution.

Raising the living standards of the present population of 230 million people is a mammoth undertaking, but the problem will be infinitely greater if the population of Latin America continues to grow at the present rate, and more than doubles in a generation. This would be an almost insuperable problem for nations with highly advanced industrial economies, but with economically retarded and politically volatile countries it almost certainly means periods of turmoil and serious trouble for the governments involved.

Many Latin American countries are largely dependent for their export income on one commodity. The biggest single Latin American export is petroleum. Coffee is second. To illustrate, 92 percent of the export income of Venezuela comes from petroleum. Chile receives 65 percent of its export income from minerals. Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Haiti receive 50 to 75 percent of their export income from coffee. Coffee also constitutes from 15 to 30 percent of the exports of Ecuador, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. A sharp drop in the prices of these commodities, especially if there are rising prices in the manufactured goods these countries import, results in a severe curtailment of their imports, huge budget deficits, and not infrequently in political instability. Inflation has also been a widespread and serious problem.

What assurance can we have that these nations, many of which are largely unprepared for self-government, do not endanger the peace of the world through revolutions and violence? Who is to provide educational fa-

ilities for hundreds of millions who are illiterate?

How can we assure even the necessary food when per capita food production in various areas now is less than it was before World War II? Nearly two-thirds of the world's people have inadequate food supplies. World food production has been lagging behind population growth. In Latin America, Africa, and the Far East, food production is growing only two-thirds as fast as population. In Latin America food production is below the levels of 25 years ago. In the last 5 years, the population of Latin America has increased almost twice as fast as food production. Medical science has brought about a sharp decrease in infant mortality in the less developed nations, and children under 15 years of age who are unable to add to production constitute 40 to 45 percent of the population, compared to 20 to 30 percent in the developed industrial countries.

Can we provide pure water supplies and drainage systems soon for hundreds of millions of these people? Can we supply means of transportation, communication, and power to many countries that are completely without such facilities? There is not sufficient available investment capital in the entire world to accomplish these objectives within a reasonably short time.

The per capita rate of growth of the national product in the less developed countries averaged 2.5 percent annually between 1950 to 1955. It declined to 1.9 percent over the next 5 years and is estimated at about 1 percent now. In recent years, the average income per person in the less developed nations increased by only \$1 a year. More than one-half of the persons in the entire world earn less than \$100 per person per year. The difference between the incomes of the peoples of the developed and the underdeveloped nations is widening at an increasing rate.

We must recognize that it is no easy task for governments in these nations in their present stage of development and with widespread illiteracy and poverty to follow middle-of-the-road policies that satisfy the radical elements, the military groups, the large landowners and businessmen. The leaders of many of these countries who are constantly facing crises feel impelled to speak the language of economic urgency and to adopt policies of expediency rather than wisdom. Governments will be considered politically inadequate if they are not economically responsive to need. As one considers the problems of the less developed nations, it seems inevitable that we shall face a turbulent and politically unstable world for years. Consequently, this is a time to be certain that we are sufficiently strong to maintain leadership in this kind of world. This is the time also to decide whether this Nation alone should attempt to assume responsibility for law and order everywhere. Can we ever be sufficiently powerful to maintain order wherever trouble may arise in the entire world? If not, what are the dimensions of our responsibility?

We have emphasized earlier the increasing role of business enterprise in this Nation. However, in varying degrees this is a world-wide development. In a world dedicated to improving the economic welfare of hundreds of millions of persons who are in poverty, business enterprise becomes a major center in a nation's life. The efficiency of production, the values of enlightened management, the widespread distribution of income to the masses, the opportunities given to individuals for economic progress, and a dedication to the primary objectives of a free competitive society all become of prime importance.

If widespread economic progress depends upon the organization of relatively large business enterprises, the world will adopt mass production, mass distribution, mass

communication, and mass education. Fortunately, these are ideas of the West, and especially the United States. Other nations may not accept our form of government. They may advocate centralized government with a minimum of freedom for the people. But they will be compelled to adopt the basic ideas of Western economic and business organization if they are to meet the desperate economic needs of their people. As they do, they may also find that these institutions flourish best in a free society where men have the opportunity and incentive to develop their talents.

These are some of the great issues which confront us. I trust I have not in these few minutes brought a false clarity to difficult issues. I am under no delusion that these are simple problems. But there is a time for the discussion and solution of great issues. There is a time for decision and action, or the relentless drift of events will make the decisions. These are issues for which the time for decision may now have arrived.

#### H.R. 10567 SHOULD BE DEFEATED

(Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the people living on rural routes throughout America want their good mail service to continue, they had better see to it that bill H.R. 10567 is defeated. This bill would authorize the Postmaster General to furnish rural carriers the vehicles needed for the delivery of mail.

The rural carriers throughout the United States travel each day in excess of 1,800,000 miles. There are 31,135 rural routes. If the Postmaster General elected to supply that number of vehicles, the paperwork in keeping track of them would be a monumental task. In addition, requests for repairs, the authorizations and the vouchers would pile up in Washington so deeply the postal service would be nothing but a paper-shuffling agency, rather than a mail delivery service.

Even worse would be the effects on the mail delivery service itself. Many rural carriers by necessity keep more than one vehicle so service may be uninterrupted. Many need special equipment for winter service, including 4-wheel drive. Many carriers live in small towns where emergency vehicles would not be available to them, and no motor pools could be established for prompt replacement due to motor failure or breakdown.

All of these problems are now met in an admirable manner by the loyal and hardworking rural mail carriers of America. They take pride in the regularity and efficiency of their service, and I know that they look with great apprehension at this proposal which would greatly cripple the efficiency of the service they now provide and would be more costly to the Government.

I will urge the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a very critical analysis, not only of the costs of this measure, but the effects on the service. When all factors are reviewed, I have every confidence that this proposal will be abandoned even by its sponsors.

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

(Mr. KING of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

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

(Mr. KING of New York's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

#### FREE WORLD TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBA

(Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, perhaps nothing better demonstrates the lack of U.S. prestige than the fact that even our allies have not heeded our requests for an embargo on Communist North Vietnam and Cuba.

The record shows that, despite requests by the State Department, free world vessels continue to unload vital supplies in quantity in both North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

We are not only cooperating in the economic boycott of Rhodesia but are flying oil into next-door Zambia. Yet British-flag vessels unload the preponderance of free world oil and food reaching our North Vietnam and Cuban enemies.

British vessels carried almost 60 percent of 1965 shipments into North Vietnam ports—31 more British vessels entered Cuban ports since 1963 than those of the nearest free world competitor.

Yet we are, I repeat, assisting the British-led blockade against Rhodesia. This is tragic. American lives and American safety are at stake. The time has come to halt free world shipping to our Communist enemies—and we must do it.

