

I respectfully ask that the RECORD indicate that had I been present I would have voted "yea" in favor of passage of the bill.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I will support the supplemental appropriation bill for the Defense Department. In so doing I also wish to make clear my full commitment to the administration's policy in Vietnam. I support the administration's policy because I am convinced our goal is an honorable and lasting peace.

I am convinced we seek no domination over other lands, we do not seek to rule the fortunes or destinies of other people. I am convinced we have walked that extra mile in seeking peace and that at this time there is no other course open but to seek out and defeat the enemy. There is at this time no other path toward peace open to us. No acceptable alternatives have been offered.

Even as I express this conviction I know I must examine my own responsibilities. Agree or disagree—like it or not—when the Nation is at war we are committed to battle with an enemy and there can be no question where every citizen must stand. There is no one whose heart is not burdened with sorrow for those who suffer because of this war. But I am resolute in my determination to do that which must be done.

To criticize, to attack, to deny support to our policy—all at a time when we are at war can only serve to undermine the morale of our fighting men. Equally dangerous it can lead to a misinterpretation by our enemies of the strength of our policy. Such a misinterpretation could result in prolonging the conflict and delaying the advent of peace.

The news I want Hanoi to get is that this Nation is determined, that we are united, that we mean what we say and that what we say is backed by every citizen of this country.

OKLAHOMA HERITAGE TELLS CONSERVATION PROGRESS STORY

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

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a booklet I received recently that describes in picture and story the dramatic problems of soil and water conservation in Oklahoma, and how the people of my State, with the help of Congress and the Federal Establishment, have acted to solve them.

The booklet is called "Oklahoma's Heritage, Ours To Guard and Keep." It is heartening to me, as I know it is to the people of my State, to realize the progress that has been made in conserving our land and water resources since the dread days of the Dust Bowl and the times of frequent and damaging floods.

The story begins 38 years ago—in 1928—when a concerned Congress took a first step to control soil erosion. In that year the first erosion control research station in Oklahoma was established at Guthrie. There followed the creation of the Soil Erosion Service in 1933, and the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service, in 1935.

In 1937, Oklahoma was among the first States to authorize soil conservation districts, the basis for continued cooperation in soil and water conservation and development among farmers and ranchers, the Soil Conservation Service, and other Federal and State agencies and organizations.

"Oklahoma's Heritage" tells a story that with some regional variations could apply to any part of the Nation where the transition in land and water conservation has been dramatic in its spread throughout the rural areas, and from the farm and ranch to the rapidly growing urban communities.

"Oklahoma's Heritage" tells us that watershed protection and development has become a people's program, a fact attested to by \$850,000 provided annually by the Oklahoma State Legislature for watershed planning and assistance to soil and water conservation districts.

I believe this heartening story of one State's travels along the road of sound soil and water conservation and development is of considerable interest outside of Oklahoma. It is, really, a national story that will be told as long as the need for rich soil and an ample supply of clean water continues to exist.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ALBERT THOMAS, OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy burden of personal grief to announce to the Members of the House the death of their colleague and my dear friend, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas.

I have had the great gift of his friendship since he was first elected to this body in 1936. In all the many years that we served together, I found him always a pillar of strength, the soul of integrity, and an extraordinarily able and hard-working man, ever concerned with the well-being of those he represented, of the Government which he served, and of the country which he loved.

Most of us who were close to him have been aware of the seriousness of the illness with which he was afflicted. We have seen him bravely endure surgery time after time. He fought the good fight all of his life; it was not in him to act any differently when life had reached its sunset. He suffered with courage, with the grace of one who did not wish that those who loved him should grieve. The fight is over, and his suffering is over. Those who loved him do indeed grieve at his passing, and I here acknowledge the extent of the loss that I feel.

He was born in Nacogdoches, Tex., in 1898, attended public schools there, and

entered Rice Institute prior to the First World War. When the United States entered the conflict, he immediately joined the Army, and was commissioned as a very young second lieutenant. After the war, he returned to Rice where he obtained a bachelor's degree. He then was graduated from the University of Texas Law School in 1926. He came back to Nacogdoches and was elected to the combined offices of district and county attorney. He was reelected to a second term which he was unable to complete, since his abilities had won for him the post of assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas.

He served with distinction for 6 years in that office of public trust and responsibility, and then won election to Congress in 1936 to represent the Eighth Congressional District in Harris County, Houston, Tex. By the summer of 1938 he had obtained no less than 12 PWA projects and \$9 million worth of Federal flood control projects for his district. Throughout his congressional career he concerned himself mightily with Houston's problems of flood control, navigation, and waterways. Houston's ability to cope with the present huge shipping traffic that fills its ports is due in large measure to his magnificent efforts through the long years of his service in the House of Representatives.

Houston owes much else to him, such as the Veterans' Administration Hospital on Holcombe Boulevard, the city's freeways built in large part from Federal funds, the Houston ship channel, the Manned Space Craft Center, the Texas Medical Center, and many, many more constructive, progressive, and valuable projects.

He never forgot his constituents. He tried to read all of their letters to him, and to dictate answers on the same day their letters were received. He was proud of the extent of his information on the wishes, needs, and beliefs of those he represented in this House. He liked to tell the people in his district that he made up his mind about his vote on any bill by reading what they had written to him about it, by talking with as many of them as he could, and then deciding the correct and fair thing to do. He was one of the most conscientious men I have ever known.

On January 22, 1949, he was selected to be the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. His chairmanship during the many years since his appointment to that highly important post has been a monument to his scrupulous honesty, his dedication to detail, to progress, and to achievement, his knowledge of the legislative process, of the needs of the Federal Government, and of the ways and wishes of his colleagues whose judgment he always respected and whose friendship he deeply treasured.

I am too deeply moved by his passing to recount the details of his many achievements as a man and as a Member of the House of Representatives. Moreover, the record of accomplishment which he established here is known to

consideration the bill (H.R. 12752), to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rates reductions, and for other purposes.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, on January 13 of this year, I rose to speak against the reimposition of the "luxury taxes" on automobiles and telephone service that had been suggested by the President the evening before in his state of the Union message. I maintained then, and I continue to believe today, that automobiles and telephone service are necessities to most Americans and should not be taxed as luxuries. For this reason, I will vote to recommit the bill before us, with instructions to strike the provision delaying the excise tax reductions on autos and telephone service.

If the bill is not returned to committee, I will be compelled to vote for final passage for a very important reason: additional revenues are required to offset the rising costs of the war in Vietnam, or serious inflation will be stimulated.

Congress Backs President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, America is faced with critical decisions in 1966, especially in our war in Vietnam. I am proud to support our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in his efforts to win freedom for the people of South Vietnam and preserve the peace around the world. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely editorial, written by Rex Edmondson of the Jacksonville Journal, of Jacksonville, Fla., which applauds the President's stand. In this I certainly concur.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal,
Feb. 19, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S STAND

How much power should a President have in times of crisis?

That question seems to be the main point of contention in Congress right now as the Senate Vietnam debates go on.

Eighteen months ago, acting with the speed and unanimity of crisis, Congress voted President Johnson its endorsement of "all necessary measures" to bar aggression in South Vietnam.

Now those Congressmen are seeming to recant on their previous stand. They are contending that they will go over the President's head and to the people to gain support opposing the administration's stand.

Those Senators who cannot go along with the strong line against North Vietnam are listening politely to those testifying who do not agree and then apparently ignoring their advice.

Retired Diplomat George F. Kennan, an expert on communism and foreign affairs, summed up the feelings of a lot of us when he contended that although we probably

should not have been caught in the Vietnam struggle, we are in it and that it would be unthinkable to back out now.

It is Kennan's idea that we should avoid getting in deeper, that our best bet is to hold what we have and hope for some sort of outside intervention that will solve the problem.

Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee thanked Kennan for his views, but said plainly that Members of Congress are determined to project their own views.

This, as President Johnson agreed later (at least on the surface) is not only the right of Congress, but the duty as well.

Much of the dissention over President Johnson's order to resume the bombings in Vietnam stems over what some Senators claim was a mistaken idea of what they were endorsing in 1964. Some, among them Senator GAYLORD NELSON, a Democrat of Wisconsin, say that they voted for the resolution with the understanding that the American mission would remain one of supporting and advising South Vietnam, not of fighting the war.

That category is one all of us would have preferred, but we have been forced into a situation where fighting now is mandatory.

This fact should not be obscured, nor should the fact be underplayed that the President, under the Constitution, is still Commander in Chief and as such must make the decisions.

The notion of the Communists that we are a paper tiger cannot be blamed on anything but the wide breach of opinion that exists now within our Government on what should be done in Asia.

If anything is to be salvaged from the sacrifices already made and which will be made in Asia it will come only because this Nation pulled itself together in one common cause.

President Johnson should not be made the scapegoat for a situation which is unprecedented in our history and one in which nobody has any ready solution. He must only do what he thinks is right.

Congress should stand ready to support any President who moves firmly and honestly in that direction.

Guidance and the Political Apostolate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. DONALD J. IRWIN OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the National Catholic Guidance Conference Journal, Dr. John Norman, professor of history and government at Fairfield University in my district, has published an article entitled "Guidance and the Political Apostolate."

Dr. Norman discusses the role of the Catholic layman in politics but he also makes some extremely interesting observations about the responsibility of all citizens in a democracy.

In the belief that Dr. Norman's article will be of interest to my colleagues, I offer it for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

GUIDANCE AND THE POLITICAL APOSTOLATE

(By John Norman, professor of history and government, Fairfield University)

Pope Pius XII once declared that "While there is much talk about the maturity and

strength of the layman in the church, it is in public life that this must be practiced and proved. To act in this field is truly to act in the church." Yet insufficient attention is directed to what the layman can do to promote Christian principles in public life, for he must not only participate more actively in civic and political affairs, but he must do so under the conscious guidance of the ethical precepts of the church. If he cannot take part as a candidate, he can do so as a rational, informed, and unselfish voter. It is not too much to say that in a democracy, the voting booth is the secular equivalent of the confession booth. Both provide a private test of one's conscience.

In a democracy politics is almost always on the edge of ethics, and often overlaps it. Its very terminology is in large part ethical in connotation. Let us consider a few examples. "Politik" itself stems from a Greek word meaning citizen, and now signifies one who is wise or prudent. "Vote" originally meant to vow in Latin. "Suffrage" indicates a prayer of intercession or supplication as well as the right to vote. "Franchise" once meant freedom from some restriction or servitude. "Candidate" in old Rome was one who dressed in white (purity or sincerity) when offering himself as a suitable aspirant for office. "Office" now means, among other things, duty, place of trust, or religious service. "Republic" represents the common weal (commonwealth) or state. And Aristotle once defined the "state" as "an association of similar persons for the attainment of the best life possible."

THE ETHICAL IMPERATIVE

Today we are laymen with reference to clergymen, but not with reference to politicians, since in a democracy all citizens are in a real sense politicians. Grover Cleveland put it well when he said, "Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, exercises a public trust." The ancient Greeks were keenly concerned over the ethical imperative to participate in civic affairs. Indeed, they referred to laymen not involved in public matters as "idiots," as any good dictionary will show. The classic expression of this feeling is found in Thucydides, who quotes Pericles thus: "We alone regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy."

But American laymen have been too frequently unsound judges of policy in the absence of proper guidance from their priests. For one thing, clergymen have not been in the forefront of overdue reform movements in the United States. Moreover, in view of the large number of priests who have expressed sympathy or support for such demagogues as Father Coughlin and Senator McCarthy (not to mention Mussolini), laymen should resolve to become autonomous Catholics in politics, and not automatic ones. Where politics is concerned, ethics is too important a matter to leave solely to the clergy. Catholics need the guidance of informed laymen, who, in the words of Jerome G. Kerwin, "hear nothing of the application of the moral to public affairs from their pulpits."

However, in the matter of greater Catholic involvement in politics, matters are improving. Only a decade ago, Rev. John Tracy Ellis complained that, though Catholics had risen to prominence on the local level (not always to their credit), very few had attained high positions on a national level. Only a few years later, D. W. Brogan observed that the President and Attorney General were Catholic, as were the leaders of both Houses of Congress and nearly 20 Governors. This did not represent a Jesuit conspiracy, he added, but America's coming of age.

It was also the coming of age of the laymen, many of whom had apparently heeded

such exhortations that an upright Catholic was bound by a serious obligation to run for office only "when his election is certain, when he is able to avert grave evils from the community, when he can accept without grave inconvenience to himself, and when no other equally competent candidate is available."

This trend toward greater participation, if continued, will help expiate the wrong of days past when corrupt bosses were almost a synonym for Catholic politicians. For there was then a kind of Gresham's law of politics, that bad politicians tended to drive out good ones. This of course does not mean that laymen will be saintly. In fact, surveys have shown that Catholic-educated individuals behave no better—and no worse—than other members of the community. But then, if men were angels, no government would be needed, as James Madison once remarked.

OBLIGATION TO VOTE MORALLY

For those who do not run for office, the moral obligation to vote is obvious. But not so obvious is the obligation to vote morally. This does not imply that there should be a Catholic vote. It means simply the application of Christian principles to politics in accordance with one's individual conscience. We neither have nor need a Christian Democratic Party. The political lay apostolate may be effectively exercised within the American party system, which peaceably reconciles the divergent interests of a pluralistic society. In this sense, Catholicism and democracy are not mutually incompatible. Far from it. Alexis de Tocqueville wrote that in the United States the Catholic religion had been mistakenly considered the natural foe of democracy. "Among the various sects of Christianity," he said, "Catholicism seems to me, on the contrary, to be one of the most favorable to equality of condition among men."

Since Catholics have frequently advanced claims to moral superiority over other sects, it would be well to try to live up to these claims, even at the risk of straining human nature. Catholic laymen could set an example for others by endeavoring to vote as though the question on conflict of interest applied to a private citizen as well as to a public official. In other words, he should not vote for his own best interest if it conflicted with the general interest. This is seldom stressed in either Catholic or public schools, or in pulpits. It is scarcely understood. When it is considered at all, it is looked upon as idealistic or unrealistic, as if idealism were not in the long run the very essence of realism.

Yet there is nothing new about the idea, even though it has been swept under the political rug. John Stuart Mill asserted, "The voter is under an absolute moral obligation to consider the interest of the public, not his private advantage, and give his vote, to the best of his judgment, exactly as he would be bound to do if he were the sole voter, and the election depended upon him alone." In all candor, how many of us vote that way? Or how many of us have ever been taught to think that way?

Mill's sentiment found an echo in one of the best and least known speeches of a great Catholic, Al Smith, in his last address just before the 1928 presidential election, although he almost certainly never read Mill. Said he: " * * * It is the duty of every American citizen, man or woman, to vote according to the dictates of conscience, solely upon the basis of what he or she believes to be for the best interest of the country itself and not upon the basis of any passion or any prejudice. Any man or woman or any group casting a ballot for any other reason except the welfare of the country is doing what they possibly can to negative the whole theory of democratic government."

Things like this need to be discussed and acted upon among Catholics. One reason for

this is that only within recent years have Catholic colleges and universities acknowledged political science as a legitimate discipline. A noted Catholic political scientist, Jerome G. Kerwin of the University of Chicago, pulled no punches when he affirmed that "Even now there are Catholic schools where it is scarcely recognized, or where it forms some minor part of history, sociology, or economics. * * * If we have Catholics in the field of political science, they come largely from the secular schools." As part of the political apostolate, Catholic alumni could enhance the prestige of their alma maters by urging the completion of this unfinished business of modern Catholic education. They had better realize that most of the advances in the social sciences have developed through the efforts of non-Catholics.

ETERNAL DRUDGERY

Apart from running or voting, political participation may entail the bother of helping out with speeches, releases, meetings, doorbell ringing, fund raising, telephone calls, stuffing envelopes, taking care of party headquarters and other grubby details. The price of liberty, therefore, is not so much eternal vigilance as it is eternal drudgery, a thought otherwise expressed in the trite but true maxim that either you run the government or the government will run you. And party politics does help run the government.

There is always the fear that one may somehow become morally contaminated by going into politics. The risk is not much greater than in any other field. If power corrupts in politics, it also does so in business—or in the priesthood itself, for that manner. It has been said that politics is the art of the possible, so that only compromise and consensus can be expected instead of perfect solutions. In a democracy it often takes deals to approach ideals. The better the laymen who enter politics, the better the results. Einstein once testified to the fact that more was accomplished in science than in political science because the latter was a much more difficult field to master.

Thus the political apostolate is far from easy. It will involve the layman in controversy, misunderstanding, and sacrifice. He must be as tough of hide as he is tender of conscience. American politics is no game for those who are only Sunday Catholics.

West Virginia's Statues in the U.S. Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Harry W. Ernst has written for the Charleston Gazette an excellent article on the two West Virginians whose statues are in the U.S. Capitol. Under unanimous consent, I include this article on the history and significance of the statues of Francis H. Pierpont and Senator John E. Kenna:

WASHINGTON'S MOUNTAINEERS IN MARBLE

(NOTE.—Each State allowed statues of two sons in the U.S. Capitol. Here are the choices of West Virginians.)

(By Harry W. Ernst)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One championed the Union and helped create the State of West Virginia. A Methodist and Republican, he was too uncompromising to be a successful politician. He was descended from an early American family.

The other, son of an Irish immigrant, helped carve out of the Missouri wilderness a farm when he was a boy. When he was only 16, he was wounded fighting for the Confederacy. His congeniality made him a successful politician. A Roman Catholic and Democrat, he was the youngest Member when he served in the House (29) and U.S. Senate (35).

They were Francis Harrison Pierpont, "the father of West Virginia" who was Governor of the restored (loyal to the Union) State of Virginia from 1861 through 1868, and John Edward Kenna of Charleston, who served in the House and Senate from 1877 until his death in 1893.

West Virginia has honored both men by placing marble statues of them in the U.S. Capitol where each State is permitted to remember two of its prominent citizens in statuary.