#### COMMERCIAL JETS IN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

(Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday carried the account of the decision of the Federal Aviation Agency opening Washington National Airport to short-range and intermediate commercial jet operations.

In my opinion, this is a most progressive step, even though some of the area politicians are expressing concern.

Most of the major commercial air carriers have announced that they are phasing-out their piston equipment, and by 1970, I imagine all commercial airlines will be flying jets exclusively.

As the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aero-

He can, for example, use new indirect powers to influence prices, profits, wages, hiring, managing and firing policies and what local city and county schools teach. He can decide that some firms will grow and others decline.

The multibillion-dollar stockpiles were set up so that the United States wouldn't be caught short of basic materials in a major war.

By selling or refusing to sell materials from the stockpiles a President can force prices down or up and thus regulate company profits.

The multibillion-dollar defense and space budgets were voted to keep the United States safely ahead of Communist Russia.

But a President can use this multi-billion-dollar-a-year contracting power to give or refuse contracts to major companies as a tool to force these firms or their unions into line.

By selecting areas where new contracts were let or new Government facilities built, a President could wipe out the prosperity of one community and create prosperity in another.

Antitrust laws were voted to prevent monopolies from harming the public and small businessmen.

But at some future date a President's underlings conceivably could threaten an antitrust investigation against a large firm which refused to cooperate in a Government program—say, a program to roll back prices. A firm could be threatened with a study of its tax returns.

Since, even for innocent firms, the cost of gathering evidence and conducting a defense might be very costly, the temptation to go along with a President could be overpowering.

Congress voted billions for education. A President can shut off sizable chunks of money to major school systems until those systems comply with administration rulings. These can go far beyond whether a school system integrates. Through national testing requirements, Federal rules on teaching and teachers can be indirectly applied to schools receiving Federal money.

If the Federal Bureau of Investigations should ever be headed by a man less honest and courageous than J. Edgar Hoover, the files of that organization could be a strong weapon in the hands of a President who wanted to convince individuals to follow his suggestions.—R.C.

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

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

**ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN TO HALT IMMEDIATELY ALL FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS**

(Mr. DICKINSON (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on New Year's Eve, I telegraphed the President and asked that action be taken to halt immediately all free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuban ports.

I pointed out that our cooperation in the embargo on Rhodesia in Africa gives

us the tool to persuade our allies to take this step.

My telegram read as follows:

According to press and news media we are participating in enforcing oil and vital materials embargo against Rhodesia. May I urgently recommend that we now insist on reciprocity by British and all the free world governments in enforcing embargo upon Communist North Vietnam and Cuba? British and other free world ships continue to land oil and other vital supplies in quantity in North Vietnam thus strengthening the very enemies with which we are now at war. Maritime Administration reported in early December 1965 that 83 British, 52 Lebanese, and other free world ships have landed oil, wheat, and so forth, in Cuban ports while ignoring our embargo requests and thus increasing threat of communism in the Americas. Now is the time for firm, decisive action on this matter by the United States.

I received an acknowledgment from the White House and was assured my views would be given consideration. I feel that not a moment should be lost in enforcing an embargo on our two active Communist enemies. So far 11 days have gone by without, so far as I am aware, any action being taken.

The entire situation was forcefully summarized by Columnist Arthur Kroch in the New York Times of December 5, 1965, who said:

Ships of our allies are regularly delivering cargoes essential to the North Vietnamese economy; and, except for South Korea, the Asiatic nations have no troops on the bloody battlefield.

**FREE WORLD SHIPPING INTO NORTH VIETNAM AND CUBAN PORTS**

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how inept in diplomacy can we get?

Here we are busy halting oil, sugar, and other shipments into Rhodesia. Yet our present diplomats cannot get our friends to stop shipping vital supplies to our active enemies. We know the State Department has tried but apparently not very hard and certainly not with effect.

British ships, Lebanese ships, Scandinavian ships, and other free world ships continue to carry oil and food to North Vietnam and to Cuba. The Communists fighting us from North Vietnam and endangering us from Cuba are thus strengthened.

It does not seem to me it would take undue skill for our diplomats to say: "If we are helping you, why you don't help us?" Or even, "If you won't help us, we won't help you."

After all, this is not a pink tea. This is not table tennis. Free world shipments to North Vietnam and Cuba endanger the flower of our manhood in one case and our security as a nation in the other.

If the administration's diplomats cannot get an embargo on free world shipping to North Vietnam and Cuba, I suggest we fire them and get some diplomats who can.

**COLD WAR GI BILL**

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a vital piece of unfinished business confronts us as we begin the 2d session of the 89th Congress and demands the earliest possible consideration. I speak of the proposal commonly known as the cold war GI bill. It is well known that this session of Congress will be preoccupied with the war in Vietnam. Certainly our concern for the many aspects of this situation would be unforgivably incomplete if we failed to seek just and equitable treatment for our fighting men defending the cause of freedom in that remote area of the world. Casualty figures alone do not tell us the full extent of the sacrifices being made by our men in uniform. Without doubt the American GI in Vietnam is making a contribution to his country at the cost of a personal sacrifice no less great than that made by his older brother in the Korean conflict or his father in World War II. We should make certain that the Vietnam veteran is accorded the same rights and privileges that we have granted in the recent past.

No doubt we will have to decide this session what Federal programs are most deserving of tax money already hard pressed by the requirements of the Vietnam war. Clearly this would not seem to be the time to initiate new programs. But even though the cold war GI bill is a new program it should be equally clear that at a time when our draft calls are on the increase and our military services are being bolstered to meet our growing commitments in South Vietnam that this is no time to slight those people directly responsible for carrying out this country's difficult and demanding job of stopping Communist aggression and subversion. I believe the American people demand that we take proper care of our veterans and that they further believe certain domestic programs, regardless of their peacetime merit should give way where necessary.

I am indeed encouraged by the announced intention of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to hold early hearings on this bill and feel certain that an equitable program can be agreed upon in the very near future. A Congress would not be well remembered by history that failed the Nation's veterans. They are not failing their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which has the broad support of the American people as is indicated by an editorial which appeared in the December 27, 1965, edition of the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., entitled "Troops in Vietnam Merit GI Benefits." Its logic is clear, its argument simple and direct, and I commend it to my colleagues. Under unanimous consent I will insert it in the Record following these remarks.

A GI education program will require added appropriations but its cost should be considered an integral part of the cost

January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

109

of the war in Vietnam. It is not a fringe benefit. It is essential to insuring that the disruption experienced by these young men will not necessarily work a continuing hardship on them as they seek to realize their life plans and goals.

The editorial follows:

## TROOPS IN VIETNAM MERIT GI BENEFITS

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, the father of the GI bill of rights for Korean war veterans, predicts early approval of a new bill which would provide similar benefits for American fighting men in Vietnam.

The prediction should be borne out by Congress when it gets down to business next year.

TEAGUE said recently he expected Congress to pass, by the end of February, legislation extending education and home-buying benefits to veterans with more than 180 days of active duty since 1955. Such a bill already has been approved by the Senate.

In simple justice to those who are fighting in Vietnam for the same principles U.S. troops fought to uphold in Korea, we share Representative TEAGUE's hope that the Johnson administration will retreat from its opposition to the measure when the House Veterans' Affairs Committee resumes hearings on the bill next month.

Previous bills have helped millions of veterans, including those who fought in World War II, go to college and buy homes. Similarly, the new bill would pay college or vocational school expenses and guarantee loans for purchase of homes, farms, and farm equipment for veterans of more than 180 days' active service since the Korean GI bill expired January 31, 1965.

Commenting on administration opposition to the bill, TEAGUE said: "Money is the whole thing." He estimated the cost would be several hundred million dollars in the first year.

Congress this year passed costly Great Society legislation at the bidding of the same administration that up to this point has opposed granting to GI's fighting in Vietnam benefits similar to those made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

Conserving the taxpayers' money is an important objective—a point which hasn't bothered Johnson when he has pushed through Congress other spending programs he has deemed in the Nation's interest.

The public should not be required to pay for frills as well as the increasing cost of the war in Vietnam and other essential spending but fairness and justice to the U.S. forces in Vietnam certainly should not be regarded as a frill.

The bill already passed by the Senate was also sponsored by a Texas Democratic lawmaker, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

Legislation that would extend the GI benefits to veterans of the Vietnam conflict deserves the support of another prominent Texas Democrat—President Johnson.

But whether Johnson supports it or not, Congress has an obligation to enact it at next year's session.

## THEY'D HAVE TO SEE IT TO BELIEVE IT

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, too often here in Washington, the elected and appointed officials forget who they really work for.

Appearances of the last session of this body to the contrary, we do not work

for the President or for a powerful lobby. We work for the people of the United States of America and it is to them that we owe an accounting for our daily efforts.

And yet only one day of the year do we even allow them into our workshop. And then it is not to see us work, but to listen with us. Tonight the President will come to the House to deliver the state of the Union address to Congress, giving the American public the rare chance to view the interior of this Chamber.

But then they will only have the opportunity to hear the Chief Executive give them his one-sided version of what his Great Society administration has done and what it intends to do.

Then the heavy doors behind us will shut for another year on the television cameras that could and should be reporting our actions into the homes of the people those actions affect.

It is of utmost importance that the Nation see Congress in action with its own eyes.

Last year bills were rammed and railroaded through the House under intense White House pressure. In many cases there was inadequate debate.

Major legislation passed without any amendments permitted except those approved by the White House. Many of these amendments would have improved the legislation.

In other cases, amendments were offered, and no debate upon them was permitted. In short, there were times last year when the legislative process was a mockery under the heavy hand of the White House.

Had the American people been able to see this House the evening that the highway beautification bill was rolled over repeated pleas for an open debate and finally rubberstamped sometime after midnight, they would view their legislative process with grave concern.

Perhaps if they could have sat here at other times and seen the effects of the administration hatchetmen on our deliberations, they would ponder about the balance of power they read about in school.

If they could have heard amendment after amendment to the bill repealing section 14(b) shouted down before they were even heard, they would have wondered if there were any freedom of speech left here.

Just a few glances of some of the mock deliberations of last year would have given them some serious doubts about this consensus they hear so much about.

But the truth is an elusive thing, and these strong-arm tactics must be seen to be believed.

I have introduced today, legislation to make sure that the American people will be able to see the performance of their democracy in action. The bill would let the television cameras stay in this Chamber after the President leaves tonight and allow them to continue reporting to America just what we do and how we do it.

I believe if the American people see this happening with their own eyes, they will demand that this lick-and-promise

lawmaking end at once. They will insist on Congress doing a thorough and a fair job of legislating. The searching and all-seeing eye of the TV camera will do a good deal in straightening out and strengthening the legislative branch of Government.

My colleagues of the minority and I seek to bring to the American people the truth instead of the hodgepodge of consensus-culled information distorted by the bureaucracy's public relations departments.

## CLEVELAND URGES CONGRESSIONAL BROADCASTING BILL STRESSES PEOPLES' RIGHT TO LOOK AND LISTEN

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today, in company with nine other Members, I am introducing legislation by which it would be possible for public sessions of the House and House committees to be broadcast live by radio and television.

This legislation carries the endorsement of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, of which I am chairman, but it is not really a partisan proposal. I hope it will win significant support from our Democratic colleagues who are likewise concerned to keep the public as well informed about the legislative branch as they are about the executive branch, which so dominates the airways.

The development of electronics media has revolutionized the country. It is changing the conduct of government, political campaigning, education, advertising and journalism. A picture is, indeed, worth a thousand words. This legislation would bring the House of Representatives—the peoples' forum—into the electronic age, at least so far as communications is concerned.

## PRESIDENTIAL DOMINATION OF AIRWAYS

It is about time. For some years, our Presidents have recognized the importance of television. Through the power and prestige of their office, they are able to dominate this media to present their particular viewpoints to the people under the best possible conditions. Tonight, for instance, President Johnson is coming to deliver his state of the Union message. He has chosen his time with careful deliberation—it is the prime viewing time across the Nation. Indeed, until the advent of television, Presidents delivered these addresses at noontime. The effect is that the message is addressed directly more to the people of the country than it is to their elected representatives. There is a subtle but profound constitutional change in this. It is a change which elevates the position of the executive branch at the expense of the legislative branch, although the two are created coequal by the Constitution.

When the President departs, the cameras and the microphones will depart with him. Under our present rules, the doors of the House will remain shut to

them throughout the important debates of this very important session, unless, of course, the President chooses to come again in this way to address us.

LIVE BROADCASTS WOULD STRENGTHEN  
DEMOCRACY

In my opinion, this is wrong. In the interests of elemental democracy as well as the interests of the Congress itself, radio and television should be permitted, under certain limitations prescribed in these bills, to bring the public to the floor. They should be able to see and hear the great debates which will decide their futures. The public should have a chance to hear the minority arguments.

I believe further that one of the best ways to win public support for some of the much-needed reforms of congressional procedures would be for the public to see and hear how some of their business is conducted.

PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

I sometimes refer to this legislation as look and listen bills. The public has a right to look and listen and this legislation would allow the people to come into their Congress. It would help to offset the overconcentration on the President and his points of view and it would help to redress the present imbalance between the two branches of government.

This legislation is a vital, first step in modernizing the Congress, and I strongly urge its prompt consideration by the House.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN VIETNAM?