Selection of two men of such contrasting background and achievement perhaps reveals a facet of West Virginia's character that isn't fully appreciated.

Although a rural, somewhat provincial State, West Virginia generally practices what its State motto preaches—"Mountaineers are always free." Without self-conscious ideology, West Virginians for the most part believe in equal rights and the right to dissent. They don't preach about such fundamentals of democracy, but simply live comfortably with them.

None of the other 17 border and Southern States has made as much progress as West Virginia in moving to end the barbaric humiliation of the Negro. And McCarthyism, which equates dissent with treason, never flourished in the State where a small number of right- and leftwingers have little difficulty being heard.

The reason may be that West Virginians are basically uninterested in ideology—whether it enslaves men because of their race or because of their politics. Their fellow citizens can seek truth by handling snakes or protesting against the war in Vietnam as long as they respect the rights of others to disagree or to be left alone.

In his novel, "Absalom, Absalom," William Faulkner discusses the cultural shock to a man who migrated from the West Virginia mountains to Mississippi in the early 19th century. In West Virginia, "the land belonged to anybody and everybody": in Mississippi the land and the people were neatly divided and "a certain few men * * * had the power of life and death and barter and sale over others."

The selection of Pierpont and Kenna to represent West Virginia in Capitol statuary indicates the State's passion for diversity and tolerance. How could a State honor both a lover of the Union and a fighter for the Confederacy during the same period?

Perhaps the answer lies in the character of the two men, who their fellow citizens obviously respected although they may have hotly disagreed with them on some issues.

The statue of Pierpont is really a monument to the State he helped establish during the Civil War, as Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa, a West Virginia native, pointed out when it was unveiled at the Capitol in 1910.

"It is a monument to times that we hardly yet understand," Senator Dolliver observed. "It is a sort of a memorial of our heroic age."

With his reputation as the father of West Virginia, Pierpont could hardly be ignored by his fellow citizens. Shortly after his death in 1899, the State society of the Grand Army of the Republic persuaded the legislature to place his statue in Statuary Hall.

Franklin Simmons, an American sculptor living in Rome, completed it in 1904. But it wasn't formally unveiled until 6 years later because of the maneuvering of several State politicians who disliked Pierpont and because of the illness of his only grandchild,

Mrs. Frances Pierpont Siviter, who unveiled it.

Pierpont's life and character are well known to students of West Virginia history. Prof. Charles H. Ambler of West Virginia University wrote a biography of Pierpont that was published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1937.

But few West Virginians probably know who their second marble representative in the Capitol was.

Born in Valcoulon, Kanawha County, on April 10, 1848, Kenna was 8 years old when his father died and left his family practically penniless.

His mother, a great-granddaughter of frontier fighter Gen. Andrew Lewis, took Kenna and his two sisters to live with her brother on a Missouri farm.

After the Civil War, Kenna joined his family who had returned to Kanawha County. He studied at St. Vincent's Academy in Wheeling for two and a half years and then entered the law office of Miller & Quarrier in Charleston.

Kenna had to wait 6 months before he could be admitted to the bar until the lawyers' test oath, which forbade Confederate sympathizers to practice law, was repealed. In 1872 when he was 24, he was elected prosecuting attorney of Kanawha County and became a circuit court judge 3 years later.

His campaign style was strikingly similar to that of John F. Kennedy. Kenna was tall, handsome, and glamorous because of his war record. He was also a powerful speaker who shunned vituperative attacks on his opponents.

Like Kennedy, he appealed to younger members of his party. And Kenna tried new ways of stirring up voters. In 1877, he campaigned with a circus to help persuade West Virginians that they should make Charleston the permanent location of their capital.

Instead of a game of touch football, however, Kenna and his youthful lieutenants celebrated his election as prosecuting attorney by playing marbles in the backyard of a friend's house.

Kenna was defeated in his first try for the House of Representatives in 1874. But 2 years later he overcame the opposition of influential Democrats and upset the incumbent, Representative Frank Hereford, of Union, Monroe County, who was chairman of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

He served three terms in the House and was chosen in 1883 to succeed Henry G. Davis, who declined to seek reelection, in the U.S. Senate.

Kenna's popularity in southern West Virginia partly resulted from his successful efforts in obtaining Federal aid for a slack-water system that made the Kanawha River navigable, which helped open the region's natural resources for development.

A personal friend of President Grover Cleveland and one of the strongest defenders of his administration, Kenna was considered a liberal Democrat who championed Federal regulation of the railroads—the dominant economic power of his era.

During Kenna's second term in the House, the West Virginia Legislature instructed the State's Congressmen to support the Texas Pacific Railroad bill. But Kenna declined, explaining:

"I have not denounced subsidies to come here and support them. I have not raised my voice in opposition to class legislation against the interests and rights of the masses to come here and lend my voice to the consummation of that very work.

"I have not joined in the indignation of my people at the stupendous power and corruption of the American lobby to come here and surrender myself helplessly into its hands."

A fellow Congressman described Kenna's position as "a bold stand for a young man

*** to take against the unanimous action of the legislature of his own State." But Kenna was persuasive. The West Virginia Legislature reversed its action.

Kenna also was ahead of his times in advocating a stronger Presidency more independent of Congress. He emerged as a leader of the Democratic minority in the Senate when he argued for 3 hours and 20 minutes that President Cleveland was right in refusing to detail his reasons for dismissing certain officials who had been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose Republican majority was attacking Cleveland for his action.

At 45, Kenna died from heart disease at his home in Washington near the Capitol on January 11, 1893. A service was held in the Senate Chamber and another one at Charleston in the small Catholic church that Kenna had designed when he was 25.

In a memorial address, a New York congressman described Kenna as believing "in the fullest possible freedom of thought and action *** he was a bigot only in his hatred of bigotry."

"Most men live too long," observed Senator Blackburn of Kentucky. "This man died too soon." There was general agreement that Kenna's death cut short a promising career.

Less than a month after his death, the West Virginia Legislature authorized a statue of Kenna to be placed in the U.S. Capitol—the first West Virginian to be so honored, which indicated his unusual popularity in a State known for rough treatment of its politicians.

Kenna's statue, which was sculptured by Alexander Doyle, now stands in the Capitol's Hall of Columns under the House Chamber. On the floor above is Pierpont's statue in Statuary Hall where the House of Representatives originally met.

The 1864 act, which authorized the Capitol to also serve as a museum dedicated to the Nation's history, permitted each State to donate two statues that are Federal property and can't be removed from the building without the permission of Congress.

By 1932, the weight of the statues had become too much for the floor of the old hall. One from each State was left in the hall and the other's were dispersed throughout the Capitol, perhaps indicating that the weight of history is even too much for buildings to bear.

Some of history's strains, however, were lifted last month when a ceremony in Statuary Hall offered hope that the Civil War has finally ended. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, in remembering Robert E. Lee's birthday, also laid a single red rose at the base of statues of both Confederate and Union heroes including Pierpont of West Virginia.

DESCENDANTS OF JOHN E. KENNA

Although all of Senator John Edward Kenna's children now are deceased, several of his grandchildren still make their homes in West Virginia.

Senator Kenna's first wife died. Their only child was a daughter, who became a Catholic nun and died in a New York convent many years ago. He had four sons and a daughter by his second wife.

One son, the late Jo N. Kenna, was judge of the State supreme court. Judge Kenna was the father of Lee M. Kenna, a Charleston attorney; and Nancy Kenna Ivison, who now lives in Connecticut.

Another son, the late Edward B. Kenna, who died at the age of 32, was listed as editor of the Gazette in R. L. Polk & Co.'s "Charleston Directory" of 1911. Edward's only child is Capt. William E. Kenna, U.S. Navy retired, who now lives in Connecticut, also.

The third son, the late Arthur Kenna, was a Charleston photographer, who had five children. They are Mrs. Gertrude Kenna

Thomas of Pittsburgh; Mrs. Louis K. Henderson of St. Albans; Mrs. Ann Kenna Moore of Vienna, Wood County; Alexander P. Kenna of St. Albans; and John E. Kenna, III, of Charleston.

The fourth son of Senator Kenna was the late John E. (Jack) Kenna, II, who was a salesman and pitched semipro baseball for the old Charleston Senators. He never married.

Senator Kenna's only daughter by his second wife was the late Mary Kenna Elkins, who married Blaine, one of the sons of the late Stephen Benton Elkins. Their only child is Stephen Blaine Elkins, a Washington real estate developer.

West Virginia still is honoring the name of Senator John Edward Kenna. Kenna, Jackson County, is named after him, as is Kenna homes in South Charleston. And, one of the new elementary schools that will be built in Kanawha County under the most recent bond issue, will be the John Edward Kenna School in North Charleston.

Honolulu Declaration Rises Above Militarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, typical of many editorials I have read is one in the Sacramento Bee which found the Honolulu declaration "heartening" in its avowal:

The war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic—

The paper quotes the declaration—

It is a moral principle. For this we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution.

The paper believes:

If the new domestic improvement and stability offensive of the Honolulu declaration is translated into reality the South Vietnamese people will obtain the greatest possible stake in resisting communism and defending freedom.

The newspaper adds that—

It is most welcome that President Johnson has determined to export a measure of the Great Society to this and other southeast Asian nations. This export may well equal 100,000 more American troops.

Because of the significance of the Honolulu declaration, I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Feb. 11, 1966]

HONOLULU DECLARATION RISES ABOVE MILITARISM

The Honolulu Declaration issued in the form of an agreement between the United States and South Vietnam as a result of President Lyndon B. Johnson's visit to Hawaii contains one very welcome new emphasis.

While L.B.J. and South Vietnamese heads of state declared their determination to persevere in military resistance to the Vietcong, there was nothing said about expanding the war. Instead there was a pledge to expand social, economic, and political reforms.

Said the declaration:

"The war for the hearts of the people is more than a military tactic. It is a moral principle. For this we shall strive as we fight to bring about a true social revolution."

How heartening it is to witness America remembering its revolutionary origin and pledging to use this heritage as a weapon in the Vietnam conflict. The signatories of the Hawaiian declaration promised that both nations would undertake to give "full support" to political and social reforms and "special support" in helping to stabilize the economy and increase the food supply for the people of South Vietnam.

Real substance has been given to these pledges by the swift dispatch of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman along with Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman to South Vietnam as well as to other Asian nations.

One of the most critical problems which has dogged the defenders of South Vietnamese independence has been the unrest of the people. Millions of South Vietnamese have maintained an attitude of neutrality toward the war. This fact has made it possible for the aggressors to find refuge and sustenance among the people and often to conceal their identity. Some of this neutrality has arisen because the people have been caught in a squeeze between the warring forces.

In some measure, however, the Vietnamese people have remained unalined because their standard of living has been so low many of them are not certain their lot would be any worse under the Communists. Ten different governments in 10 years have caused political instability and confusion which aids the aggressors.

If the new domestic improvement and stability offensive of the Honolulu Declaration is translated into reality the South Vietnamese people will obtain the greatest possible stake in resisting communism and defending freedom. It is most welcome that L.B.J. has determined to export a measure of the Great Society to this and other southeast Asian nations. This export may well equal 100,000 more American troops.

Estonian People Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, each year on the appropriate days, Members of this Chamber join their fellow Americans throughout the world in remembering that millions of persons in countries behind the Iron Curtain live their daily lives subjected to Soviet imperialism. It is well that we vocally remember, thereby keeping alive even a faint hope that someday the captive nations of Europe may join the international community as free and independent members of the family of nations.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the greatness of the Estonian people, and to recall that 43 years ago these proud people declared themselves independent. They then reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion to the west. But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Commu-

nists—with their Red army—overran and occupied the country during World War II. That these traditionally free people are not free today is one of the great tragedies of our times.

Since World War II began, approximately 55 former colonies representing about 1.5 billion people have gained their independence, these peoples constituting about one-third of those living today, are free. In many more cases, western colonial powers helped and nurtured their colonies toward responsible independence. What we in the West and most of the newly independent countries fail to realize is that during this same period of time, not a single colony of the Soviet Union has become an independent state. In fact, the Soviets have expanded their empire where they have been able, and have brutally repressed those under their yoke who have sought to attain their freedom.

Yet it is the Soviets, employing the Marxist dialectic, who have branded the Western nations as the colonial powers, when in fact, Mr. Speaker, behind the Iron Curtain lies the largest colonial empire the world has ever seen and suffered with. We ought to recognize the spurious Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for exactly what it is: a colonial empire which makes a mockery of sovereignty, freedom, human justice, and social conditions.

We shall not let ourselves be fooled by the Russian propaganda agencies. Life in this "worker's paradise" is difficult, as the Estonians watch their where-withal being shipped out of their country; as they watch their women and children being forced to work hard and long hours and days for no apparent increase in the nation's standard of living; as they crave the amenities of life, especially clothing, only to be told, "perhaps next year"; as the majority of Estonians outside the major cities live in substandard housing, many of these units having only outside plumbing; as wages rarely rise, and almost never faster than the cost of living. It is a sorry life, but it should not surprise us to see this. The millions of people in the captive nations learned a long time ago that the true nature of Russian socialism is somewhat less than colonial poverty.

We are not deceived. We shall not forget. The Estonian people have our faith, our trust, and the everlasting hope for a brighter tomorrow.

Tribute to the Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, while we have read a great deal recently about the contributions being made by members of our armed services, the work of the Air National Guard has not received the attention it deserves. The part-time military men who compose the

Guard have been providing full-time assistance to the Military Airlift Command and assuming an increasing share of responsibility for our total military airlift program.

Last year the "weekend warriors" of the Air National Guard played an unprecedented role both in hauling tonnage to Europe and in helping to speed the movement of men and materiel to southeast Asia. In 1965 the 26 Air National Guard heavy transport squadrons carried approximately 25 percent of the total cargo tonnage delivered to Europe by the Military Airlift Command. In recent months, Guard aircraft have provided a significant additional capability to enable the Military Airlift Command to reduce the backlog of military cargo in stateside terminals.

So that the splendid service of these civilian airmen may be more widely recognized, I include in the RECORD the following article from the January issue of the National Guardsman magazine:

THE AIR GUARD'S AIRLIFT—ANYWHERE, ANYTIME

(By Maj. Corb Sarchet)

(NOTE.—Air Guard transports serve the Nation three ways: flying cargo hauls, troop airlift, and aeromedical evacuation flights. While in a training status, its fleet of 212 ocean-spanning aircraft has flown more than 27,500 tons of cargo overseas for the Military Aircraft Command, demonstrating its "ready now" status. Its 1,122 experienced pilots are a significant asset for a pilot-short Air Force, its planes one-third of the MAC fleet.)

In nearly 5 years since its beginning, it has flown more than 34 million miles, carried 260,000 passengers, and hauled nearly 52,000 tons of cargo for the National Guard and MAC combined, and with a safety rate better than that of MAC. Its planes could move the men of one infantry division in one "lift". The Air Guard MAC fleet is truly a "go anywhere, any time" force in being that provides the Air Force that added "go power" when the going gets rough.)

Now 5 years old, the Air National Guard's heavy transport force plays a significant role in the Nation's airlift picture.

As part of "training" activities, Air Guard transports carry thousands of tons of vital military cargo to points all over the World—tonnage which otherwise would have to be borne by the already heavily-committed craft of the Military Airlift Command (ex-Military Air Transport Service) or farmed out to commercial carriers.

Air Guard transport crews also voluntarily have flown hundreds of "special" missions above their normal training requirements whenever MAC has become hard pressed, and cargo and passengers stack up at MAC's terminals.

Air Guard transports also answer the call when special airlift projects arise for which MAC's Regulars can't be spared from their primary tasks. Such a case is the just-concluded "Christmas Star" in which 76 Air Guard transport crews took time off from their civilian jobs and families to fly 406 tons of Christmas packages, gifts, and mail from an appreciative Nation to its fighting men in Vietnam.

MAC couldn't handle the cargo—it was stretched tight already, supporting the southeast Asia effort. In fact, it used the opportunity to ship 139 tons of military cargo to Vietnam aboard the Air Guard transports along with the Christmas gifts.

Ironically, it was at this very time of the greatest need for airlift, and amidst greatly increased use by MAC of the Air Guard capability to help carry the growing cargo requirements, that announcement was made

February 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A967

he meets and, like his immediate predecessor, Sanford Bomstein, now serving as chairman of the board of directors of RBA, has developed a vast circle of staunch friends in every walk of life. In view of RBA's present leadership, one would not have to go very far out on the limb to predict a year of unprecedented success and accomplishment for the association in 1966.

Hoffa Reaches for Still More PowerEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. JAMES C. CORMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has accurately pointed out that "with friends like Jimmy Hoffa, the American labor movement does not need any enemies."

Mr. Hoffa's proposal leading to the threat of general strikes is not in the best interests of the public or the American workingman. The Hoffa scheme can only lead to the imposition of restrictive laws upon organized labor and a stifling of the great contributions which the unions have made to strengthening our economy and bringing a measure of equality and justice to the collective bargaining table.

The Times editorial of February 8 follows:

HOFFA REACHES FOR STILL MORE POWER

With friends like Jimmy Hoffa, the American labor movement doesn't need any enemies.

The president of the Teamsters Union, who has managed thus far to stay a step ahead of Federal efforts to clap him in jail, delivered himself of some rather fantastic proposals over the weekend.

First, Hoffa announced a campaign to enroll professional athletes from baseball, football, and other sports in a giant union under the Teamsters' wing.

Nothing could undermine public confidence in the cleanliness of sports faster than allowing a man with Hoffa's record of unsavory connections to gain a position of influence.

Fortunately, both team owners and players appear cool to the Teamster plans.

One day after inviting himself into professional sports, Hoffa made an even more extraordinary proposal.

In a Detroit address, he suggested that unions should join in fixing a common expiration date for all labor contracts in each city, and for unions in allied industries across the Nation.

There is nothing unusual about union contracts within a given industry having a common expiration date. This is the pattern where industrywide bargaining exists.

But Hoffa's proposal goes much further, since it is aimed at giving organized labor the power to stage massive walkouts, cutting across union and industry lines.