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

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, following the adjournment of Congress, to make a study tour of Vietnam and other parts of Asia. I made this trip at my own expense in order that I could report to my constituents, the situation in Vietnam from first-hand observation. I know that many of my colleagues went to Vietnam and shared in much of the information I was able to gather and I am sure many of them will report their findings to the House from time to time, as I intend to do.

At this point I would like to point out the most disturbing element of this very confusing war situation. That is the support the Communist enemy, the Vietcong, is receiving from our allies. Ships of many nations from the free world are steaming daily into the harbor at Haiphong, unloading goods and materials for the North Vietnamese which enable them to carry on the war in which American boys are dying in the cause of freedom for all people. I have called repeatedly, as many of you have, for a blockade of the harbor at Haiphong.

A situation which has not been publicized, and which is even more shameful than the free use of the harbor at Haiphong by our allies, is the shipping of goods through the Mekong River, through South Vietnam into Cambodia.

The South Vietnamese are powerless to prevent these shipments because the Mekong River is considered an international waterway. In the past year, while American men have been fighting to the death to halt the Communist aggression against South Vietnam, more than 250 ships of our allied nations have sailed up the Mekong River and unloaded supplies in Cambodia near the very heart of the area where these supplies are needed by the Vietcong to wage their war against a free people.

Now, listen to this startling fact, about the same number of free nation ships have been going into Haiphong harbor and the combined total of allied shipments to Haiphong and through the Mekong River add up to more than the total goods and materials shipped to the North Vietnamese by Communist nations. Surely we in Congress and the American people have the right to ask the President, what goes on in Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of this Congress who can give a reasonable explanation to his constituents and to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the men who have died at the hands of the Vietcong for such support of our enemy by nations which are supposed to be our friends?

Why does the President keep these facts from the American people? Is it because he puts less trust in his own people than he does in the hope that the Communists do not really mean what they say when they threaten to bury us and rule the world?

I am firmly convinced that the first order of business of this session of Congress should be to demand a frank report from the President concerning his intentions in Vietnam. The very least the American people should expect is that he take whatever action is necessary to cut the supply lines to North Vietnam, especially those supply lines being used by nations who freely accept our aid and support, but continue to send in goods to strengthen our enemy and theirs. We cannot continue to fight for the freedom of the world unless the rest of the world is willing to contribute something to the protection of freedom. Not another day should go by without serving notice on the world that no further shipments are going to be permitted through Haiphong Harbor or up the Mekong River.

PEOPLE WORRIED ABOUT U.S. ROLE  
AS WORLD POLICEMAN

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIN] joined me in sending a letter to the President, in which we reported public concern about the U.S. role as world policeman. As it dealt with the Vietnam war and the need for a better union of free-nation effort in world affairs, I am placing the text in the RECORD:

JANUARY 7, 1966.

DEAR Mr. PRESIDENT: We hope your state of the Union message will include recommendations for a more perfect union of the free nations. This would lift the spirits of the American people. It would give them hope that in the future we will no longer be virtually alone in "guarding the gates of freedom," as is the case today in Vietnam.

The American people are disappointed and distressed because our major allies are not sharing the military burdens we have assumed in southeast Asia. They are also worried about what lies ahead if the United States attempts to police the world by itself.

Your message presents a splendid opportunity for you to announce steps which hopefully will lead to effective free-world teamwork in dealing with worldwide trouble spots like Vietnam.

The atmosphere will change from gloom to promise if you will state U.S. willingness and desire from this day forward to follow policies that are developed jointly with our allies. If we are ever to achieve cooperative action, we must accept cooperative policymaking. We must treat our allies as responsible and trustworthy partners.

Policy on all critical problems which have worldwide importance should be developed automatically within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Had we developed policy with our allies in the early days of the Vietnam struggle we could reasonably expect their full cooperation today.

We must set goals worthy of the tremendous sacrifices now being made in Vietnam. Long-range objectives of the free-world community must be defined. Free-world institutions—presently weak and in confusing array—must be brought together and strengthened. Resolutions to these ends will be before the new session of Congress, and your encouragement will be most helpful and gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY.  
ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.  
ALBERT H. QUIN.

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

[Mr. HARVEY of Indiana's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE GIVEN TO DR. R. F.  
TROIANO

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last October more than 400 of the leading citizens of Yonkers, N.Y., paid tribute at a Columbus Day dinner to Dr. R. F. Troiano for his years of dedicated service to the community—New York State's fifth largest city.

On that occasion, Dr. Troiano had a most important message, not only for the city of Yonkers, but for our entire Nation. He proposed a fund for America—a fund not of dollars, but of citizenship.

I was proud to join the many community leaders in Yonkers in honoring Dr. Troiano and I was deeply impressed by his message. In the hope that people all over the United States will read and

I believe the approach in this provision is not inconsistent with vigilance against illegal narcotics traffic. There are many ways to eliminate that traffic—one, I believe, is to take as many young and first offending addicts out of the stream. Prosecutionary discretion in narcotics cases is a means to that end.

A commitment to greater use of rehabilitative services in narcotics will not be possible unless the Federal Government can initiate a new program for construction and funding of treatment facilities. The third bill I introduce today, consequently, provides \$25 million a year for a 3-year program of aid for new services and research projects.

A formula of two-thirds, one-third Federal-State matching grants will control the appropriation of 80 percent of the grants. The remaining 20 percent will be given as a direct 100-percent grant to nonprofit private organizations with little capital of their own. Equally important in this measure, I believe, are the provisions to encourage new people to enter the narcotics rehabilitation field. Vocational training would be expanded with use of funds authorized by the legislation.

Let me say then that I would hope programs in rehabilitation would make a special attempt to utilize cured addicts or rehabilitated criminals, or even poor people in the services. The reality of narcotics addiction is unique. Those who have shared the experience of victimization, and those who have found the skill to overcome oppressive conditions are best equipped to help their fellows.

The fourth bill in the program I am submitting provides aid for the construction and acquisition of treatment facilities. Its formula is essentially similar to that in the third bill, dealing with rehabilitation services. It authorizes expenditures of \$50 million a year for 2 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me once again express my conviction that narcotics legislation must receive attention during this session of Congress. Under President Johnson's skilled leadership, the country is beginning to grow aware of the invisible poor and exploited amidst us. I suggest that the plight of no citizen in this country is as tortured and agonized as that of the narcotics addict. To cure a social problem, we must first properly identify it. As much as anything, the bills I am today introducing seek to establish a new definition and approach to narcotics problems. Only when this is achieved will we have any grounds for hope that the terrible fact of addiction can be eliminated.

#### U.S. FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR REX M. WHITTON

(Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the International Road Federation is one of the outstanding worldwide organizations active in the field of highway transpor-

ation. This organization publishes monthly a paper known as World Highways, which has extensive circulation in all sections of the globe. I am happy to note that in the January 1966, issue, there is a long article paying proper tribute to an old friend of mine, the U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton.