The Teamster boss says he wants to follow the example of foreign countries "where you find whole cities shut down" by general strikes.

There is no reason to believe that responsible union leaders will rise to the Hoffa bait. In fact, they are probably considerably embarrassed by it, since it comes on the eve of a key Senate vote on labor-backed efforts to outlaw State right-to-work statutes.

The outcry resulting from the transit strike which paralyzed New York is evidence enough that the American people would not tolerate the kind of massive union power envisioned by Hoffa.

Any serious move in that direction almost certainly would result in restrictive legislation or application to unions of the anti-trust laws.

Vietnam Clarification VNEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Long Island Press of February 23, 1966, entitled "Vietnam Clarification."

I wholeheartedly agree with the point taken in the editorial, on the need for clarification, and commend the article to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

Vietnam Clarification

There is a great hue and cry over how to achieve our aims in Vietnam. Some say we've had enough debate and let's get on with the job. But should we stop the debate when we still don't know what the "job" is really all about? Hardly.

It is in this area that Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is doing the Nation a service. His controversial statement about a coalition in Vietnam with the Vietcong is forcing some hard, cold looks at where we're going and how we will get there in Vietnam.

Only debate can bring some measure of clarity into these cloudy issues. On Saturday, for instance, Senator KENNEDY did not specify free elections as a precondition for including Communists in any postwar government in Saigon. Yesterday, he made it clear he meant that this precondition must be met.

Over the weekend Vice President HUMPHREY, Under Secretary of State George Ball, and Presidential Assistant McGeorge Bundy blasted Senator KENNEDY. But yesterday, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, another of the President's top advisers, took a position close to the Senator's.

If Senator KENNEDY means representation for the Communists through free elections, General Taylor said, "I'd have no trouble with it * * *. If he means negotiating them into a coalition government, I'd not be for it."

What the Senator is now saying makes more sense than his original statement. He is now calling for clarification of this serious confusion in the administration's policy.

He pointed out a glaring contradiction. On one hand, the United States claims it will talk with Vietcong and Hanoi without any preconditions whatsoever. On the other, there are indications that these are preconditions, including the one that none of the dissident elements "which undoubtedly will include the Communists will be represented in the government."

"You can't have it both ways," he said, "and in my judgment this is important for us to be clarified."

Regardless of how one might feel about Senator KENNEDY's views, he has served the purpose of forcing discussion. What he is saying, in essence, is that if we are fighting a limited war, we must expect a limited

peace and must begin to think, therefore, in terms of those limitations. If not, if we are to fight a total war aiming for unconditional surrender, then we must face up to all its bloody consequences.

Youth Concert Thrilling EventEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the performance of the orchestra from the Interlochen Arts Academy, Monday evening in the State Department Auditorium, here in our Nation's Capital, made me proud to be from the State of Michigan and to be a member of the Michigan congressional delegation which sponsored the concert.

As a measure of the effect on the audience, a former member of a famous string quartet with the London Symphony Orchestra was exuberantly collecting autographs.

Mr. Speaker, the United States could do no better than to have this group of talented, disciplined, delightful young people tour the countries of the world with their outstanding gift of music.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, who taught music for 20 years at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor—which is in my district—and who is professor emeritus from that great institution of learning, is to be congratulated for holding onto his long-time dream of a great arts academy until it became a reality. Thor Johnson, who coaxed, bewitched, or developed a group of high school music students into a single instrument of surpassing beauty, is to be applauded. My deep appreciation also goes to each member of the orchestra behind whose performance were many hours of concentrated practice and single-minded devotion to the mastery of an art that speaks in a universal language to peoples of every land.

I take special pleasure in the fact that the following members of the orchestra are from the Second Congressional District of Michigan: Roberta VanMeter, Plymouth—violin; Norman Fischer, Plymouth—violin; Michael Ferguson, Ypsilanti—bassoon and contra-bassoon; Gary Breeding, Milan—french horn; Edward Kalousdian, Ann Arbor—tuba; Peter Bonisteel, Ann Arbor—percussion.

In the Washington newspapers which covered the concert, the string section was referred to as a disciplined, many-splendored thing, and the programing was considered to be "comparable to that of any symphony orchestra in the world."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD the reviews of the Interlochen Orchestra's concert written by Cecilia H. Porter for the Washington Post and Wendell Margrave for the Evening Star, both published on February 22:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1966]

YOUTH CONCERT THRILLING EVENT
(By Wendell Margrave)

Those fortunate enough to attend the concert last night at the Department of State Auditorium of the Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra had the inspiring experience of hearing a fine orchestra concert, comparable in programming to that of any symphony orchestra in the world, played by 102 young people of high school age.

The school they represent, an outgrowth of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, is a college preparatory school for students gifted in the arts. The orchestra rehearses 2 hours a day, 6 days a week for a 32-week season and is at present on a tour which takes them today to the University of Maryland, tomorrow to Carnegie Hall, then to three performances in Canada.

The orchestra members are mostly from the Middle West, but all sections of the country are represented, and there are members from Taiwan, Finland, and Japan. Three are from the Washington area; violinist, Nancy Cole from Silver Spring, clarinetist, Jonathan Lautman from Takoma Park, and Eugene Sittenfeld, percussionist, from Bethesda.

It was a thrilling performance. It is a student orchestra, to be sure, with not quite the routine confidence and mature sound of a professional group, but wonderfully competent, wonderfully accurate, wonderfully unified. The Kodaly Concerto for Orchestra and the Shostakovich First Symphony gave opportunity for much excellent solo work by individuals, notably Violinist Victoria Matosich, Cellist Jane Schroeder, a remarkable young bass player named David Currie, Miriam Jakes, a blonde oboist with the embouchure a bit to the right but with a sweet sound and a musician's way of phrasing, and the spectacular and dedicated tympanist, Tsutomu Yamashita from Kyoto.

The best single section in the orchestra is the brasses, for they have the incisive attack and golden tone that is America's own peculiar contribution to brass playing. This rests as much on the example of the great jazz players as it does on the symphony tradition; and it gives a particularly vital thrust to the sound of the orchestra. The conducting was in the experiencing hands of Thor Johnson, who for years conducted the Cincinnati Orchestra. Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, founder of the music camp and of the academy, who is everywhere a symbol of this kind of enterprise, conducted the "Roman Carnival." At the close of the program, the concert-master led the orchestra in the excerpt from Hanson's "Romantic Symphony" that is the Interlochen theme.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 22, 1966]

INTERLOCHEN STUDENTS PERFORM LIKE ADULTS
(By Cecelia H. Porter)

Nearly 90 red-coated teenagers massed on the stage of the State Department's West Auditorium last night to present an adult evening of music.

The players form the permanent orchestra of the Interlochen Arts Academy, a recent prep school expansion of the famed summertime National Music Camp in northern Michigan.

For this first appearance on a seven-concert tour of the east coast and Ontario, Thor Johnson, the director of the school, conducted three-fourths of the program. The founder of the summer camp, Joseph Maddy, took the baton for Berlioz' Roman Carnival Overture.

The program, which also included Mozart's "Linz" Symphony, Kodaly's infrequently heard Concerto for Orchestra, and Shostakovich's First Symphony, showed a wise se-

lection calculated to challenge all the players with at least one major responsibility for the 2 hours.

It is practically a norm for the conservatory orchestra to fall short in one or more sections. With high school groups, you note the enthusiasm, then quickly assemble the "but's" and "however's."

Yet few excuses are necessary for this orchestra, in which even the string section is a disciplined, many-splendored thing.

The five continuous movements of the Kodaly concerto, composed in the midst of World War II, proved to be the apex of the concert. The solo violas and cellos, responding smoothly to an equally eloquent wind assembly, transformed the largo into a sumptuous, impassioned affair intensified with unbelievable nobility in the later tutti reaffirmation in Bachian motivic work.

The command shown in this movement, as in the first with its incisive brass punctuations, and in the two allegros, stunningly managed even in improvisational solos, could hardly be matched by good adult performers.

The certainty evident through all levels of the string section most obviously characterized the reading of the "Linz." The reading of the adagio indicated an unusual maturity in maintaining a slow tempo without sacrificing the metrical pulse.

The musicians languished tastefully over the protracted dissonances and solo episodes. Yet they never sank into that ominous quicksand of increasingly sluggish paces that drags performers into the mire of a new "Farewell Symphony."

There was a wonderful pliancy in exchanges between sections and individuals in the Berlioz. Maddy drew forth a controlled rather than a weeping sentimental cantilena.

Coming from the pen of a 19-year-old, the Shostakovich symphony impressed its Russian hearers immediately and impressed the audience last night. All the elements—skilled pizzicato, light wind tonguing, luxuriant tutti mixtures—were there for a total suavity and grace that were outstanding.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, and the leadership of the House of Representatives in the comments and remarks that have been made here on this sad occasion.

All of us are deeply grieved by the loss sustained through the passing of this good servant of the Lord.

In Dr. Braskamp I found, as a native Iowan and a fellow Presbyterian, a welcome handclasp and a friendship that was stimulating.

During the 14 months I knew him I came to look forward to his incisive choices of Scripture that prefaced the opening prayer each day. Dr. Braskamp distinguished himself as a churchman in this area long before he came to serve as Chaplain of the House of Representatives. I am certain that his 16 years of service to this body will stand as an eloquent monument to a gifted and dedicated spirit.

More Flags for Vietnam: Nations Supporting the U.S. Effort in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the only country assisting South Vietnam in its struggle against conquest by its northern neighbor. Although we wish more substantial assistance were being provided by more nations, we should not overlook the valuable military, economic, or sometimes political and moral support which has been rendered by other nations. We should not forget which nations are willing to stand up and be counted on our side.

Three nations have made the supreme commitment of sending troops, and risking the lives of their sons for the cause of freedom just as the United States and the Republic of Vietnam must do. These nations are Australia, which has sent one reinforced battalion of 1,500 men; New Zealand, which has sent one artillery battery of 300 men; and the Republic of Korea, which has sent a reinforced division of 17,000 men and supporting forces totaling 3,750 men. Other military assistance has been provided by Malaysia, which has supplied training to Vietnamese for counterinsurgency operations and some armored vehicles; the Philippines and Nationalist China, which have sent psychological warfare as well as medical personnel; and Thailand, which has military air detachments in Vietnam and supplies training for South Vietnamese Air Force personnel.

In addition to these countries which are sending military assistance, more than 30 nations are supplying or have agreed to supply some sort of nonmilitary assistance. In most cases this support signifies an affirmation of their support for the struggle against aggression. Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Laos, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Spain, Turkey, and Uruguay have sent medicines and flood-relief aid. Canada has provided educational assistance, medicines, flour, and aluminum warehouses. Western Germany has provided assistance for agricultural development, physicians, technicians, and ambulances. Iran has sent petroleum products and Ireland has provided financial support. Japan has sent economic assistance, technicians, medical supplies, radios, and ambulances, although it holds the Japanese Constitution prohibits sending troops. Laos has provided refugee relief. The United Kingdom has provided financial assistance, and Venezuela is sending rice. Even traditionally neutral Switzerland has provided 30 microscopes.

In total, 31 nations have supplied some sort of tangible assistance. Eight more have agreed to provide assistance of some kind.

There is another kind of support which has been provided which I would like to mention, and that is political and moral

support. For many years the United Kingdom, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference of 1954, has supported the basic policies of the United States when the other cochairman, the Soviet Union, sought to issue messages condemning United States or South Vietnamese policy. Similarly Canada, as a member of the International Control Commission, has repeatedly helped protect the free world interests against unfair charges by the Communist side. Other nations have voiced support in important resolutions in international or regional organizations such as the United Nations or SEATO.

All of these contributions have been welcome and appreciated. Nevertheless, in view of the magnitude and importance of the task in South Vietnam, we have every right to ask for more.

Over 1,300 Southeastern Louisiana College Students at Hammond, La., Support President Johnson's Vietnam Policy

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a resolution signed by over 1,300 students at Southeastern Louisiana College in my hometown of Hammond, La., supporting this country's policy in Vietnam. I have forwarded this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson to show the President and the entire country how these many young people are patriotically supporting the United States in its struggle in South Vietnam.

The students at Southeastern strongly support their President's policy. In addition to this resolution they sent a similar resolution with a large number of signatures to our troops in Vietnam before Christmas. I feel that these young people represent the finest tradition of our American heritage. I am sure that the sentiments expressed in the resolution represent the views of an overwhelming majority of our citizens throughout the country.

The following is the resolution sponsored by the Southeastern Louisiana College student government and signed by the hundreds of students at that institution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States of America is involved in a military conflict in Vietnam; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson is Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; and

Whereas the American foreign policy is being applied to its best effect in Vietnam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the student government of Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, La., representing the entire student body,

go on record as being in full support of our Federal Government's policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, That this body honor the men in Vietnam by rising for a moment in silent prayer; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be recorded in the official minutes of the student government senate and that a copy be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The following is a letter which I received from James J. Brady, president of the student government at Southeastern:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: On behalf of the student body of Southeastern Louisiana College, I am forwarding to you a copy of the resolution supporting our President's and Government's position in Vietnam.

As you can see this resolution is accompanied by a list of over 1,300 names of students on our campus who support this position. These names were collected by various members of the student body at different places on the campus.

This petition is not the neatest nor the most attractive that might be composed, but the sincerity of the students whose names appear on this roll reflect the true greatness of our republic.

I, therefore, ask that you make known our position concerning Vietnam to the President and to the other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. BRADY,
President, Student Government.

And finally I include the letter which I sent to the President along with the resolution:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with great pride that I forward to you a petition signed by 1,300 students of Southeastern Louisiana College, located in my hometown of Hammond, La., expressing the support of these young people for our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

The letter transmitting this petition, from Student Government President James J. Brady, reflects the hope of our country through the courageous attitude of this student body.

I am very pleased and happy to submit this petition to you.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened with the passing of our beloved Chaplain. His voice is now silenced but he is still to be heard. He is saying to us now what he has many times said in his counsel to us, individually and collectively. Whatever the loss, whatever the problem, however dark and formidable things may appear, whatever our grief and whatever our hardship: "Be of good cheer."

In our grief of losing Dr. Braskamp we need but remind ourselves of his sustaining words of encouragement: "be of good cheer." "God's will be done."

The words he lived by come from Joshua:

Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

In his prayers, as he opened each session for 16 years, he would inspire us and encourage us in the tasks before us. In more ways than we will ever know he gave us courage and renewed our strength.

To his bereaved family I offer my sincerest sympathy.

More Have Died on U.S. Highways Than in All the Nation's Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the carnage which occurs daily on our roads and highways becomes increasingly serious with the passage of time. Fortunately, a greater degree of attention is being paid to the problem than has been paid in the past. A number of bills on the subject have been introduced, including my bill, H.R. 12549, to create a National Traffic Safety Agency to lead in accident loss prevention through research and application of its findings.

Because of its relevance, I would like to include in the Record an editorial from the Sacramento Bee, Sunday, February 13, 1966, entitled "More Have Died on U.S. Highways Than in All the Nation's Wars," which I think points out the magnitude of the problem quite graphically and indicates how much more substantial the difficulty will become unless action is taken on a number of fronts to alleviate and solve it.

The editorial follows:

MORE HAVE DIED ON U.S. HIGHWAYS THAN IN ALL THE NATION'S WARS

In the Revolutionary War, 4,435 Americans died in battle. In the War of 1812, another 2,260 were killed. In the Mexican War, 1,733 lost their lives. The Civil War claimed 141,414 Union soldiers dead in battle and 74,545 Confederate dead. Another 385 were killed in the Spanish-American war. World War I claimed 53,513 Americans killed in action, World War II 292,131, and the Korean war, 33,629. As of early this month, 1,035 had died in Vietnam. This totals 605,080 in American battle dead.

An appalling sacrifice, but to a cause: Freedom.

Last year, 49,000 Americans lost their lives on American highways and this says nothing of the 3.5 million maimed and injured and the billions lost in property damage.

Over the last quarter of a century, dating only to 1941, a total of 1.5 million have died on the highways, more than twice as many as have been killed in all of the Nation's wars dating back 190 years.

Yet murder-by-motor continues. This year, traffic statisticians expect more than 50,000 will die, and again this says nothing of the injured. Despite improvement in road

engineering, deaths the next 10 years will go up, year by year. Indeed, it may be as President Lyndon B. Johnson said in an address before the American Trial Lawyers Association in New York City: "It is a fact that if we continue on our present suicidal rate, half of all Americans will 1 day suffer death or serious injury on our highways."

The causes?

They are several.

The first, and perhaps the predominant factor, is the human factor.

The traveling public has become so used to death on the highways, so familiar with the casualty listing, it has come to accept the carnage as just one of those things, and therein lies the greatest danger. Slogans have failed to encourage safety. Laws specifically written to inspire responsibility at the wheel have been inadequate. The hazards have been taken out of travel, insofar as possible, through straightening out curves, easing access and egress, etc. Still the slaughter continues.

Second, more and more cars are being produced, bought and fed into already congested arterial and freeway routings. In the early 1920's American producers were turning out 1.9 million cars each year. By 1930 production had risen to 2.7 million. By 1940, to 3.7 million. By 1960, to 6.6 million. Last year, production in the United States totaled more than 7.7 million and producers have predicted a 10 million production year by 1970.

Third, the automobile industry has made some progress, yes, in making motoring safer; but U.S. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, for one, thinks it has not done enough. He emphasized that General Motors Corp., the largest producer of cars in the world, made a profit of \$2.1 billion in 1965, yet spent only \$8 million on research—a sum he termed grossly inadequate.

Meantime, what will be essential to the eventual solution is much, much tighter regulation—driving is not a right but a privilege—and sustained experimentation to produce both safer cars and safer roads. And it will take public education, by the ton. All of this will be for naught, however, if the man at the wheel cannot be reached and convinced. If he cannot, very possibly he eventually will be able to be reached—at the morgue.

Lithuania Deserves a Better Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States know Independence Day as a happy occasion, a holiday filled with picnics and parades. By contrast, there are less fortunate peoples for whom the anniversary of independence evokes only a poignant memory. Such a nation is Lithuania.

Forty-eight years ago this month, Lithuania gained independence after more than 120 years under first Russian then German domination. That fragile state of freedom lasted but a few years. The country suffered as a battleground during World War II, was for 3 years under German occupation, and in 1944 was occupied by the Soviet Union, which to this day exercises oppressive dominion over the 3 million inhabitants of Lithuania.

The United States properly refuses to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. And we citizens who so cherish our own freedom hope the days will be short until that same freedom can be enjoyed again on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. We join Erwin Cahman, of the Christian Science Monitor, in declaring, "The Baltic peoples—an ancient, culturally rich folk with proud national traditions—deserve a better fate, and one day may achieve it."

Citizens Honor Hamburg Township Fire Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of individual initiative and its importance in our democratic system of Government on the floor of the House before.

Today, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members the work of the Hamburg Township Fire Department in Livingston County, Mich., which I am privileged to represent in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide fire protection for the area, a group of civic-minded men in Hamburg Township founded a volunteer fire department, and equipped it with their personal funds and additional sums they were able to raise. I believe that the members of the Hamburg Township Fire Department deserve to be honored for contributing time and money to the safety and welfare of their community.

I join with the citizens of Hamburg Township who paid tribute to their extraordinary fire department recently at a dinner in its honor.

I am pleased to include an article on the department, published in the Brighton Argus, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HAMBURG TOWNSHIP DINES FIREMEN

HAMBURG.—Tribute to the volunteers who man the only privately owned fire department in the Nation, will be paid by the residents of Hamburg Township, January 29, when the firemen will be guests at a dinner at the Lakelands Golf Club.

Although all the equipment is owned by all the members of the volunteer fire department, the organization is a nonprofit organization—in fact it depends on financial assistance from private sources and many of the firemen themselves have expended sizable sums of their own on equipment.

The 6:30 o'clock dinner at the golf club to be given by the residents of Hamburg Township celebrates the 20th anniversary of the volunteer fire department's incorporation.

Twenty years ago Hamburg had no fire protection. It had no lifesaving equipment. Today, because of the untiring efforts of a group of civic-minded volunteers it has both. Not only do these men maintain and operate firefighting and resuscitating equipment, but they also finance it.

This organization has grown from a group

of stout-hearted, green volunteers with two war-surplus, gasoline-powered pumps—one on the creek bank, the other mounted on a two-wheel trailer—to a group of stout-hearted, trained volunteers who now own three radio-equipped mobile units and a large-volume electric pump at the creek which could supply the entire village of Hamburg with water, if need be.

At the present time they are awaiting delivery of a new American-Marsh 1,000-gallon tank truck with both a high and low pressure pump.

Lincoln Day Oration of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] delivered the annual Lincoln Day oration before the Middlesex Club of Boston. In his eloquent address, Congressman Morse invoked the principles which inspired President Lincoln and the Republican Party to national leadership a century ago, and challenged all Republicans to carry forth the battle for freedom in our own era.

In calling for a "new birth of freedom" in these tangled and troubled times, Mr. Morse declared:

We must recall that the keystone of freedom is responsibility—and that the highest responsibility of a free political party is to govern—for the people.

Toward this goal, he called upon all Republicans to pursue Lincoln's vision of a party of the people, a great party of diverse men and women "joined together not because they share a common dogma, but because they share common goals."

Mr. MORSE's concise and compelling address merits the attention of all Americans, and I would include it in the RECORD at this point:

LINCOLN DAY ORATION OF CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB, BOSTON, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

"Of strange, discordant, even hostile elements we gathered from the four winds and fought the battle through—under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy."

So said Lincoln in speaking of a Republican Party which was not then 3 years old.

His words described the explosive emergence of a new force, made of shredded remnants of political failure, born to meet the troubled conscience of a troubled people, destined to preserve the integrity of a nation determined to destroy itself.

"Did we brave all then to falter now? Now when that same enemy is wavering, dis-severed and belligerent."

These words, too, are golden with age, for though they challenge us today, Lincoln used them to chide Republicans a century ago.

For Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that unity begets strength, that discord breeds disaster.

Lincoln knew, as we must learn, that his party—our party—would deny its essential character and insure its own destruction were it to impose upon itself a discipline of ideological conformity.

Hurley, a veteran of World War I and a long-time resident of the immediate area.

The 16-acre site was purchased by the town of Randolph from Mr. Lind for \$43,600 and has been extensively landscaped with a football field, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and areas for physical education.

STATISTICS

Acreage: 16.87 acres.
Building area, 86,910 square feet.
Student capacity: 1,000 students.
Parking capacity: 185 cars.
Building cost per square foot: \$15.60.

Expenditures:

General contract including site development.....	\$1,560,400
Planning and supervision.....	112,320
Clerk of the works.....	12,450
Furnishings and equipment..	133,123
Miscellaneous.....	14,301
Unexpended.....	4,406

Total appropriation..... 1,837,000

State: 50 percent.

DEDICATION AT RANDOLPH JOHN F. KENNEDY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BY HON. JAMES A. BURKE

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, faculty members, and friends, I am delighted to have been invited to speak at the dedication of this beautiful junior high school, named in memory of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy. This dedication ceremony has particular significance to me because I had the honor of serving in the U.S. Congress under his direction as President. John F. Kennedy always had an intense interest in education. As a Congressman from Massachusetts, in one of his early educational proposals, John Kennedy said: "I am aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public school graduates in every part of the country." Let us not forget that much of the educational legislation passed during the last session of Congress was originally initiated by John F. Kennedy.

His youthful vigor appealed greatly to the younger generation and they immediately began to identify themselves with the President. President Kennedy encouraged their confidence by choosing the youth of America to represent our country abroad under the auspices of the Peace Corps. He realized that the future of our country was in their hands and emphasized to American youth the importance of staying in school and completing their education. We, of Massachusetts can be justly proud of our schools and the remembrance that one of our native sons was elected to Congress, went on to become a great Senator, and a dearly beloved President of the United States. These attainments should be emphasized to the students of John F. Kennedy Junior High School, since they too can become the future leaders of America. John F. Kennedy was so proud to be the President of a democratic society because he believed that only in a democracy did the future leadership depend so much on educational preparation.

Our Government has made education free and available to every American, beginning with the elementary school and continuing through high school. Junior high school is an important transition, the transition to greater maturity and learning. It is with the introduction of junior high school that the student begins to sort out his knowledge and attains a greater proficiency in subject matter.

Those of you who will be studying and teaching at this beautiful John F. Kennedy Junior High School have a manifold responsibility, a responsibility to a past Congressman, Senator, President, and educator. It

is up to all of you not to allow specialization of subject matter to consume the student as well as the teacher. Having broad interests is most important in keeping our democratic way of life alive.

Unfortunately, President Kennedy did not live to see many of his educational ideals enacted into legislation, but let all of us here cherish his name and be inspired by his educational beliefs. In a message to Congress, President Kennedy referred to education as a "keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." Today, let us remember the name of John F. Kennedy as a keystone in the structure of this school. I know that I share with all of you the hope that this school will endure and flourish with all of the beauty and greatness inherent in its fine name.

Is Appeasement of the Aggressors Going To Be the Reward for Our Heroes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, February 21, 1966, on page A-3 of the Washington Evening Star, appeared two stories of American heroism in Vietnam. Nearly 200,000 brave young Americans are fighting tyranny and aggression in Vietnam. They are fighting, not only to protect the right of the South Vietnamese to be free, but they are also fighting to prevent the spread of Communist aggression until it enslaves our own land.

American heroes are dying in Vietnam to protect the right of those who are doing their best to cause our defeat at the hands of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy. Certainly all Americans respect the right of free discussion and we will preserve the right of dissent. But where do we draw the line between legitimate debate and honest dissent and treason?

Is sending blood, funds, and propaganda to the enemy that is killing Americans, dissent or treason? Does free debate include the right to fly the flag above our own and to falsely accuse our own country of crimes against humanity?

I hope many Americans, including Members of Congress, read the articles in Monday's Star. And if they did, what will they tell these brave boys on that day when we all must make a reckoning of how we lived and how we died? What are those Members of the other body who are so sure America is wrong and the enemy is right, willing to say to the loved ones of these brave heroes? Or is peace so sweet and fear so great that our country has reached the point where we are ready to abandon all honor, all respect, all freedom in the hope that we may be permitted to live?

Throughout the proud history of America our people have stood for freedom. Every generation has produced those who prefer death to slavery. Have we lost the courage of those who have gone before?

I do not believe the American people

have, but I am afraid there are those in positions of leadership who, for whatever reason, seem to be willing to abandon principle for expediency, freedom for slavery, honor for peace. Let us rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and for which countless thousands have bled and died and for which Americans are suffering and dying today in Vietnam.

It may be a small measure of tribute, but I would like to include the stores of American heroes, Stephen Laier and James McKeown, in the hope that their sacrifice will remind all Americans of national purposes which seem to be forgotten. Stephen Laier and James McKeown will be remembered by history and their memory will be enshrined forever in the hearts of men who dream of freedom. Who remembers today the name of the screaming beatnik who took part in yesterday's anti-American demonstration?

The news stories from the Star follow:

A HERO'S 15 DAYS: COURAGE TO GATES OF DEATH

(By Peter Arnett)

SAIGON.—A young infantryman named Stephen Laier has shown in 15 pain-filled days that in some men the only limit to courage is death.

The courage of Laier, 18 years old, 6 feet tall, and weighing 225 pounds, almost defies comprehension by men who have never been wounded in battle.

From the moment he lost both his legs to a bursting Vietcong mine early in February, to the time 15 days later when life finally ebbed from his body, Laier fought for survival with a tenacity that brought tears to the eyes of those who knew his wounds were mortal. The doctors did everything to save him.

Big, blond Laier, from Fort Wayne, Ind., suffered his terrible wounds February 4 as an ambush patrol from his company of the 1st Battalion, 16th Regiment, 1st Division, chased a sniper and got hit by hidden mines wired to detonate simultaneously.

LOSES BOTH LEGS AT ONCE

Three of the men were killed instantly, the remaining 11 wounded. Laier, close by the mines when they burst, lost his legs on the spot.

With wounds this terrible, most men slip into shock and die.

Laier, the radioman for the patrol told doctors later he knew he was the only man alive capable of operating his radio equipment.

He tied rough tourniquets around the stumps of his legs and groped for his radio in the undergrowth. The blast had upset the calibration of his radio.

In the gathering dusk, Laier returned the set, a difficult job for a whole man. Then he began calling to his company headquarters at nearby Lai Khe.

AID TAKES 35 MINUTES

Laier then attempted to call down medical helicopters, but they could not land because of the darkness. A patrol from his company arrived on foot, guided by him.

By this time 35 minutes had gone by.

His company commander, Capt. Edward Yaugo, from Warren, Ohio, asked Laier, "Is there anything we can do for you?"

Laier replied, "Yes, you can get me some morphine."

Dr. Kris Keggi, from El Paso, Tex., remembers Laier being brought into the 3d Surgical Hospital at Bien Hoa that night.

"Medically, he was dead then," Keggi said. "We probed his veins. There was no blood

A964

in them. He was literally down to his last drop of blood."

TREMENDOUS WILL TO LIVE

Keggi and his aides pumped 6 pints of blood into the youth and he came around.

Fifteen days later a total of 60 pints of blood had been given him, literally replacing his normal blood supply six times.

"His will to live was tremendous," Dr. Keggi said.

Lai developed a multiplicity of complications, necessitating further operations on his legs.

"We fought against amputating his legs at the hips," Keggi said. "We hated to do that. This man had been a football player, and he told us that he wanted to get out, wear tin legs, and walk again."

At no time did Lai complain about his misfortune.

NURSE HELPS WITH LETTERS

"Maybe it was because his grandfather had lost his legs because of diabetes. He didn't seem afraid to face life," said Capt. Marguerite Giroux, from Malone, N.Y., the operating room nurse.

Nurse Giroux helped Lai write letters home, to his mother and his girl friend.

"He was so brave, that he didn't even want to tell his girl friend that he was so sick. He said she would not have to worry about him," Nurse Giroux said.

To help sustain him in his quiet desperate fight for life, Lai, a Roman Catholic, asked for a priest. As many as five Catholic chaplains at a time came to visit him. Nurse Giroux said he prayed constantly.

GENERAL GIVES BRONZE STAR

Lai's commanding officer, Maj. Gen. Jonathan Seaman, visited Lai several times. Seaman was so impressed with the young radioman that he wrote a friend, "This is one of the bravest men I have seen in 30 years as a soldier."

Seaman presented Lai a Bronze Star with "V" for valor, and told him, "This is the highest award in my power to present you. I wish I could present you with a higher one."

Lai told his commanding general: "I want to stay in the Army when I get my new legs."

Death did not come as a merciful blessing for the terribly wounded infantryman. He tried hard not to die.

HE DIVED ON THE GRENADE: GI GIVES LIFE FOR BUDDIES

(By John T. Wheeler)

CU CHI, Vietnam.—"When he spotted the grenade, he lunged on top of it without hesitation. He hollered, 'Move out you people,' and then it went off."

Spec. 4 James McKeown, of Willingboro, N.J., was telling about Spec. 4 Daniel Fernandez, 21, of Los Lunas, N. Mex., whose ultimate act of bravery saved the lives of four of his buddies.

But the blast of the Vietcong grenade ended his life.

His officers are recommending him for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Last Friday, Fernandez was in a reinforced squad lying in ambush outside the 25th Division's 2d Brigade perimeter, 25 miles west of Saigon. The Americans were hit by a much larger Vietcong force using a .50-caliber machinegun, a light machinegun, automatic weapons, and plenty of grenades.

"The grenade hit Dan on the foot as he was crawling," McKeown said today. "When it went off, it tore into his groin, abdomen, and right leg."

Pvt. David R. Masingale, of Fresno, Calif., a medic, told Fernandez while they were waiting for a medical evacuation helicopter, "Hang on, buddy."

Fernandez replied, "I'm going to hang on." But he added: "I never believed it would hurt so much."

Just before the helicopter took off, Fernandez asked Sgt. Ruben Perkins, of Nash-

ville, Tenn., "Who's going to take care of you now?"

"We had been working together ever since we joined the unit," Perkins said. "He called me 'Sergeant Rock' and I called him 'Old Dan.' He was real young, but real grownup in his attitude."

Fernandez, whose father, Jose, lives at Los Lunas, already had served one stint in Vietnam, a 90-day volunteer tour as a door gunner on armed helicopters. He earned the Air Medal and a Purple Heart during that tour.

He returned to Vietnam last month with the 1st Platoon, C Company, of the 5th Mechanized Infantry's 1st Battalion.

He was still volunteering.

"He was in the same spot the night before and volunteered to go out on patrol again even though he hadn't had any sleep for 48 hours," 2d Lt. Joseph D'Orso of Norwalk, Conn., said. "He was always volunteering."

Masingale, one of those saved by Fernandez' lunge atop the grenade, said his friend "had a girl back home he planned to marry when he got back. He also wanted to get a new truck for his father's ranch."

Dan Fernandez was hit by a rifle bullet after the grenade exploded. He lived to get back to the brigade hospital. Doctors fought for 2 hours to save him, but the internal bleeding was heavy.

The Vietcong paid a price, too. Seventeen of them were killed and five others were believed killed and carried away by comrades.

Invitation to Freeloaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as I scanned the editorial page of the Waukegan News-Sun, of Thursday, February 10, 1966, the aforementioned caption caught my eye.

The Waukegan News-Sun is a daily published in the principal city of Lake County, most populous of the counties which comprise the 12th Illinois District. It wields a decided influence as an opinionmaker.

In this editorial, "Invitation to Freeloaders," is summed up the opinions of a considerable number of my constituents and, I venture to say, of my colleagues and their constituents. I recommend it to those who have not given serious thought to the reasons why H.R. 8282 should be defeated.

INVITATION TO FREELoadERS

When a depression-haunted Congress enacted legislation about 30 years ago requiring every State to set up basic unemployment compensation laws, the objectives were simple and clearcut.

To qualify, unemployed workers had to be willing and able to work. Benefits from the program, separately governed by each State, were to go to legitimate wage earners who had clearly lost jobs through no fault of their own.

The program has since become an accepted part of American life—but policing has posed persistent problems. Through the years, thousands of unscrupulous claimants—loafers, schemers, parasites, and moonlighters—have bilked millions of undeserved dollars from the States.

And now before Congress is a bill, H.R.

8282, which threatens to open the door wider than ever before to freeloaders, while at the same time, taking away the States right to govern the program as they see fit.

The bill is being pushed hard by labor, personified by George Meany and Walter Reuther. Another ardent supporter, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, has given his stamp of approval.

What does this bill plan to do? First, it will allow Washington to set the standards for distribution of unemployment benefits in all States—a State prerogative until now.

Second, benefits will be doubled and tripled. And the terms of these benefits could run as long as 1 year.

In Lake County, an unemployed, unmarried worker can draw a maximum \$42 per week for 26 weeks under unemployment compensation. Once in awhile, he may receive an emergency 13-week extension, based on an overall increase in unemployment in Illinois.

Under H.R. 8282, by 1971, this same Lake County worker could draw \$100 or more each week for a minimum of 26 weeks, not a maximum as under the present law. Furthermore, the bill would relax the number of safeguards already imposed by the States. Workers who voluntarily quit jobs for any reason, including just plain laziness, could still receive compensation. The same would be true of employees who had been dismissed for outright misconduct.

The question that is always asked is: "Who pays for this tremendous increase in unemployment compensation?" Initially, the answer is the employer who would be saddled with an estimated 60-percent increase in payroll taxes. Ultimately, unless the employers could somehow absorb the higher cost, the increase would be passed on to the buying public.

From a narrow, individual point of view, the liberalized benefits may be tempting. But measured in terms of the broad public interest, exorbitant benefits without proper safeguards against abuse would badly distort the true spirit of unemployment compensation.