I have known Rex since he was the chief highway engineer for the State of Missouri. I worked closely with him in those days, and even more so since he assumed the most important role of Administrator of our vast highway program. Under Mr. Whitton's guidance the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which authorized the construction of our great highway system, has been properly implemented and the results can be seen today in the vast new roads that crisscross all sections of our land.

I am privileged and proud to have the opportunity to place into the Record this tribute to a most distinguished public servant, Rex M. Whitton.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the January 1966, issue of World Highways:

PERSONALITY PROFILE: U.S. FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR OVERSEES REVOLUTIONARY HIGHWAY PROGRAM

U.S. Federal Highway Administrator Rex M. Whitton has headed the Bureau of Public Roads during the most momentous period in the history of the U.S. Federal-State highway program.

Now rounding out his 5th year as the top U.S. highway official, he has probably overseen more revolutionary developments in the program than occurred during the previous 45 years of the Bureau of Public Roads-State highway department roadbuilding partnership.

Mr. Whitton took office as Federal Highway Administrator on February 10, 1961, under the late President John F. Kennedy, bringing with him the benefit of more than 40 years experience with the Missouri State Highway Commission, nearly 10 of them as its chief engineer. He applied his energies to advancing the top-priority work on the 41,000-mile (66,000-kilometer) National System of Interstate Highways while at the same time accelerating construction and reconstruction of other elements of the U.S. road network.

When he assumed direction of the Bureau of Public Roads there were about 10,000 miles (16,100 kilometers) of the Interstate System in use, including more than 2,000 miles of existing roads that had been incorporated into the system. Today half the 41,000 miles (66,000 kilometers) is in operation, another 6,000 miles (9,700 kilometers) are under construction, and comparable progress has been made on the other Federal-aid road programs.

But Mr. Whitton's impact on the total U.S. highway effort has principally been felt in adjusting it to new conditions and challenges both at home and abroad. Shortly after he took office he began reorganizing the Bureau to devote increased attention and talent to the specialized fields of planning, research and development, and highway safety.

#### PLANNING R. & D. SAFETY

Under Mr. Whitton's direction, the Bureau has been pursuing an intensified nationwide effort to foster planning in all U.S. cities. The planning itself is a State and community responsibility, but the Bureau is offering financial assistance, advice, and encouragement.

The Bureau and the States also have undertaken broad studies of U.S. highway needs

after 1972, when the present huge program is scheduled to expire or taper off.

In urban transportation research the Bureau has stepped up efforts to improve methods of predicting and planning for future needs and is working on improved electronic-control systems for more efficient use of available street capacity. It has recently made Federal funds available to the States in much greater amounts for such purposes.

Research and development in highway location, design, and construction have been varied and productive and the future promises far more positive results. The use of aerial-survey techniques, coupled with the computer, has been notable; nuclear, sonic, and other nondestructive testing devices have been developed; and roadbuilding machinery is becoming automated.

Mr. Whitton has established an Office of Highway Safety in the Bureau that deals with the problem of traffic accidents—their causes and a means of reducing road deaths and injuries. He instituted a spot-improvement program to eliminate hazards at highway locations with high accident records. The Bureau is also exploring information and guidance systems involving electronic detectors, communications, computers, and other similar devices that will aid drivers.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, just ended, a law was enacted that may have far-reaching effects on halting the rising trend of auto deaths and accidents. It directs that after December 31, 1967, each State should have a comprehensive highway-safety program approved by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

#### ETHICS AND ESTHETICS

Any list of Mr. Whitton's contributions to highway progress in the United States must include the adoption and promotion of human and moral values in the road program. In 1962, for example, financial assistance to families and businesses displaced by Federal-aid road construction was made possible for the first time. Until then relatively few States made any payments for moving costs. Now the Federal Government reimburses States for an appropriate share of moving costs paid by an individual, a family, a business, farm, or nonprofit organization.

He has long been an advocate of esthetic design of highways themselves and of preventing unsightly encroachments on the adjacent countryside. He took an active part in promoting President Johnson's highway beautification program, which became law on October 23, 1965.

"The people who build highways know that what they build will last for years," Whitton has said. "They know that how they build will have a deep influence on the areas they serve. They know that highways are the windows to the beauty and grandeur of America."

"The people who build highways want to build with beauty. They want to preserve and enhance our natural and man-made heritage. They want to serve the spiritual as well as the physical needs of our Nation."

#### AN INTERNATIONALIST

Mr. Whitton has taken a more active role in international road matters than any of his predecessors and his leadership has projected the Bureau's activities further into world transport problems and attempts at solutions. He has attended virtually all of the international highway and traffic engineering conferences during his term of office. He was a principal speaker at the Fourth IRF World Meeting in Madrid in 1962, at the IRF Regional Conferences in Tokyo in 1964 and Lima in 1965, at the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress in Washington in 1963, and at many other similar meetings.

"We in the United States claim no special fountain of knowledge," he told the Lima

January 12, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

123

lies with water supply systems, electrification, improved harbors, roads, and transport facilities.

3. Technical assistance: To improve human skills through education in agricultural methods, public health, public safety, public works, public administration, logistics, and other areas.

4. Counterinsurgency: To maintain basic services for the people by providing foodstuffs, farm tools, roofing, and cement and other things. Included in this part of the aid program is strengthening of the national police.

What are the prospects for immediate victory? Victory in this instance is not like that of a conventional war in that it must mean the containment of militant communism. This will undoubtedly take time and effort and sacrifice. But the stakes are enormous and the price is worth our best efforts. I don't mean to be pessimistic. The fact that we have taken a stand there has already had tremendous repercussions throughout Asia, Africa, and more particularly in Indonesia.

I recall as vividly as any experience of my life, the days of the Cuban crisis. You may remember that Congress had just adjourned and President Kennedy summoned all of the congressional leaders back to Washington. There in the Cabinet Room of the White House he outlined in detail the Russian missile threat to the United States. For 1 momentous week the Nation looked down the nuclear barrel. On the Monday after the Sunday morning that Khrushchev wrote his letter to the President indicating withdrawal of the missiles, President Kennedy said, at his final briefing, "The military threat of Russia is receding. Now the threat will come from Communist China as it develops the hydrogen bomb."

Two years later, almost to the day, gathered in the same room, almost the same people, with the exception of President Kennedy, President Johnson briefed us on the explosion of the first nuclear device in China. There were many questions directed at Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara. The principal one was, "What threat does this pose to the free world?" The answer came back—very little as of now, but a major and dangerous one 10 years from now, barring no change in the aggressive government now dominant in China.

And as I talked with our leaders in Vietnam and Saigon, these meetings kept recurring in my mind. So this is the ultimate challenge of Vietnam. Whether we turn back the threat now or whether we repeat the events of other days and ultimately face a China infinitely stronger than it is today, determined to conquer the rest of mankind. In essence, our success in containing communism in south Vietnam may well determine whether or not our country and the free world will be forced to fight world war III.

Our men in Vietnam understand this and they are willing to make whatever sacrifices are required to prevent this from happening.

This is what all of our people at home must understand. This is what the so-called demonstrators, unless they be Communist motivated, do not understand. And this is the message that I bring back from that far-off place where Americans are fighting to preserve your freedom and mine.

In conclusion, let me quote from the address made by President Johnson at the Johns Hopkins University in April 1965:

"We fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure. \* \* \*

"The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest. \* \* \*

"Over this war, and all Asia, is another reality: the deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, attacked India, and been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. \* \* \*

"Why are we in South Vietnam? \* \* \*

"We are there because we have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. We have helped to build, and we have helped to defend. Thus, over the years, we have made a national pledge to help South Vietnam defend its independence. And I intend to keep that promise.

"We are also there to strengthen world order. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of American commitment, the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

"We are there because there are great stakes in the balance. Let no one think for a moment that retreat from Vietnam would bring an end to the conflict. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another. The central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.

"There are those who wonder why we have a responsibility there. We have it for the same reason we have a responsibility for the defense of the freedom of Europe. World War II was fought in both Europe and Asia, and when it ended, we found ourselves with continued responsibility for the defense of freedom.

"Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves, only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way.

"It should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

"Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

Mr. Speaker, since my speech was delivered December 20, our Government has undertaken by every honorable means to bring about the kind of just peace described in the last paragraph quoted above. The whole world hopes for success.

#### NARCOTICS ADDICTION

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, four bills in total, which must occupy a position of absolute priority on the congressional agenda of 1966.

The problem is narcotics addiction. The need is for a more humane and effective Federal approach to that grave reality. The focus must be an attempt to differentiate the sickness of narcotics use from the crime of narcotics distribution, and in such cases to substitute rehabilitation for pure punishment.

The bills I am introducing today are intended to make it possible for the Federal Government to make such distinc-

tions in narcotics cases. Each is designed to allow a more flexible response to what is finally an immensely complicated psychological, medical and social reality. Two of the measures attempt to modernize procedures for the prosecution and punishment of narcotics crimes. Two seek to promote a new Federal commitment to research, treatment and rehabilitative services and facilities for addicts. The bills are complementary.

A more enlightened narcotics policy requires initially that diseased addicts be withdrawn from the category of simple criminals. Accordingly, one of my bills would authorize the pretrial civil commitment of addicts for medical treatment and probationary care—in lieu of criminal prosecution. My own State of New York has been a pioneer in providing civil commitment for addicts. The bill I today introduce attempts to write such procedure into Federal law. Persons accused of narcotics crimes would be allowed the option of undertaking a compulsory treatment and rehabilitation program, rather than standing trial for offenses presently designated as crimes, but usually the simple expression of their narcotics disease.

Safeguards are built into this approach. The civil commitment program would not be open to persons charged with stealing narcotics for resale, nor would it be available to criminals convicted of two or more felonies, nor to those with a prior pending felony charge. Persons who had previously participated in civil commitment programs on two or more occasions would also be prohibited from further participation. These safeguards are necessary, though it is my own view that all narcotics criminals must eventually be given open rehabilitation opportunities.

My second bill seeks to move in that direction. Our first goal, however, must be treatment of the young addict, the first offender, and those most vulnerable to the criminal trade of dope distribution. We must try to break the vicious circle of addiction, imprisonment, release, and renewed addiction.

The second bill seeks certain reforms in existing narcotics criminal law. The operating principle is to be prosecutorial discretion in enforcing narcotics laws in order to provide incentive for addicts convicted of Federal crimes to pursue treatment while in confinement. If adopted this legislation would allow Federal courts to use probation, parole, and suspended sentences as tools to promote the rehabilitation of the addict-criminal. Changes envisaged would allow judges to determine whether an accused is a major peddler of narcotics, and should be tried under the most stringent provisions of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, or is a simple addict arrested for possession alone and deserving of less punitive treatment. The principal intention of this provision is to provide, within the structure of the law, clear incentives for narcotics addicts to avoid narcotics peddling, and to seek rehabilitation while in custody. The bill also provides some flexible sentencing provisions for the Federal Youth Corrections Act.

much concerned with the measures we have adopted to prevent export of investment funds because of the unfavorable balance of payments existing there.

With these preoccupations, one would think that Vietnam would not be a matter of grave concern to these people—but this is not the case. They now thoroughly understand what would happen should we withdraw from Vietnam.

And even greater understanding exists in Australia, a country which has stood with us in World War I, World War II, the Korean war. Australia is a land mass almost the size of the continental United States. It has been described as the world's largest island and smallest continent. Throughout this vast area only 11 million people reside, and immediately above that continent lies Indonesia with the heaviest concentration of population on earth. From Indonesia to the southeast Asian peninsula and Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos is an easy jump. So Australia is acutely aware of Vietnam; acutely aware of the stakes involved.

Then I went to Hong Kong, the incredible city which has grown in 15 years from 500,000 people to 4 million people. There is a city that trades with the whole world, and is part of the mainland of Communist China. Practically all of the food consumed by the 4 million people who live in Hong Kong comes from the mainland. Why does Hong Kong exist, people ask. The answer is not difficult to come by. It is to Red China's advantage to allow Hong Kong to operate as a free and separate entity, because through this great port is generated most of the hard currency which the Communist Chinese use to purchase essentials from the outside world for their economy.

But most of all, Hong Kong is a listening post. The intelligence agents of all nations move in and out of the area.

What does one find out in Hong Kong? Several things, I think. One, that the split between Russia and China is a very real one, having an impact on every Communist Party on earth, and vitally affecting decisions which may ultimately determine whether or not world war III is avoided. One soon discovers that the very old leaders of Communist China—the average age of the 17 men who make up the top leadership is 68—face many problems of their own, the main one being what the Communists call revisionism, namely the tendency to forsake militant revolution for internal development, using some of the same incentives employed by free enterprise societies outside the Communist orbit.

So having gone to these places, I went to Vietnam. I was there several days. I talked to our Ambassador, to our military leaders, to our soldiers. I visited hospitals, the countryside. I did everything possible to find out all that I could about all that is going on there. One can only get impressions and one hopes that they are valid ones.

Let me say that I have no advice to give to the military. I have complete confidence in General Westmoreland and the other splendid officers who make up our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps leadership in that part of the world.

They have now, and will continue to have, my full support.