Instead of deterring unemployment, or in the altruistic sense, allowing wage earners a small stipend during a rough period, the bill would make a mockery of personal incentive while diminishing the rights of States and forcing employers and consumers to foot the huge bill.

H.R. 8282 should be defeated.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, was a great shock. He was a man of wisdom, and good counsel who daily reminded this House that everything we do here, no matter how vital and enduring it may seem at the moment, shall all pass away but that the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever.

For 16 years Chaplain Braskamp ministered to this House, invoking divine blessings on our efforts. Although he was a staunch Presbyterian, he served God; and his ministry applied alike to all who serve and have served in this House.

We will miss this good and wise man who so honorably served the Lord in this

Survey Shows Prosperity**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post, an outstanding newspaper of the West, has conducted its 10th annual consumer analysis survey of the metropolitan area. I am pleased to report that the metropolitan area is really prospering. Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding article by Willard Haselbush, Denver Post business editor, under date of Sunday, February 20, 1966, which is as follows:

The Denver metropolitan area is teeming with persons who are well-housed, well-paid, well-educated and enjoy, as a routine way of life, ownership of savings accounts, stocks, bonds, appliances, and luxury items.

The "war on poverty" doesn't involve some 90 percent of the area's families because 49 percent make from \$8,000 to more than \$15,000 a year and only 10 percent of all families in greater Denver report annual incomes of \$3,000 or less.

The 10th annual consumer analysis survey of the metropolitan area released Sunday by the Denver Post underlines continuing prosperity in the Mile High City and its suburbs.

The survey, conducted by experts following a proven cross-section procedure used by leading newspapers across America, involved interviews with 3,870 families—1.3 percent of the population—chosen not at random but by address, age bracket, income and other factors.

It showed that Denverites are earning more, spending more and saving more than ever before.

It revealed that 92 percent of all families, regardless of income, own one or more automobiles and that 30 percent of the vehicles were bought in the last 12 months—both new and used.

It showed that 77 percent of all metropolitan-area dwellers own their homes. That includes 51 percent of families earning less than \$5,000 a year who own and do not rent their living quarters.

The gain in 1965 among families making \$8,000-plus a year was 4 percent, the survey showed.

It also showed that 8 percent of the metropolitan area's families gross more than \$15,000 a year, 22 percent are in the \$10,000 to \$15,000 income bracket and 19 percent make between \$8,000 and \$9,999 a year.

That adds up to 23,900 families, in an area with a population of just more than a million persons, who are in the \$15,000-plus annual income bracket.

Other highlights uncovered by the annual survey showed that 19 percent of all heads of households in the area have college degrees, another 17 percent have completed up to 3 years of college and 32 percent have high school diplomas, but no college training.

Only 14 percent, said the mathematical projection, dropped out of grade school and never went back to school.

Forty-seven percent of the Denver area household heads are managers, officials, professional men, proprietors or craftsmen, and 12 percent are retired. The retirement total of family heads in the area, the survey showed, is 35,900, far ahead of the 29,900 who have clerical jobs. Only 3 percent of the area's population falls in the laborer category. That's 9,000 against the 41,900 who didn't finish grade school and the 56,800 who have college degrees.

The Denver Post's 1966 consumer analysis in book form now is being distributed to advertisers and advertising agencies by the newspaper's advertising department and its representatives, Moloney, Regan & Schmitt, Inc.

A composite picture of continuing and rising prosperity in the Denver area emerged from the person-to-person survey which began last September.

It showed that 75 percent of all families in the area have charge accounts, that 84 percent own insurance policies, 31 percent have stocks and/or bonds and 79 percent have savings accounts. Of these, 57 percent reported bank savings, 39 percent have money in savings and loan institutions and 38 percent own shares in company credit unions.

The scientific projection of those polled showed that 29 percent of all Denver-area families have savings bonds and 33 percent hold mutual fund shares.

Other highlights:

Twenty-nine percent of the Denver-area households—a total of 86,700—consist of two persons and 14 percent—41,900—have six or more members.

Denver has more children than adults. The survey showed that 4 percent are under 2 years old, 13 percent between 2 and 5, 21 percent between 6 and 11, and 20 percent between 12 and 17.

Only 11 percent of the area's husbands are over 65 and 36 percent are between 35 and 50.

A total of 104,700 housewives are jobholders. That's 35 percent of the total, an increase of 3 percent over a year ago. By income groups, 23 percent of the fulltime, housewife jobholders reported a total family income of \$15,000 or more a year.

Downtown Denver remains the favorite shopping area for 27 percent of the population, the projection showed. That compares with 21 percent who shop regularly at Cherry Creek, 17 percent at Lakeside, 14 percent at University Hills and 12 percent at Westland.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington as a freshman Member of the House, one of the things I found most heartening was the high quality spiritual guidance given the Members of the House of Representatives by their Chaplain, the late Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Perhaps I responded more warmly to him because he was a fellow Iowan and because he also rose from modest beginnings and found, through education, a means to serve others. I only know that I found his daily message a source of wisdom and inspiration and one which helped me view the daily round of quorum calls, rollcalls, and speeches as part of the continuing march of our national history.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say how fortunate the House of Representatives has been in being served by so illustrious a Chaplain as Dr. Braskamp, and I join all Members, both old and new, in offering my sympathy to his family and to all who have lost his valued guidance. Dr. Braskamp, however, had lived life to the

full and in a manner worthy of his calling. There can be no finer eulogy to him than to paraphrase a line from one of the last prayers he offered for us. Surely, for him, that prayer, uttered just a few weeks ago, was fully answered for he, indeed, had "removed from him everything that holds us back from a complete surrender to Thy ways and Thy will."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no higher praise than to acknowledge that in Dr. Braskamp, we knew a man who preached to us, not only with his words, but also with his life.

Nation's Best Minds Advise President Johnson on Southeast Asia**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a recent letter made this historic statement in a personal message:

Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this Government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions.

This statement first appeared publicly in my newsletter, Capitol Comments, on February 14, 1966, in which it was pointed out that the Vietnam conflict apparently is entering a significant new phase of reconstruction and pacification.

Under unanimous consent I insert this issue of Capitol Comments in the Appendix of the RECORD, believing it to be of interest to my colleagues and to Americans generally.

The newsletter follows:

VIETNAMESE CONFLICT ENTERS NEW STAGE

(By JOE L. EVINS)

This week in Washington was marked by major and significant developments in the continuing Vietnamese crisis. The conflict seemingly is moving into a new stage. This became apparent with the recent meeting of President Johnson and other high American officials with officials of the South Vietnamese Government during the week in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Following this meeting a joint declaration was issued in which the goals of the two nations were announced. A concerted effort will be made to build a democratic nation, beginning at the grassroots level.

According to the announcement, as areas are liberated from the Vietcong, American and Vietnamese teams will move in to launch basic programs, in education, in economic reform, in agriculture, and in health to create stable and self-governing communities.

It is most significant that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Agriculture attended the sessions at Honolulu and then moved on to South Vietnam to begin immediate work on these programs to build free, self-governing, democratic communities.

It is also significant that President Johnson dispatched Vice President HUMPHREY to visit South Vietnam to continue the momentum for this positive program of reconstruction.

February 24, 1966

followed a democratic pattern. More important was the wide latitude which was his to choose friends, activities, and beliefs. The increasing responsibility about making more and more of his own decisions was both gratifying and frightening to Melvin.

Melvin also grew concerned about current events. Remembering his earlier lessons he thought that those rebellious ones who burned their draft cards had somehow missed the point in their interpretation of democracy. He debated the actions of those who marched in protest of the Government's policies in domestic and foreign affairs. He wondered what he would do if he were in a position of leadership in the Nation.

And thus it was that Melvin, like Ulysses, became a part of all that he had met. Melvin's story is my story and, like Melvin, I have formed my understanding of the meaning of democracy, realizing that the years and experiences to come will add new dimensions to these beliefs.

I believe with Lincoln that democracy is government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I believe that true democracy recognizes the worth of the individual by guaranteeing him certain freedoms as set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that our form of democracy evolved from the thoughts, experience, and prayers of men through the centuries and will complete its evolution only through the efforts of men today and in the future.

I believe that democracy is more than a form of national government. It pervades all of life for those who live within its framework.

I believe that this democratic form of government places more demands upon the individual than any other form of government because in granting freedoms it exacts compensating responsibilities—or, as John D. Rockefeller, Jr., put it, "every right implies a responsibility; every opportunity, an obligation; every possession, a duty."

I believe that I cannot separate myself from the processes of democracy and blame others for its imperfections. I believe that I must participate actively in our democratic government, and that I must prepare myself now for that participation.

This is what democracy means to me.

House Loses Rev. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this House has sustained a great loss this week with the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

In his quiet way, Dr. Braskamp was a constant source of spiritual comfort to all Members of this House, both those who shared his denominational preference and those who were members of other faiths. All of us, in different ways, have profited by knowing this kindly and gracious man. His passing leaves a great void in this House, but he shall never be forgotten by those of us to whom he gave so generously of himself.

For more than a half century, Dr. Braskamp did God's work and the world is a better place for his presence. To all Members of the House his loss comes

as a personal one. Each of us has lost a good friend.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in extending our condolences to his son, Bernard, Jr., and to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and to the other members of his family.

The Meaning of Democracy to 16-Year-Old Elizabeth G. Rasche, of Fairbanks, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the heart-warming words of 16-year-old Elizabeth G. Rasche, a senior in the Lathrop High School, of Fairbanks, Alaska, describing what democracy means to her. She is Alaska's winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary, and I want to share her speech with you. It follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

Democracy: a skinny 17-year-old in fatigues and combat boots, fighting his first war from behind his first submachinegun; a teacher explaining the War of 1812 or judicial review or an eloquent American poet, urging her students to express their own feelings without hesitation, without fear; a college girl guiding an illiterate child's groping mind through his first reading lesson and returning the wonder in his face. Democracy: an ideal emblazoned in the souls of a new generation, a generation dedicated to preserving it as a living, glowing reality.

I'm 16 years old, and I'm part of this generation. I live in a world of hostility, a world where men submerge their very humanity in primitive brutality, a world in which the freedom I love seems sometimes a tenuous thing; and often I cry out in frustration, "What can I do?"

The answer is stereotyped: I can absorb the essence of democracy in my history, government and literature classes. I can take part in activities which contribute to my intellectual, emotional, and moral development. I can keep informed of current affairs, and build myself into a wise, capable citizen. This is my duty; it constitutes my role as an American high school student. But like so many students, I grow impatient with the taping; I long to give.

I'm thankful for the small ways I have been able to give in my community. Throughout 7 years of Girl Scouting I was encouraged to "help other people at all times" in ways as diverse as making Christmas favors for the aged and aiding in a full-scale polio vaccination program. I've worked with young children as a library aid and Red Cross volunteer. I've come to understand other cultures better through the foreign visitors my family and I have entertained in our home. Just last summer, as a hostess for one of our local civic organizations, I welcomed people from every State and many foreign countries to my city. Greeting them at the airport, answering their questions, and making them feel at home, I felt a deeper kinship not only with my countrymen, but with all mankind.

Presently school absorbs most of my time, but school itself exemplifies democracy. I'm proud to be a member of our vibrant

student council, which is patterned after the U.S. Congress and encompasses such programs as student exchange, flood relief, and aid to UNICEF. I'm in many other activities as well. In some, I'm a leader; in others I'm a follower, and this is the way it should be. I round out my week by teaching a Sunday school class of exuberant fourth graders, convinced that America is, and must remain, "one nation under God."

But is all this enough? My answer is an emphatic "No." I believe in my generation and in what we're doing, but I believe there's more, much more we could be doing to sustain democracy. I'd like to see a teen corps of unpaid volunteers fighting poverty and sickness and illiteracy throughout the Nation; this might be an extension of Project Headstart. I'd like to see youth chapters of both political parties in every American town.

I'd like to see some of our teen centers turned into centers for democratic action. I'd like to hear the familiar complaint "There's nothing to do" answered with worthwhile service projects: helping out at the polls, landscaping, making intelligent high school broadcasts. These are only a few of the innumerable ways we can and should be preserving the democratic ideal.

The older generation, which emerged strong and resilient from war and depression, has set a noble precedent for us. If we too are to be strong and resilient, if we too are to perpetuate democracy, we can't sit back and simply enjoy our education, with the idea of using it in a few months, a few years, a few decades. We can and must begin right now to put it to work. We are the new generation. Today is ours.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 26 years since the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. In an era when the United Nations is expanding its membership yearly, many people have never learned of Lithuania's history and its tragic fate. Indeed, a sizable percentage of member states was not even in existence when Lithuania fell to Soviet perfidy.

On February 16, we observed the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuanian Americans have led the fight to inform the world of their homeland and of their homeland's loss of freedom. Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a rich and honorable history going back to the 13th century. The takeover of this small nation stands as a clear example of the expansionist tactics of the Soviet Union and of its indifference to the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

The United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into Russia. We thus reiterate our support for the principle of self-determination and for the moral and political implications of this principle.

I congratulate the Lithuanian-American organizations in the United States for their long and tenacious fight in behalf of this cause.

tion and pacification gained at the session in Hawaii.

The Governments of the United States and South Vietnam agreed on these main points at Honolulu:

- To resist aggression.
- To work for the social improvement of the people.
- To strive for self-government.
- To promote free, democratic elections.
- To attack hunger, ignorance and disease.
- To continue the quest for peace.

President Johnson is continuing his firm, reasoned direction of the conflict and there are strong indications that our American forces are inflicting sustained, substantial and telling losses on the Vietcong and on invading Communists.

In response to a letter which your Representative sent to President Johnson concerning the Vietnamese conflict, the President said in reply:

"Whatever else history may say, it must record that everything this government is trying to do is the result of the collected wisdom and judgment of the best minds in the country. And I alone will take responsibility for all final decisions."

The President has an awesome, lonely and grave responsibility in safeguarding the interests of freedom and halting the onrush of communism in southeast Asia, and at the same time, avoiding the missteps that would trigger a nuclear war.

The President is moving in the direction of achieving an honorable peace without a general war. There could be no greater responsibility placed upon the shoulders of any man—and the President needs our support in this critical time.

David Dammann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a young man in Atlanta who is in the frontlines of the war against poverty.

David Dammann is a Job Corps recruiter who has interviewed some 1,000 young residents of Atlanta's most deprived neighborhoods, and has persuaded 250 of them to take advantage of the opportunity to help themselves by joining the Job Corps.

Mr. Dammann, a graduate of Duke University, is the subject of a column by Hugh Parks which appeared in the Atlanta Journal on February 1. I insert this column at this point in the RECORD:

HE'LL CHANGE YOUR MIND

You may have several sincere reservations about the Job Corps but at least two have rubbed off by the time you have finished talking with Dave Dammann:

1. He is determined to see it work, although he is underpaid.
 2. If they get enough like him it will work.
- Dave, based in Atlanta, is the Job Corps top recruiter in the United States.

He pulls on an old sweater or an old coat, climbs into an old Rambler, sees that the protective placard which says Job Corps lies on the seat beside him and sets out, night and day, to some of Atlanta's most dangerous neighborhoods.

He wears the sagging sweater or coat because he found when he wore a neat business

suit he was tagged immediately as a detective and kids he wanted to talk to would scatter at sight. The placard is to place on his windshield to protect his car from being stripped while he's away from it.

He ignores whatever derisive calls, or worse, that are flung in his direction and heads confidently toward a corner gang, calling out, "Hey, fellows, don't run, I'm not the law, I want to talk to you a moment." Or, "Good doctor," to the leader, "I've got a good deal here."

In Buttermilk Bottom, Cabbage Town and Blue Heaven, he has become a familiar figure, this rambling 24-year-old graduate of Duke.

Does he ever have any qualms about being alone? Especially at night?

"I was brought up in a Queens neighborhood," he replied, "which for 2 years straight had the highest juvenile delinquency rate in New York City, including Harlem. I have been stabbed before."

CAUSES CAMP DIRECTOR TO COMPLAIN

When he was growing up, the neighborhood was primarily a mixture of European immigrants: German (he is of German descent), Greeks and Italians. Now Puerto Ricans and Negroes are moving in.

"Of the 300 kids in our block," he went on, "my 2 brothers and I are the only ones to go to college. This was because our parents and our grandfather, who is a teacher, inspired us to want a higher education. I learned that all you need is guidance—proper guidance. We had that."

Since he joined the Job Corps here less than a year ago, Dave has signed 250 boys out of the 1,000 he interviewed. About two-thirds are Negro.

He follows up their progress at the various camps which they attend from 8 months to 2 years, depending on what work they are capable of learning and are interested in. His persistent letters to directors of the 82 camps, asking about his recruits, so annoyed one that he complained to Washington.

He can talk the language of the slum kid (not all are from slums) and will threaten to hap one aside the head if he doesn't go all out in his new opportunity. Some aspire to high goals, most are realistic, and two Negro boys with a fourth grade education had their ambitions centered on learning enough so they could pass the Air Force's written examination. And they passed.

Such a gifted athlete that he was All New York State in soccer when he was in high school, easy-walking Dave came south to Duke to study to be a teacher but decided upon graduation—and this from a guy who is working for Washington—"that there is too much bureaucracy in the schools."

He is married to the former Carrell Ann Larmore, daughter of Jesse Larmore, chief of adult probation for Fulton County. She is studying for her Ph. D. in psychology at Emory and it is good that she has been granted a financial "assistantship" because Dave's salary is \$6,050 a year.

**Pearl Harbor Shipyard Supervisors
Conduct Vietnam Poll**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I count myself among the more fortunate Congressmen in that I represent an educated and well-informed electorate. Many of our citizens have demonstrated

a keen awareness of the issues with which this Nation is beset. One such citizen is Mr. Jerome A. Cook, of Aiea, Hawaii, who is a vice president of the National Association of Supervisors, Department of Defense.