Now for some observations. First, we must stay in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace is obtained. Why? Because it is a crucial test between our country and Communist China, and its outcome may well determine whether we ultimately fight world war III or not. Communist China believes that it must conquer the world. It believes that it can do this through so-called wars of "national liberation." Here in the dense jungles and broad deltas of the tropical climate, every method of terror and coercion has been employed to bring about the success of this so-called war of "national libera-

tion." Why is the Vietcong strong? Because the methods of terror and assassination remove the energetic adult leaders and force the young men from the villages and countryside into the Vietcong.

If we leave without a just peace, then the word is out that the West has lost and communism has won. The impact of this is quite obvious to any thoughtful person. Suffice it to say that Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, India, would fall very quickly. The chances are that when the Philippines come under the gun, we would then be in an all-out world war III. These are the simple, basic reasons for being in Vietnam.

Some argue that Vietnam is so far away, and is so insignificant that its conquest by Hanoi and Peiping present no problem of such magnitude as to justify the present escalation of our military efforts.

Let us examine this for just a moment. In 1931, you may recall, the then Secretary of State, Harold L. Stimpson, urged President Hoover and the British Government to confront the Japanese when that nation committed aggression against Manchuria. Mr. Stimpson was not heeded, and Manchuria led on ultimately to Pearl Harbor and the chain of aggression was not broken until many Americans had lost their lives on islands that most of us had never heard of. There are many similar events of the recent past which might be cited, the failure of the League of Nations, Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia, Hitler's defiance of treaty obligations, his seizure of one country after another, and ultimately the blood and sweat and the death and destruction of World War II.

So the notion that we can secure a quick peace by ignoring and forgetting about Vietnam is something that all of recent history tells us is wrong. And our Communist adversaries themselves have made it quite clear peace would not come with the sacrifice of the people of South Vietnam. Already they are talking about "national liberation" of Thailand. Thailand has never been a colonial nation. From whom would it be liberated? Not from us, or the British, or the French, but from the Thais.

And if we left, does any sensible person believe that the balance of power in the world would remain as it is now? Does anyone believe that Berlin would be secure, or that Communist terror would not be promoted throughout Asia and Africa and Latin America?

In a remarkable interview a few days ago, Ho Chi Minh rejected any notion of negotiation other than by way of total surrender on the part of our people.

I have been in Japan. Their laborious effort has been quite successful in creating a peaceful and a democratic society. Its economy and industry are now harnessed to the ways of peace. After being in Japan, I am convinced that it could not continue this course, if we, in effect, surrender in Vietnam and withdraw from southeast Asia. One other important consideration occurred time and time again in my discussions in Vietnam, Japan, and elsewhere, and that is that the split between the communism of China and the communism of Russia is very real indeed. If we withdraw, there can be no doubt that the Chinese brand of communism, that repeatedly and explicitly says it wants no peace, shall become dominant. That is why negotiation on the terms laid down by Hanoi and Peiping would, in my opinion, visit a holocaust upon the world rather than lasting peace.

Is there an easy way out? Is there a simple solution? The answer is "No." Imagine if you will the United States with half of the cities and towns under Communist control. Imagine no road or railroad or canal or river safe for communication and transportation. Imagine the farmer unable

to produce his crop because of terror, murder and assassination, and imagine a terrain of jungles and swamps largely inaccessible, and you get some notion of the problems in Vietnam. Add to this fact that most of the leadership—the mayors, the councilmen, the educators, the editors, the physicians, the lawyers, and engineers have been assassinated. It is under these conditions that we seek to join with the forces of the Vietnam Government to pacify South Vietnam. This is why our military leaders don't claim victory. They say we have stopped "losing."

Six months ago, village after village was being surrounded and overcome, and the Government forces had retreated to the town squares and to the city of Saigon. Today, many of the villages have been retaken and pacified. More than that, the people know that we are there and we intend to stay. The impact of this is one of enormous significance.

Now, about our own men. Our forces are extremely able, tough, alert, and intelligent. Most of the men in our forces today are high school graduates; most of our officers are college graduates. Most of them are trained in government, in economics, and political systems; and most of them, thank God, understand the philosophical and political threat of communism so that they know what the war is about. The morale of our men is tremendous. Inspiring is the only word to describe it.

What has been the impact on them of so-called peace demonstrations here at home? All of the soldiers to whom I spoke understood that the demonstrations were the work of small minorities, or were promoted by Communist agitators. None were deceived into believing that they represented any major opinion in our country.

In some ways the effect has been quite opposite from that intended. In that literally millions of Americans have written to our forces in Vietnam expressing support. I presented petitions of about 7,000 citizens, gathered by the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area, and from about 3,500 students, staff, and faculty members of Tulane University. These expressions of support from our own area are being duplicated throughout the Nation, and are enormously encouraging to our forces.

There is no doubt that our military effort in Vietnam is vital to the ultimate success of the South Vietnamese people in achieving a stable, viable government under a free society. But the fact is that military success in defeating the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army is one aspect in a long, arduous task of rebuilding the South Vietnamese society to meet the challenges and responsibilities of self-government as a modern state. One of the toughest aspects of our job in Vietnam—in terms of the long haul—is succeeding with our economic and social programs there.

Today more than 1,000 employees of the Agency for International Development—many of them working in the countryside and the small hamlets and villages—are engaged in helping the South Vietnamese people in the fields of agriculture, health, education, public works, public safety, public administration, labor industrial development, and various provincial operations such as resettlement of refugees, rehabilitation of Vietcong prisoners and others. Our Government is now providing more than \$300 million a year for our technical personnel to work with the South Vietnamese in these important areas. This economic assistance is a four-point effort in four major areas:

1. Grant aid: To finance imports to help maintain the South Vietnam economy on a day-to-day basis, and to prevent serious inflation, and curb the balance-of-payments deficit.
2. Capital projects assistance: To broaden the economic base and improve urban facilities.



January 12, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

121

Mrs. Raymond Gautreaux said information pamphlets and forms distributed at the institute should answer most of her questions.

"I've been doing our own income tax forms since we've been married and I ought to be able to figure them out without too much difficulty," she said.

Mrs. Gautreaux's family had to leave its home at 3027 Music after suffering losses of some \$10,000. The family is temporarily living at 4702 Perлита.

Louis Barnes, 101 Nutria Drive, Chalmette, and George Santos, 3106 Jackson Boulevard, Chalmette, said the institute was both educational and constructive.

Another man seemed extremely pleased to learn that he can deduct the loss of food spoiled in his freezer because of no electricity. "That alone made it worth the trip here," he said.

#### DEDUCT "FORGIVEN" SBA LOAN, STORM VICTIMS ARE ADVISED—TAX STEPS OUTLINED HERE BY EXPERTS

(By Clarence Doucet)

Hurricane victims who made Small Business Administration loans must deduct the "forgiven" part of their loan from the total casualty loss from Betsy claimed in their 1965 Federal income tax returns.

That announcement came Wednesday night at the Hurricane Betsy Tax Institute at Municipal Auditorium.

The institute was sponsored by the Times-Picayune and the New Orleans States-Item.

Harold LeBlanc, Federal revenue agent from Baton Rouge, made the announcement about the SBA loans as he outlined the Internal Revenue Service's policy regarding recovery of Betsy victims from sources other than insurance.

He said the "forgiveness" part of the SBA loan is considered as "compensation other than insurance."

#### HELPFUL CITED

Along the same lines, the IRS announced that money made available by "disaster relief" agencies must also be considered a recovery other than insurance.

In these cases, as well, any recovery or reimbursement received from these groups would reduce the casualty loss claimed on tax returns, he said.

LeBlanc was one of several Federal and State income tax officials who addressed the institute.

An IRS official said that more than 4,000 packages, which contained information and forms for filing Federal and State income tax returns, were handed to persons as they entered the auditorium.

Actual attendance was estimated by a fire marshal at more than 3,200.

Chester A. Usry, New Orleans district director for the IRS, headed the Federal tax officials. William E. Tuttle, Baton Rouge, director of individual income tax for the Louisiana Department of Revenue, headed the State revenue department delegation.

Other IRS officials who spoke included Ralph P. Hebert, chief, audit division, New Orleans district; and Thomas Byrnes, revenue agent and senior instructor, New Orleans district.

Edgar Poe, Washington correspondent for the Times-Picayune, was master of ceremonies.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE

Poe explained that the sole purpose of the institute was to "provide a public service." He said one result will be to minimize the income taxes of persons who suffered losses due to Hurricane Betsy.

Usry announced that the IRS office in New Orleans will have a special telephone service for hurricane victims who wish additional information about their particular problems. Betsy victims desiring this assistance should dial 527-2371.

Usry also announced that beginning January 3, 1966, specially trained personnel will be available to assist taxpayers in person in Room 117 in the Federal Building at 600 South.

He urged hurricane victims to file their returns before February 15 to avoid the delay which usually comes after that date.

"If you send them to us after February 15," Usry added, "your returns will hit us with 100,000 others, and I don't know when you'd get your refund in that case."

Byrnes defined casualty tax losses—in this case Betsy losses—noting that for tax purposes they are divided into real property losses and personal property losses. Combined, they represent the total casualty loss.

He said that food, medical supplies and subsistence given to hurricane victims does not reduce their casualty loss.

LeBlanc, in addition to announcing the IRS policy concerning "forgiveness" loans, also answered in general terms questions submitted to the IRS via the Times-Picayune.

He emphasized that any losses because of Betsy are 1965 losses and must be reported in 1965 returns. He also emphasized that, though some lost items may have had great sentimental value to the owner, they must be reported at their actual worth immediately before the hurricane.

Hebert urged taxpayers to "be reasonable in estimating the values of articles damaged or destroyed."

He said revenue agents and auditors have been reminded to "be reasonable and practical when considering the values reported on income tax returns."

Hebert also said taxpayers should provide "an adequate explanation of the casualty loss claimed on your return."

He added:

"Remember, the purpose of an adequate explanation is to enable the auditor to evaluate the reasonableness of the loss claimed without having to audit your return. Therefore, it is to your advantage to include in your return all the important information concerning the loss."

Other State income tax officials attending were: J. W. Brown, Baton Rouge, chief administrative assistant for individual taxes; Harold Couvillion, Baton Rouge, reviewing auditor, and Wilson Barrett, auditor in the New Orleans office.

#### AWARDS GIVEN

At the conclusion of the stage presentation, Usry presented certificates of meritorious public service to both newspapers for sponsoring the institute. The certificates were signed by IRS Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen. Poe accepted for the Times-Picayune; and Walter Cowan, managing editor of the States-Item, accepted for his newspaper.

Persons attending were then invited to address personal questions concerning their individual tax problems and Betsy losses to IRS agents, who were positioned at 17 tables in front of the stage. Three other tables staffed by Federal and State tax personnel, were also available.

The packages distributed to persons attending the institute contained "Hurricane Betsy Losses and Your Income Tax," a reprint of the 10-part series which appeared in the Times-Picayune; copies of the special sheets prepared by the IRS to aid hurricane victims in listing their losses; copies of Form 1040, the U.S. individual income tax return; a copy of the booklet, "Disaster, Casualties, and Thefts: How the Federal Income Tax Applies"; instructions for filing Form 1040 for 1965, as well as copies of the 1965 Louisiana Income Tax Return and a special sheet to submit with State returns for claiming losses.

#### ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON WAR IN VIETNAM TO THE PRESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 20, 1965

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the recess between sessions of the 89th Congress, I traveled to southeast Asia to see firsthand the U.S. effort in South Vietnam and to assess our trade policies in other countries in that area.

Upon my return I reported my findings in a speech to the Press Club of New Orleans and I would like to offer this report to my colleagues.

I would also like to report that reaction to the speech was very favorable, and through communications and conversation with my constituents in the Second District of south Louisiana, I have found overwhelming support of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

Here are my remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, OF LOUISIANA, ON WAR IN VIETNAM TO THE PRESS CLUB OF NEW ORLEANS, DECEMBER 20, 1965

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have just now returned from a trip which has taken me halfway around the world, and from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere. I have been in New Zealand, Australia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Japan.

I wanted especially to go to Vietnam. As the war has quickened and as more Americans have become involved, I felt it essential, if I were to make intelligent determinations in the Congress on the issues involved, to go there and talk with our people and the Vietnamese people.

I felt it would be best, however, to go first to other countries closely associated with Asia, and also directly in the path of the Chinese Communists' thrust for world conquest.

Happily, I was able to combine these two missions. As you know, for years I have served as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee. In this capacity, I have helped to write many of our trade and tariff bills, and I have worked as hard as I know how to expand trade and commerce through our own port here in New Orleans.

I also wanted to look at the problems and promises of trade between these countries and our own, and I wanted more particularly to stress the advantages of our own home port. In each country I met with the top people, both in and out of Government, and today, briefly, I would like to report to you some of my observations.

New Zealand is a long way away. From Washington to Wellington, its capital city, is not only halfway around the world, but it also means a complete change of seasons. I was there in their late spring, and one of the days there was bright and sunny and the beaches were crowded with bathers. Christmas is very different from ours in that the people go to the countryside and the beaches, and do very much like we do on the Fourth of July.

New Zealand is an agricultural country. It produces lamb, wool, and beef—all for export. It is vitally concerned with such problems as the impact upon their trade by the possible entry of Great Britain into the Common Market. It is vitally concerned with our own import and export policies, and very