Mr. Cook, in making plans to come to Washington in March for a meeting of the national association, conducted an opinion poll of the Pearl Harbor shipyard supervisors so that he would have their views on some of the critical issues that confront our government. On the issue of the war in Vietnam, Mr. Cook's poll showed strong support for the administration's policy among the members of the association in Hawaii.

The results of Mr. Cook's poll, in which 165 supervisors participated, are as follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The United States should use all its military might to end the war in Vietnam at the risk of war with Red China.	112	30	11
2. Are you willing to pay more taxes to support the war?	110	30	13
3. We should at least bomb all of North Vietnam, including Hanoi and seaports.	118	22	12
4. The United States should recognize the Vietcong at the negotiating table as legitimate parties to peace talks.	68	74	14
5. The United States should withdraw completely from Vietnam as it is too unimportant to risk a world war.	13	131	7

**Room 307, Gilman Hall—Some
Reminiscences**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in California, on February 21 a group of distinguished Americans participated in the dedication of room 307, Gilman Hall, at the University of California at Berkeley as a national historic landmark.

History was made in this room in the thirties through the research work conducted by renowned nuclear scientist Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, and his associates. From the efforts of these esteemed scientists came plutonium with all its awesome implications for both peace and war.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of my fellow Californian, the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who participated in the dedication of this historic room 307:

**ROOM 307, GILMAN HALL—SOME
REMINISCENCES**

I am happy to participate with Art Wahl and Ed McMillan in this 25th anniversary of the discovery of plutonium and I especially appreciate the fact that Stew Udall is officiating in this dedication of room 307, Gilman Hall as a national historic landmark.

I imagine it is typical of our time—because of the speed of change, the sheer number of significant events which pile up in the quickly passing years—that each of us today lives through a little more history in our lifetime.

At least this seems to be the case. It is an exciting time to be alive, to be working, to be trying to make some contribution to the scheme of things—and occasionally to have some small success in the effort.

It is also a time when time itself is something of luxury—particularly time to reminisce. But since today is a special occasion, I hope you'll afford me a little of that luxury.

Having a room in which you and your colleagues worked rather routinely, and certainly unceremoniously, designated as a national historic landmark is an unusual experience, to say the least. Those of you who remember room 307 Gilman Hall as it was in those early days (and remained for many years) will agree that a less significant or historical-looking room hardly existed on the campus of the University of California.

Fortunately the room is still here. It has been enlarged somewhat and it contains more complicated equipment. The simple small sink, down which some of our precious plutonium was inevitably lost in the course of our experiments 25 years ago, has been replaced by another sink. The little cubbyhole with its low slanting ceiling directly under Gilman Hall's roof, where we kept our electroscope and various samples, is still an appendage to the room. And it still opens through glass doors to the little outdoor patio where, because of the shortage of laboratory space and fume hoods, we were forced to carry on some of our experiments which gave off noxious fumes.

I recall that our counting equipment was two doors down the hall, in room 303. The first plutonium had its alpha radiation measured in that room and therefore room 303 shares a place in history with room 307. Joe Kennedy and I had our desks in room 303, and later in the year 1941 one whole wall was taken up with a chart of isotopes to which additions and changes were frequently made.

Had Art Wahl, Joe Kennedy, Ed McMillan, or I had the slightest idea that today's event would transpire, we might have looked for other more auspicious quarters. I don't think we would have gotten them. Space was at a premium and we were lucky to have even these rooms to work in. Fortunately, we were more interested in getting results in our work than in our surroundings or any significance they might have in the future.

But in recalling the story of plutonium I should go back further—perhaps to 1936 when, as a graduate student, I spoke in the college of chemistry weekly seminar as was required of each of us once a year. Since the fall of 1934, when I began my graduate work at Berkeley, I had been reading first the exciting papers by Fermi, Segre, and coworkers from Rome and then the equally fascinating papers by Hahn, Meitner, and Strassmann from Berlin. They were studying the interesting radioactivities which were produced when uranium was bombarded with neutrons and which they attributed to isotopes of transuranium elements.

I remember how I devoured those early papers and how I considered myself something of a minor expert on those "transuranium elements." In fact, they were the subject of my talk at that seminar in 1936, an hour-long talk in which I described those "new" elements and their chemical properties in great detail. I need not remind you, I am sure, that in January of 1939 word reached us that Hahn and Strassmann in Germany had identified those "transuranium" isotopes as barium and lanthanum, and other fission products of uranium, and thus established that they were not new elements at all.

During the 2 years following my seminar talk in 1936 and before the discovery of fission, my interest in the neutron-induced radioactivities in uranium continued unabated and, in fact, increased. I read and reread every article that was published on

the subject. I was puzzled by the situation, both intrigued by the concept of the transuranium interpretation of the experimental results and disturbed by the apparent inconsistencies in this interpretation. I can remember discussing the problem with Joe Kennedy by the hour—often in the postmidnight, small hours of the morning at the old Varsity Coffee Shop on the corner of Telegraph and Bancroft Avenues where we would often go for a cup of coffee and a bite to eat after an evening spent in the laboratory.

I first learned of the correct interpretation of these experiments, that neutrons split uranium into two large pieces in the fission reaction, at the weekly Monday night seminar in nuclear physics conducted by Prof. E. O. Lawrence in Le Conte Hall. On this exciting night in January 1939, we heard the news from Germany of Hahn and Strassmann's beautiful chemical experiments. I recall that the fission interpretation was greeted at first with some skepticism by a number of those present in that room, but as a chemist, with a particular appreciation for Hahn and Strassmann's experiments, I felt that this interpretation just had to be accepted. I can remember walking the streets of Berkeley for hours after this seminar in a combined state of exhilaration, in appreciation of the beauty of the work, and disgust at my inability to arrive at this interpretation despite my years of contemplation on the subject.

Now, with those radioactivities identified as fission products, there were no longer any transuranium elements left. However, in later investigations by Ed McMillan at Berkeley and others elsewhere, one of the radioactivities behaved differently from the others. It didn't undergo recoil. It didn't separate from thin layers of uranium when uranium was bombarded with slow neutrons. This was the beta radioactivity with a half-life of about 2.3 days. Along toward the spring of 1940, Ed began to come to the conclusion that the 2.3-day activity might actually be due to the daughter of the 23-minute uranium 239 and thus might indeed be an isotope of element 93 with the mass number 239 (93-239). Phil Abelson joined him in this work in the spring of 1940 and together they were able to chemically separate and identify and thus discover element 93.

Immediately thereafter, during the summer and fall of 1940, Ed McMillan started looking for the daughter product of the 2.3-day activity which obviously would be the isotope of element 94 with mass number 239 (94-239). Not finding anything he could positively identify as such, he began to bombard uranium with deuterons in the 60-inch cyclotron in the hope that he might find a shorter lived isotope—one of a higher intensity of radioactivity that would be easier to identify as an isotope of element 94. Before he could finish this project, he was called away to work on radar at MIT.

During this time my interest in the transuranium elements continued. Since Ed McMillan and I lived only a few rooms apart in the Faculty Club, we saw each other quite often and, as I recall, much of our conversation, whether in the laboratory, at meals, in the hallway, or even going in and out of the shower, had something to do with element 93 and the search for element 94. I must say, therefore, that his sudden departure for MIT came as something of a surprise to me—especially since I didn't even know when he had left.

In the meantime I had asked Arthur Wahl, one of my two graduate students, to begin studying the tracer chemical properties of element 93 with the idea that this might be a good subject for his thesis. My other co-worker was Joe Kennedy, who was a fellow instructor at the university and, as I have indicated, was also very interested in the general transuranium problem.

When I learned that Ed McMillan had gone, I wrote to him asking whether it might not be a good idea if we carried on the work he had started, especially the deuteron bombardment of uranium. He readily assented, writing that it was a good idea that this work be continued.

Our first deuteron bombardment of uranium was conducted on December 14, 1940. What we bombarded was a form of uranium oxide, U_3O_8 , which was literally plastered onto a copper backing plate. From this bombarded material Art Wahl isolated a chemical fraction of element 93. The radioactivity of this fraction was measured and studied. We observed that it had different characteristics than the radiation from a sample of pure 93-239. The beta particles which in this case were due to a mixture of 93-239 and the new isotope of element 93 with mass number 238 (93-238) had a somewhat higher energy than those from pure 93-239 and there was more gamma radiation. But the composite half-life was about the same, namely, 2 days.

However, the sample also differed in another very important way from a sample of pure 93-239. Into this sample there grew an alpha particle emitting radioactivity. A proportional counter was used to count the alpha particles to the exclusion of the beta particles. This work led us to the conclusion that we had a daughter of the new isotope 93-238—a daughter with a half-life of about 50 years and with the atomic number 94. This is much shorter lived than the now known half-life of 94-239, which is 24,000 years. The shorter half-life means a higher intensity of alpha particle emission which explains why it was so much easier to identify what proved to be the isotope of element 94 with the mass number 238 (94-238). (Later it was proved that the true half-life of what we had, i.e., 94-238, is about 90 years.)

On January 28, 1941, we sent a short note to Washington describing our initial studies on element 94, which also served for later publication in the Physical Review under the names of McMillan, Wahl, Kennedy, and Seaborg. We didn't consider, however, that we had sufficient proof at that time to say we had discovered a new element and felt that we had to have chemical proof in order to be positive. So, during the rest of January and into February, we attempted to identify this alpha activity chemically.

Our attempts proved unsuccessful for some time. We did not find it possible to oxidize the isotope that was responsible for this alpha radioactivity. Then I recall that we asked Prof. Wendell Latimer, whose office was on the first floor of Gilman Hall, to suggest the strongest oxidizing agent that he knew for use in aqueous solution. At his suggestion we used peroxydisulfate with argentic ion as catalyst.

On the stormy night of February 23, 1941, in an experiment that ran well into the next morning, Art Wahl performed the oxidation which gave us proof that what we had made was chemically different than all other known elements. That experiment, and hence the first chemical identification of element 94, took place in room 307 of Gilman Hall, the room that is being dedicated as a national historic landmark today, 25 years later.

The communication to Washington describing this oxidation experiment, which was critical to the discovery of element 94, was sent on March 7, 1941, and this served for later publication in the Physical Review under the authorship of Kennedy, Wahl, and Seaborg.

Almost concurrent with this work was the search for, and the demonstration of the fission of, the isotope of major importance—that is, 94-239, the radioactive decay daughter of 93-239. Emilio Segre played a major role in this work together with Kennedy, Wahl, and me. The importance of ele-

being channeled into campaigns to make the poverty warriors look better, if not good. It is quite true that an important feature of a campaign like the one launched against poverty is bringing the program itself to the attention of its beneficiaries. But we have already recited in this space the lengths to which the Enquirer has gone in that direction.

We have dispatched a special reporter to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to learn firsthand what the war on poverty is all about. We have charted the multitude of antipoverty programs in operation in Cincinnati. We have devoted a major part of a recent issue of the Pictorial Enquirer to the antipoverty program. And we have carried day-to-day reports of the activities within the program's scope.

The other communications media in the Queen City have done nearly as well.

These efforts have been undertaken not to enhance anyone's image; they have been undertaken to inform the public.

There is a world of difference between "news" and "publicity." "News" is what happens. "Publicity" is manufactured news, frequently the illusion of news; it is what someone would like to be news. Those who cannot make news must seek instead to make publicity.

This, we fear, is the situation in which too many of America's poverty warriors find themselves. They are so destitute of achievement that they must buy public attention.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, Feb. 10, 1966]

CAC AND PRESS AGENTS

The Community Action Commission, which supervises the war on poverty here, is taking another look at the proposed spending of \$36,000 a year for press agents.

Although the CAC board Monday night did not formally rescind the action approving the budget (passed 11 to 7 at a previous meeting), it did authorize the creation of a committee to study it.

It is interesting to note that the 15-page argument for spending the \$36,000 had been given directors a week before a decision was taken at the January meeting and did not receive the benefit of an appraisal by the executive committee or any other committee of the CAC.

Whatever the outcome of this reappraisal, we think the CAC staff and board will discover as other Government agencies have discovered, that nothing beats good, effective work to win good, effective publicity.

Carl S. Miller: Tennessee Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the number of casualties of the Vietnam conflict continues to grow, there is a tendency to think in terms of just that—cold, impersonal numbers.

One such "number" was Capt. Carl S. Miller, of Robertson County, Tenn., who was killed in action in the beginning of this month as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam.

Captain Miller believed in what he was doing in that Asian land, and he believed in what the United States is doing. The following editorial from the Robertson

County Times is a fitting tribute to a courageous and gallant soldier, not a number, to a man who made the ultimate sacrifice to insure the safety and security of his country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Robertson County (Tenn.) Times, Feb. 3, 1966]

A SALUTE TO CAPTAIN MILLER

The county mourns with Mrs. Carl S. Miller, Jr., whose husband, Captain Miller, was killed in action last week as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam. At the same time we can all be proud—as his family is proud—of the contribution he has made in the cause of freedom.

Captain Miller grew up in Robertson County before embarking on a military career he realized might someday take him into combat. He had a sense of duty and was willing to make any personal sacrifice for his country—and indirectly for his three boys, who survive.

As his courageous wife so plainly stated it: "Bing didn't have a choice, he was sent to Vietnam. But, if they had given him a choice, that's where he would have wanted to be."

There are those who stand today arrogantly burning draft cards and shouting for our Government to quit the fight against communism. They haven't, for the most part, been outside the country or seen the results of surrender to tyranny.

Captain Miller saw the ugly face of communism and constantly wrote of his conviction that our Government was right to stand and fight. He looked on it as a privilege to join in this fight.

For those of us who cherish our freedom let us salute Capt. Carl S. Miller—a patriotic American we won't soon forget.

Vice Adm. F. L. Ashworth Is Acclaimed as an Example for American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, almost coincident with his 54th birthday last month, announcement was made that Vice Adm. Frederick Lincoln Ashworth had been named commander of the U.S. Navy's mighty 6th Fleet. This event led the Beverly Times, of Beverly, Mass., to acclaim this naval leader's service to our country as an example which today's American youth well might follow. In the hope that it may inspire others, therefore, I am pleased to present the editorial from the Beverly Times of February 1, 1966, as follows:

A REAL HERO

It is always an honor to a community when one of its sons or daughters achieves unusual distinction. Such is the case with Beverly and Frederick Lincoln Ashworth, recently named a vice admiral and given command of the U.S. Navy's 6th Fleet, mainstay of our defense in the Mediterranean and Middle East.

Admiral Ashworth whose mother lives in Wenham, which, incidentally, he also lists as his home address, was born in Beverly on January 24, 1912. His career has been adventurous and distinguished. It is a story which makes fascinating reading even in the

today's make-believe world of James Bond, the Man From U.N.C.L.E., and the Batman.

But Frederick Ashworth's accomplishments are fact not fiction. And they set a pattern of old-fashioned virtues, such as loyalty, bravery, and patriotism, which are too frequently overlooked or ignored by 20th century youngsters.

In high school, as president of the student council, he began to set the high standards which carried him through life. He graduated from the Naval Academy in 1933 at the age of 21 and as a junior officer served aboard a battleship, but soon transferred to Pensacola for flight training.

On December 7, 1941, when Pearl Harbor was attacked by the Japanese, he was attached to the Bureau of Ordnance in Washington. A few months later orders came through for transfer to an advanced carrier training group and finally in 1942 he took command of his own aerial torpedo squadron.

Operating out of Henderson Field on Guadalcanal, he won his first decoration—the Distinguished Flying Cross. His job was a dirty one. It took leadership and old-fashioned guts. Daylight raids on Japanese shipping in the Solomon Islands. Bombing missions against enemy positions and always the dangers of hostile fighter aircraft.

For canny planning in helping direct several key amphibious operations the Bronze Star was next.

Then came a turning point in his life. He was assigned to a supersecret mission in Santa Fe, N. Mex., with the unromantic title of "Project Y." In reality it was the development and perfection of the atomic bomb.

Admiral Ashworth helped supervise and coordinate field tests of the bomb, and then on August 9, 1945, he flew with the Army B-29 bomber which dropped the second atomic weapon on the Japanese city of Nagasaki. For this he was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Silver Star.

Back to the States after the war, he helped in the basic planning of the Bikini atom bomb test and the first stages of the underwater delivery of nuclear weapons.

In the last 15 years, top commands: the giant aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt, commandant of midshipmen at the Naval Academy, carrier divisions, Deputy Chief of Staff, European Command, and finally, Commander, U.S. 6th Fleet.

You can have your television and movie stars. Such is the stuff of real heroes.

American Bar Association Unanimously Affirms Legality of American Action in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the questions that have been raised concerning U.S. action in Vietnam, I was interested to note that on February 21, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association unanimously adopted a resolution affirming the legality of our participation in that country under international law.

The chairman of the association's section on international and comparative law, which originated the resolution, is Edward D. Re, a distinguished authority in the field, who serves this country as

Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I am proud to have Dr. Re as a close friend and constituent.

I submit for the RECORD an article from the February 22 issue of the New York Times in reference to the action of the bar association:

BAR GROUP FINDS U.S. WAR POLICY LEGAL UNDER U.N.

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, February 21.—The American Bar Association's house of delegates today passed by unanimous voice vote and without debate a resolution affirming the legality of the U.S. participation in Vietnam under international law, the United Nations Charter and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The resolution was intended as an answer to statements by WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. During last week's televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MORSE said that some international lawyers believed that the U.S. position was illegal.

Eberhard P. Deutsch, of New Orleans, chairman of the Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations, presented the resolution at a midyear meeting at the Palmer House here. All 250 attending members of the policymaking house of delegates voiced support.

Mr. Deutsch said the Senator "perverts and misconstrues" the meaning of the United Nations Charter. He also said he hoped the resolution would strengthen the position of Senators who support the war and "fervently" hoped it would support the fightingmen in Vietnam.

The resolution was prompted by RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, who suggested at the hearings that the American Bar Association reply to Mr. Morse's contention.

Mr. Deutsch said he would report passage of the resolution to Senator LONG and stood ready to testify before the committee on the action if called to do so. The resolution was sent to J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the committee.

Mr. Deutsch conceded that the resolution was silent on the question, raised by Mr. MORSE, whether President Johnson should have asked for a congressional declaration of war. However, he said that he believed it was implicit in the resolution that the war was legal regardless of a formal declaration.

Edward W. Kuhn, of Memphis, president of the 120,000-member association, said the action "repudiated" Mr. MORSE and that his organization would "lobby" for its position. He did not elaborate.

The resolution was reportedly the unanimous product of Mr. Deutsch's standing committee and the section of the international and comparative law, whose chairman is Edward D. Re of New York. If an association delegation should go to Washington, the two chairmen and Max Chopnick of New York, who is on the international law section, would make up the delegation.

The American Bar Association's reaction was unusual in its rapidity. Although the resolution was limited to support of the administration on legal points, it amounted to support of the administration's Vietnam policy generally, a key member of the international law section disclosed.

NO NAMES MENTIONED

The resolution, although clear as to intention and meaning, mentioned neither Mr. LONG nor Mr. MORSE by name. An accompanying report said that international law professors in 31 universities had expressed their opinion "that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal, and is not in violation of the charter of the United Nations." This was a reference to a statement by a group of professors sent last month to Presi-

dent Johnson and put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative J. J. PICKLE, Democrat, of Texas.

The reported declared:

"Articles 51 and 52 of the [United Nations] Charter expressly provide that nothing contained therein 'shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense,' nor preclude 'the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action.' The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is such an arrangement or agency."

The text of the resolution follows:

"Whereas in recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, it has been stated that international lawyers are agreed that the U.S. position in Vietnam is illegal and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas articles 51 and 52 of the charter sanction steps for self-defense and collective and regional security arrangements such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to which the United States is a party;

"Whereas in the course of these hearings it has been suggested that an expression on this subject by the American Bar Association would be appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Bar Association, That the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution immediately to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate."

This Is My Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the U.S. Congress, I have tried to keep the people I am honored to represent informed of my activities and record in Congress, as well as the policies of the Federal Government. In my years here, some 16,000 bills have been voted on in the House of Representatives. Along with others of us, my record has been on several occasions misrepresented by falsehood and half-truths from the mouths of selfish special-interest groups and political opponents. I here spread my voting on the issues, that each person may determine for himself that my record has been made in the interest of the people.

I voted for the tax reduction bills, which have encouraged industrial and business expansion and produced more jobs. Three substantial tax reductions have been enacted during my service and each had my full support.

I consistently vote for an invincible national defense, and oppose every proposal to weaken our Nation through unilateral disarmament. I believe our fighting men should have the best possible equipment in ample supply. I will continue working to that end.

I voted for the bill to prevent and con-

trol the pollution of waters, and to provide for the development of our water and land resources.

I voted for the bills relating to community health services, and to provide for the development of programs to help the aging, and to provide for health research facilities.

I opposed the act which causes higher consumer price for coffee.

I voted for increased social security benefits, disability benefits, and increases in old age pensions and other assistance.

I voted to reduce the voluntary retirement age to 62, and for widows, to age 60, and to allow greater earnings before reduction in social security benefits.

I voted for education and training benefits for veterans, and for other GI benefits.

I voted to improve the Railroad Retirement Act.

I voted to provide more educational opportunities for our young people, and to provide loans to students. I have assisted the schools and colleges in our district in their applications for funds and loans amounting to many millions of dollars, and have successfully assisted them in their other problems with the Federal Government.

I have successfully introduced and enacted bills to ban pornography from the mails, and to allow prosecution of purveyors of pornography in the jurisdiction where deliveries are made, and have supported other bills to protect decent people from this obnoxious traffic. I continue to oppose distribution of Communist propaganda through our post offices.

I have introduced and supported bills to strengthen the criminal laws of this country, so that people might be safe on the streets.

I have responded to every request from a community for assistance in its economic development and in its dealings with the Federal Government. This has resulted in a large number of grants and loans for hospitals, water and sewer systems, libraries, housing, airports and airport construction, remodeling of public buildings, new post offices, public facilities, and countless other improvements.

I have aided numerous industries and businesses that are locating in our district, or expanding their operations in our district, in their applications for loans and other assistance from the Federal level. Our growth in this respect has far exceeded the expansion in any other comparable area.

At times, cities and businesses have come to me for help after losing hope of success, and I have succeeded in getting favorable action.

I have helped thousands of individuals, including farmers, businessmen, labor, veterans, housewives, the aged, disabled and dependent persons in presenting their claims and problems to the various departments of the Government. I regard this opportunity of service as a privilege, and among my most treasured possessions are the letters of appreciation which I have received from these people who have contacted me after all other hope of receiving help or consideration had been exhausted.

In fact, an ex-Congressman who lives in our district, and his son, a State sena-

In her term of office Sister Francetta was assisted by her young executive vice president, Sister Jacqueline Grenman, who is now president. She was recently appointed to Sargent Shriver's Committee for Project Headstart, which helps preschool children from poverty-stricken areas. Sister Jacqueline is also the only woman member of the President's Advisory Panel in Research and Development in Education.

Their superior general in the Sisters of Loretto is Sister Mary Luke Tobin, the only U.S. nun invited to be an observer at the Vatican Council.

Sister Francetta saved the story of her retirement from Webster as a scoop for the student newspaper. She said that she had long been a firm believer in the professional policy of retirement at age 65 and that the policy seemed pertinent to her. But she added that her order is also a service corps. She had called her old friend U.S. Senator STUART SYMINGTON to tell him of her proposed retirement and her interest in the war on poverty. The Senator told her to send him a letter detailing her history.

In it she said, "I am in excellent physical and mental health and could perform some function in the President's war on poverty. I am tremendously interested in the anti-poverty program and the Peace Corps. I am eager to share in some phase. There is work for me within my congregation, but I am convinced that people like me, already dedicated and committed, can perform a service in the larger complex of the needs of the world."

The letter went from Senator SYMINGTON to Sargent Shriver, and the rest is history. The Job Corps suggested that a civilian wardrobe might be more suitable. With conventual approval, she complied.

Public reaction to her appointment has been good. "I have received only the highest respect for what I'm doing, and great understanding. Letters have arrived from all over the country, from strangers and former pupils, with expressions of good will and encouragement."

One Hundredth Birthday of Millville, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago this Saturday, on February 26, 1866, the pretty city of Millville, in Cumberland County, N.J., held its meeting of incorporation and, during that evening, voted itself out of the "township" classification and into the "city" category. This event is being celebrated Saturday in Millville with a centennial parade and civic banquet.

The parade will be complete with bands, marching units, and floats, and promises to be a highlight of Millville's 100th birthday celebration which officially began on January 10, 1966.

On that day, a reenactment of the first town council meeting ever held in Millville was staged in a town meeting during which residents of Millville donned the costumes current 100 years ago and portrayed the roles of the original participants. It was probably the first town meeting ever held in which the participants received curtain calls.

Saturday's parade is the second in a

series of events being staged by the Millville Centennial Corp., to mark the end of the city's first century. On July 4, there is scheduled a gigantic community picnic and fireworks display, and on June 30 through July 2, the formal celebration will conclude with a historical pageant.

Mr. Speaker, today Millville is known as "the Holly City of America" to note the fact that the traditional Christmas season decoration is grown there in great profusion and provided to holiday time markets throughout the Nation. Millville now has some 20,000 residents and, although it is a relatively small community by some standards, its citizens are looking forward to growth and progress during their city's second century. This spirit is inherent in the manifesto which the Millville Centennial Corp. issued at the beginning of the 100th birthday celebration.

The manifesto states that Millville intends to create new civic awareness among all its citizens, plans to uncover new civic leaders, stimulate the local economy, honor its heritage, and focus its attention on the future.

I might note that two of America's most famous personages have joined in the centennial celebration. The Millville "Brothers of the Brush," a group of male residents who have grown beards reminiscent of the style of 1866, invited Astronauts Frank Borman and James A. Lovell—whose Gemini V beards became quite widely remarked upon—to accept honorary memberships in Millville's bearded brotherhood, and both accepted.

I cannot help but be proud of the spirit exhibited by Millville's residents—paying honor to yesterday while, at the same time, preparing carefully and systematically for tomorrow. I am proud to help mark the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of this progressive, charming city and look forward to joining with Millville's celebrants Saturday.

Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail Echoes President Johnson's Call for Congressional Reform of Election Spending Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Gazette-Mail of Charleston speaks forthrightly when it says:

The matter of election spending has been studied to death. The need now is to do something about it, and this is not hindered by a lack of good examples.

In Britain, careful limits and controls on reporting are enforced. In West Germany parties agree beforehand to spending limits and there is careful checking and reporting.

As the paper points out:

President Johnson recently cast a spotlight on the need for reform of laws governing election spending.

Because this editorial is a timely and lucid summary of the issue, I ask unanimous consent of my colleagues to make it a part of the RECORD.

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

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Feb. 6, 1966]

ELECTION SPENDING LAWS NEED DEGREE OF SANITY

President Johnson recently cast a spotlight on the need for reform of laws governing election spending. In so doing, he echoed the plea of the late President Kennedy and the proposals of the Republican Coordinating Committee. This is a bipartisan project, but regrettably Congress continues to ignore it.

Present laws are unrealistic to the point of being ridiculous. The Corrupt Practices Act sets a maximum spending limit of \$5,000 on congressional candidates and \$25,000 on senatorial candidates—limits that would assure defeat for any serious candidate who heeded them. Candidates therefore evade the law by proliferating campaign committees and thus there are no effective limits.

President Kennedy contended the need is for full reporting and publication of campaign expenditures, not control over amounts. As an indication of the astronomical expense of campaigns today, it cost John Lindsay and his supporters about \$2.5 million to win the recent race for mayor in New York.

Such an expenditure does not necessarily mean there is wrongdoing. It does not in any way imply an election has been "bought." As with everything else, the legitimate costs of organizing, conducting, and giving necessary public exposure to a campaign have gone up, up, up.

Indeed, there is more chance for skuldugery under the present law, when a candidate must contrive ways to cover up necessary expenditures, than there ever would be under a system of full and accurate reporting of what he actually spent.

Besides full reporting, such inducements as tax credits have been proposed to encourage giving by contributors. And there are ways to keep check on reporting and assure its honesty. In Florida's model system, for example, a candidate can have only one treasurer and must do business at only one bank to make checking manageable.

The matter of election spending has been studied to death. The need now is to do something about it, and this is not hindered by a lack of good examples. In Britain, careful limits and controls on reporting are enforced. In West Germany, parties agree beforehand to spending limits and there is careful checking and reporting.

Certainly the United States, which considers itself quite a civilized democracy, should be able to bring some sanity into our election spending laws to assure honesty and full public knowledge about what's going on. Congress should get busy and see that it is done.

Mr. Johnson Believes in Democracy for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the issue of Vietnam is gen-

Appendix

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, this month we again memorialize Abraham Lincoln. In the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, an editorial appeared on February 12, which is most helpful to those people still interested in some of the original basic American philosophies:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Throughout this broad land today the birthday of Abraham Lincoln will be observed in classroom studies, speeches, and by the printed word.

All who comment on the life and deeds of the martyred President, especially in this particular moment of our history, can do no better than recall some of his own words.

Uttered more than a century ago, these words of the Great Emancipator are still amazingly applicable to conditions in our land today:

"Till lately I have been in favor of unlimited liberty for every man as our Constitution seems to guarantee. But is it not an act of folly to give absolute liberty of conscience to a set of men who are sworn to cut our throats the very day they have their opportunity for doing it?"

"Is it right to give the privilege of citizenship to men who are the sworn enemies of our Constitution, our laws, our liberties, and our very lives? Is it not an absurdity to give to a man a thing which he is sworn to hate, curse, and destroy?"

"Sooner or later the people of the Republic must put a restriction on the exercise of liberty turned toward the destruction of that from which it came * * *. But this is the problem of another generation."

The problem of which Mr. Lincoln was speaking certainly is with the present generation, what with the poisonous seeds of communism being sown on our university campuses, in our trade unions, and even in our Nation's highest legislative halls.

Another prized utterance by President Lincoln appraised the coveted spot the United States holds in the world:

"We, the American people * * * find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portions of the earth as regards extent of territory, fertility of soil, and salubrity of climate.

"We find ourselves under the government of a system of political institutions conducting more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty than any of which the history of former times tells us. We, when mounting the stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings.

"We toiled not in the acquirement or establishment of them; they are a legacy bequeathed us by a once hardy, brave, and patriotic, but now lamented and departed, race of ancestors."

A warning as to the only way we could someday lose this great Nation was related in

other words of wisdom from the humble Abraham Lincoln, born in a log cabin in Kentucky 157 years ago today and who rose to be our 16th President:

"At what point shall we expect the point of danger? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never.

"All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

If government is kept in the hands of people, if free enterprise is allowed to flourish, if the internal threat of communism is curbed; then, as Abraham Lincoln said, no power on earth can take away the rich legacy bequeathed us by our forefathers.

Job Corps Nun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the January issue of Catholic Digest had an article by Rosemary Donihi entitled "Job Corps Nun." This article is about Sister Francetta Barberis, who is now a consultant to the Director of the Women's Job Corps Centers. As this article points out, Sister Francetta has brought with her valuable experience in working with young people.

For the benefit of my fellow colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD. I am sure that they will agree, after reading this fine article, that the war on poverty has enlisted a top general in the form of Sister Francetta.

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

JOB CORPS NUN—SISTER FRANCETTA IS NO. 2 WOMAN IN A U.S. GOVERNMENT PROJECT

(By Rosemary Donihi)

Sister Francetta Barberis, S.L., on June 1 became consultant to the director of the Women's Job Corps under the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, D.C. She retired from the presidency of Webster College in St. Louis at the same time. She has been a Sister of Loretto for 47 years, and is 65.

She is called Sister in the office though now and then a wag ventures Fran since she wears secular clothing in her new position.

Bennetta Washington is director of the Women's Job Corps and Sister Francetta is, in effect, the No. 2 woman in the voluntary training program for girls from 16 to 21.

Most of the girls dropped school after the ninth grade, have sixth-grade level skills, have been out of school for more than 6 months, and come from families living in substandard housing.

The first three residential centers for them were in St. Petersburg, Cleveland, and Los Angeles. Two more are in Charlestown, W. Va., and Omaha. With 1,500 girls registered now, 10,000 are expected before the year is out. "Our job," says Director Washington, "is to turn out a woman equipped to work, marry, and raise a family. It is not just to train the girls as secretaries, beauticians, or dental assistants."

When the St. Petersburg training center became a trouble spot, Sister Francetta was sent there. She talked with the girls, the townspeople, and the people vacationing in the city, to smooth things out. Out of the friendly conversations was born a citizens' boosters club to help make the Job Corps enrollees feel at home.

When she is home from what can become a countrywide circuit, Sister Francetta lives with both telephone and address unlisted, in a pleasantly furnished efficiency apartment in Foggy Bottom, a portion of downtown Washington near the river. The old section has been modernized for Government people like Sister Francetta, who like to walk to work.

Since her profession as a nun she has lived mostly in large religious houses with domestic staffs, but now she does her own cooking and cleaning. Her Sisters of Loretto have no Washington residence, but many of them visit her.

Her workload is constant. She goes early to the office and leaves late, but friends have given her season tickets to the National Symphony and the experimental Arena Stage. She goes to mass at the church of St. Stephen the Worker, the late President Kennedy's White House parish.

Her wardrobe is built around suits and soft-shirt dresses, more often dark than light. For summer she was equipped with three handbags: one white patent leather, one brown, and one black. She is a major Government executive and dresses for it. Her silver-threaded dark hair is medium short and softly permanented. She does it herself. She takes an engaging pleasure in your honest declaration that she looks 15 years younger than she is.

Until her 18th year, Sister Francetta trained to be a professional ballerina, but then chose the convent. "Now," she says, "I am dancing in spirit all the time."

Sister Francetta focused national attention on Webster College during her 7 years as president. Since her arrival there in 1958, it has embarked on a revolutionary new program of teacher training, more than doubled its faculty, increased the number of lay persons on the faculty, and attracted professors of many faiths.

Physically, the college complex has tripled; the attendance has nearly doubled; men have been admitted to full-course schedules in the department of fine arts, music, and theater arts. A \$1.5 million center of performing arts has been made possible through gifts and pledges of Sister Francetta's long-time friend, hotelman Conrad N. Hilton. Theater Impact, a semiprofessional summer stock company, has been successfully launched.

erating so much heat it is heartening to encounter the light of Mr. Spivack's February 17, 1966, column, "Watch on the Potomac," in the New York Journal American. Mr. Spivack rightly points out that if the President had only to cope with those critics who openly support the Vietcong, there would be no problem.

But when President Johnson is faced with the kind of insidious defeatism which preaches that the Vietnamese, and for that matter all of the people of southeast Asia, do not understand democracy and that it is futile to believe that democracy can live in that part of the world, then his foreign policy burdens are immeasurably increased.

This kind of criticism dangerously feeds on the reactionary belief in racial superiority and isolationism and is often mouthed by alleged liberals who believe that it is better to consign the people of southeast Asia to the "tender mercies" of the Communists than to wage a war for their liberation.

I commend this article to the attention of our colleagues.

HONOLULU AND THE DEFEATISTS

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—The President's foreign policy burdens are being immeasurably increased—not by "appeasers" in and out of Congress, but by defeatists.

If he had only to cope with those few who openly support the Vietcong there would be no problem. If his critics argued that the way to handle a bully is to yield to him, their public support would be minuscule. Every man, within his own experience, from school days to adulthood, knows that a bully does not stop until he is made to stop.

But when critics, especially those who assume the mantle of foreign policy "experts," argue that democracy "can't win" in southeast Asia, that the Communist tide sweeping that part of the world cannot be turned back, then you have problems.

Nothing can so sap the spirit of an individual, or a nation, as constant repetition of the theme, "It can't be done."

It was to get away from this kind of depressing atmosphere that the President decided to fly to Hawaii to meet with the South Vietnamese leaders, to reaffirm our objectives as they were stated in "The Declaration of Honolulu" and to give hope to the people of Vietnam as well as our troops.

When he returned to the mainland the President said he was "refreshed." There was good reason for it. What he heard in Hawaii was far more encouraging than what he was hearing in Washington. The American and Vietnamese military men agreed with Premier Ky's assertion that, within 7 months, the situation in the field had changed "100 percent." Not only are the non-Communists not losing, the military initiative is now in our hands.

But what greeted the President on his return to Andrews Air Force Base?

First there was a columnist's broad, sweeping assertion that the whole Government has "gone stale." Less than 24 hours after the Hawaiian conferees had agreed to wage a war on "social misery" in Vietnam, there were whining complaints about the lack of "fresh ideas."

Next came a series of recommendations from nonmilitary men that we ought to ease up on the pressure against the Communists, adopting, in effect, a Maginot Line strategy. This was hardly a fresh idea.

But underlying all this criticism there was something else—a kind of racist superiority on the part of those who disclaim racism of any kind, some of whom have, in fact, been active in civil rights activities.

We are now being told that the Vietnamese are so different from Americans that it is impossible for them to have anything resembling a democratic form of government.

This is an insidious kind of defeatism. Although those who talk this way may consider themselves "liberals," the appeal is to the most reactionary instincts, to isolationist sentiment, and to those who feel racially superior.

What the defeatists overlook is the fact that many Orientals, Japanese, Filipinos, and others are building democracy, despite their cultural differences with us. Certainly the President believes it can be done. That's why the conference was held in half-Asian Hawaii—to show the real spirit of Honolulu.

Life of Alfred Sloan Belies Red Claim of Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, the distinguished columnist and publisher, wrote a most perceptive and penetrating article which appeared in the Washington Star, on the life of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., a guiding force in the building of the General Motors business empire.

Mr. Lawrence makes the point eloquently that Red China could never have an Alfred Sloan because its totalitarian, communistic economic policies would preclude his development.

It is the basic story of individual initiative compared to the stifling of individual freedom.

Because of the broad general interest of this article to my colleagues and to the Nation, I have unanimous consent that the column be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

LIFE OF SLOAN BELIES RED CLAIM

(By David Lawrence)

In the realm of communism—whether in the Soviet Union or Red China or in other parts of the world—the constant cry is that capitalism is selfish and inhumane and that social welfare can be achieved in each country only by giving arbitrary power to a small group of men.

But today the people of the Communist world could learn a lesson if they read the obituaries being printed about the life of Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., who died last Thursday at the age of 90. For here was a man who amassed a fortune of more than \$300 million, but gave virtually all of it away for the cause of human welfare.

There have been others like Sloan in American history, but the stories of their altruism are too often lost in the maze of other happenings in a busy world.

Sloan was one of the ablest businessmen this country has produced. Men engaged in big business are sometimes pictured as heartless or as materialistic to the extreme. It may come as a surprise to many of the younger generation who lean toward the Communist philosophy to discover that there are far more philanthropists among the successful businessmen of American than there are selfish human beings.

Sloan's case is a significant example of how money is made and how it can be spent.

It was his genius in building up General Motors to one of the largest businesses in the world that made it possible not only for him, but for others who invested in that enterprise, to earn large sums as the stock of the company appreciated steadily in value over the years.

In 1937, Sloan created the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, with an initial grant of \$10 million, to help studies in science and economics and broadened it later to aid in medical care and research, particularly in cancer. He said at the time he gave away the \$10 million:

"Having been connected with industry during my entire life, it seems eminently proper that I should turn back, in part, the proceeds of that activity with the hope of promoting a broader as well as a better understanding of the economic principles and national policies which have characterized American enterprise down through the years."

Sloan was a modest man. He rarely made public speeches or talked about his ventures into the field of philanthropy. He was deeply concerned with the functioning of the free enterprise system and with the right of every individual to improve his lot by his own efforts in cooperation with others.

Sloan was also a great executive. He once said:

"I never give orders. I sell my ideas to my associates if I can. I accept their judgment if they convince me, as they frequently do, that I am wrong. I prefer to appeal to the intelligence of a man rather than attempt to exercise authority over him.

"Get the facts. Recognize the equities of all concerned. Realize the necessity of doing a better job every day. Keep an open mind and work hard. The last is most important of all. There is no shortcut."

Under the American system of free enterprise, individual initiative is encouraged. The same cannot be said of the Communist system. Indeed, the American standard of living is the highest in the world, and so are its philanthropies.

Private contributions for charitable programs of various kinds in the United States totaled \$10.6 billion in 1964. No individual really is able to accumulate enough to give any substantial part of that big sum. But the large givers in every city are usually businessmen. Many of Sloan's associates, for instance, have followed his example and have donated much of their earnings to philanthropic projects.

Sloan's life emphasizes the great advantages of the American system of individual freedom, as contrasted with the oppressive and truly selfish system of communism by which a few men achieve power and impose their will on hundreds of millions of their countrymen.

There are many unsung heroes in the commercial world, but the impact of their redistribution of wealth has certainly been felt in America by universities and colleges, churches, hospitals, and other institutions supported by philanthropy.

Chester W. Nimitz: An American Naval Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 4 days before his 81st birthday, Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz died. This Nation, and especially the hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who served under him, now

sadly join in a farewell tribute to a great U.S. naval figure. He came from a small town in Texas to eventually command and lead to complete victory the greatest naval force ever assembled on this globe. His service to his country can never be forgotten and his attributes as an American officer will stand always as an example of the finest in a great tradition.

Following his graduation as seventh in a class of 114 in the class of 1905 of the Naval Academy, Admiral Nimitz handled a wide variety of assignments in a meritorious manner. His rise in his chosen career was finally capped by a tour of 2 years, 1945-47, as the highest uniformed naval officer in this country. But he will always be remembered as the man who assumed command of the Pacific Fleet in the dark days of December 1941 and who led it to a brilliant victory over Imperial Japan. Combining a great strategic perspective, an eminently successful tactical competence, an ability to get the most from his men, and a resolution to persevere until victory, he led the American naval forces through a series of battles and campaigns to Tokyo Bay in September 1945. He started with a badly hurt fleet and nursed it and built it into the greatest striking force the world has ever seen.

After his outstanding military career he continued his public service in many positions of a private and public character. He always displayed his traits of geniality, humanity, and intelligence in a fashion to do honor to himself and his Nation. He finally retired to his home near San Francisco in 1956. It is with great pride as an American that I extend to his wife and four children my deep respects and sincere condolences on this sad day.

Rent Dole Could Lead to Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, aside from the immorality of the Federal Government taking the hard-earned dollars of working taxpayers to pay the rent for those unwilling or unable to afford better housing, the whole system of handouts opens the door to widespread scandals. There already has been evidence of massive corruption in the poverty programs, but no one seems interested in bringing it to light. Before Congress appropriates money for rent subsidies, we had better make sure that all the loopholes for chiselers and dishonest officials have been closed.

The well-known columnist, Lyle Wilson, had a warning on this subject in the Washington Daily News of February 23, "Beware of Scandal." I include the article as a part of these remarks.

BWARE OF SCANDAL
(By Lyle Wilson)

Editorials predict that President Johnson's rent supplement plan would invite outra-

geous scandal. The Miami Herald headed its editorial with these words: A subsidy for scandal. The editorial made these points in support of its prediction:

Original rent guidelines were so loosely drawn that families with annual incomes of \$8,100 would have been eligible.

The Federal Housing Administration, which would administer the rent dole, lacks both experience and the staff to prevent chiseling.

There has been no effective congressional action to assure adequately enforced standards of eligibility.

There is another disturbing aspect of the rent dole. It is that distribution of charity among the voters traditionally has been a vital part of boss rule and corruption in the great cities. William Marcy Tweed was the most notorious of the city bosses. Boss Tweed was Grand Sachem of New York's Tammany Hall. In 1805, 16 years after organization of the Tammany Society, it was incorporated as the charitable institution. Scribner's concise Dictionary of American History relates the sturdy growth of Tammany Hall in part as follows:

"The enfranchisement of propertyless whites (1822), which Tammany had championed, was the source of its gradual growth to power. Until the advent of William M. Tweed as leader (1860), Tammany Hall differed from other urban political organizations only in degree. He made it a smoothly running juggernaut, which has served as a model for city machines. Tweed controlled the mob by catering to its religious and racial groups and by gifts to the poor."

Gifts to the poor. A bucket of coal, a hamper of food, clothing when needed, some folding money on election day. It all added up to corruption. Boss rule and bag government built up a foundation of which a dole or a subsidy or a supplement, all pretty much alike, created and enforced the loyalties upon which political power was based. Tweed happened to be a Democrat. There were equally corrupt Republicans in New York and elsewhere.

Political corruption is not limited to but has been most notable in large American cities. Corruption is likely to flourish where politicians can buy the gratitude of voters with public or private funds or can coerce voters by the power to withhold funds from needy citizens. Poverty fertilizes the field of corruption. Bad administration of public funds invited corruption regardless of the purpose to which the funds are appropriated.

A decent respect for the public welfare requires that President Johnson and the Congress take adequate precautions against the rent dole becoming a subsidy for scandal.

UN
Now, as Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker—

I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy.

The New York Journal-American gives this quote, noting that—

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then.

The paper feels that the dissension voiced in this country "may convey to

Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag."

The words of warning seem apropos, and I suggest that the editorial on the subject be made a part of the Record. It is herewith submitted.

NOW, AS THEN

"I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy."

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then, and his birthday makes their recollection appropriate in this time of national stress when our difficulties without are rendered more serious by dissensions within.

The quitters are in full, loud voice. They would have us pull out of Vietnam, willy-nilly, in virtual surrender and world disgrace, in shameful abandonment of pledge and honor.

There are, too, sincere doubters who believe our engagement in Vietnam should never have been started. These, too, are in demanding chorus.

And there are, of course, the outright Communists within our midst, and their duped peacenicks who seek by clamor to frustrate reason.

There are dissensions by many whose stature gives importance to their views and by many of low station whose importance is that their noise may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag.

But the flag still is and will be, to the day of victory, a banner of meaningful stars and stripes so historically made possible by George Washington and now so historically maintained by President Johnson and the vast majority of the American people.

An Atlanta Boy Meets the Poverty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has come in for a certain amount of criticism lately because of a few isolated instances of apparent favoritism or poor judgment in the selection of youths enrolled in the program. I believe that the vast majority of such cases were simply instances in which decidedly disadvantaged youth were not quite poor enough—their families perhaps had annual incomes of up to \$4,000 or so, rather than the \$3,150 figure established as the poverty guideline for a four-person family.

Overall, I think the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is being administered in an excellent fashion, and is achieving the intended results. As an indication of what I mean I insert at this point in the Record an article by Marvin Wall which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on January 21, concerning a disadvantaged young man who, like countless others, has found the door to opportunity through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA

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

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the vast majority of my constituents, when I say that it was with the greatest regret and personal sadness that I learned that the great senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, will retire at the end of this year.

PAT McNAMARA has been an outstanding servant of the people of Michigan; he has been a respected and beloved legislator; he has been, to many of my colleagues, and to me, a valued mentor. In the 12 years that PAT McNAMARA has served his State and his country, he has been a driving force behind some of the most important social legislation of the century: Hospital and health care for the elderly, aid to education, civil rights, and the first concerted Federal efforts to fight poverty.

As the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, he has been responsible for programs that are helping to provide thousands of cities and towns with capital improvements that are soon translated into new jobs and improved health and welfare. This is the proud legacy that PAT McNAMARA will leave our Nation when he retires next January.

After a lifetime of dedicated service, first as a leader in trade unionism and then in public service, PAT deserves to be able to ease up a bit. I wish him well in his retirement; but the Michigan congressional delegation and the people of Michigan will miss his leadership in the coming years.

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

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

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that this afternoon when one vote came on a quorum call and another on adoption of the rule on the foreign aid bill I was with Dr. Irving Muskat, chairman of Interama, in conference with the Honorable John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, relative to some vital aspects of Interama and was not able to get back in time for these votes. However, I have, of course, voted on the other votes respecting the foreign aid bill, including final passage of the bill today.

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

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the power of prayer, I was deeply moved, as were others present, by the remarks of President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 14th annual President's prayer breakfast meeting, held last Thursday, February 17.

Burdened by the weight of decision-making demanded by his high office, and having to make decisions calling for sending of American young men into the battlefields of Vietnam, our President stated that he has found the courage to face the next day in prayer. He quoted the words of another tormented President of a past generation, Abraham Lincoln:

I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day.

President Johnson added that his strength comes not only from his own prayers, but also from the prayers of the mothers who have given their sons to our country, and who in their great sorrow still found the courage to write him and to pray for him. The President was preceded by the world renowned evangelist, the Reverend Dr. Billy Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in the hope that those who did not hear the president may gain a better understanding of the heart and mind of our great leader by a reading of the complete text of his moving and inspiring remarks made on February 17, 1966, at the 14th annual president's prayer breakfast held at the Shorham Hotel here in Washington, under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 14TH ANNUAL PRAYER BREAKFAST AT THE SHORHAM HOTEL, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

Dr. Graham, my beloved friend, Senator CARLSON, distinguished guests at the head table, my dear friends, I am pleased to return again to our annual prayer breakfast to be among so many of my old friends. In this room this morning we have been privileged to hear one of the great speakers and leaders of our time. He has been heard by some of the great leaders of the most powerful nations in the world, yet not a single one of us is ashamed to say, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Just a few blocks from here, on the front of the National Archives, is an inscription, "The past is prologue." As your President, I have had many occasions to realize the truth of that statement. Throughout our long history our Presidents have struggled with recurring problems. The way they handle those problems and their successes or failures can guide us in the actions that we are called upon to take today.

But there are some things that history cannot teach us and among them is how to bear, without pain, the sending of our young Americans into battle and how to fill the aching void as we wait for the news of their

fate and how to console the wife, or the mother, or the little children when that news is bad.

These are the times when I recall the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "I have been driven to my knees many times by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seem insufficient for the day." In private prayer at unusual moments, I have found courage to meet another day in a world where peace upon earth is still only an empty dream.

The Prophet Isaiah tells us, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint."

I believe that with all my heart, but in these troubled times I am sustained by much more than my own prayers. I am sustained by the prayers of hundreds of Americans who daily take the time to look up from their own problems in order to try to give me a little encouragement in mine. Not long ago I received a letter one morning from a mother whose son had been killed in Vietnam. She spoke of the pain and the loss and the tears that are ever ready to flow, but through all of this were words of encouragement for me from this dear little lady.

In her letter she concluded, "Mr. President, I wish I could tell you all that I feel in my heart. There just aren't words, so we ask God to bless you and your little family, that He will guide you in all the terrible decisions that you must make. As long as we believe, our strength is in our faith in God and He will never fail us."

My countrymen, in those words from that dear mother are to be found the greatness of this Nation and also the strength of its President.

FINANCING OF WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the fine explanation of H.R. 12752 provided by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and I appreciate his appeal for our support of its enactment.

I likewise appreciate the very pointed admonitions set forth by the ranking minority Member the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. It is heartwarming to know that an issue as vital as the financing of the war in Vietnam has such bipartisan support. However, I also agree with my colleagues who feel most strongly that this is, at least to some degree, discriminatory legislation.

Last June we removed the excise tax on many, many items, including a partial removal of the excise tax on automobiles and telephone charges. It occurs to me that we might have turned to the more luxury-type area to reimpose the excise tax. A tax on luxury items is certainly not one that touches the impoverished or the workingman. I concede also that the machinery is still in operation for collecting the excise tax on automobiles and telephones, and for that reason, it seems most appropriate that this be the area, though I reluctantly agree, where additional revenue must be found.

We all loathe the war and none can deny that we are now engaged in a cruel war in Vietnam. Our servicemen dare not

be denied the implements of war or the necessities for their subsistence, but since we are now engaged in this involvement I find no recourse except to approved the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

I do so with the hope that in a very brief period of time we can restore these tax cuts and that the additional costs of warfare will be lifted from the backs of our taxpayers. While making this necessary adjustment now, I agree most wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we need to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures for domestic purposes—and such eliminations can be made. However, those who are suffering from inadequate economic resources today, those who have been disadvantaged by years of economic drought as many of the inhabitants of the Appalachia region, should not be made to suffer the first expenditure cuts. Wise expenditures of aid for these areas will help to replenish the treasury in the future and improve income.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly express approval of the legislation in the hope that what we do here today, out of prudence, will provide assurances for victory in Vietnam.

THE REDWOODS DESERVE BETTER THAN COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on conservation, delivered yesterday, is one of the most far-reaching and far-sighted on this subject of all time. The President is to be highly commended for his generally excellent program, and particularly on his proposals to combat water pollution.

California's Governor Brown deserves credit for his efforts leading to the inclusion of a Redwood National Park in this program and for his work to secure provision of appropriate economic adjustment payments.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid or honest if I were to say the administration's redwood proposal is adequate to preserve this great and unique resource. Unfortunately, it falls far short of what is necessary if any meaningful stands of redwoods are to be preserved for future generations of Americans.

It takes a thousand years or more to grow mature redwoods, and, once cut, much longer still to establish a climax forest, if indeed that is possible at all. This point, incidentally, is not the opinion of novices or special-interest representatives. This point was made by the National Park Service in its report of September 1964, prophetically entitled "The Redwoods, a National Opportunity for Conservation."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the administration's bill would appear to ignore this very message. It appears to disregard the simple but staggering fact that only 10 percent—or 200,000 acres—of this country's original redwood forest remains to-

day. It appears to ignore the reality that last year alone some 15,000 acres of redwood giants fell to the woodman's ax, and that more are being felled—many in the very area proposed for preservation—as we talk.

These facts plainly indicate that bold action is required, but bold action does not characterize the administration's plan.

This plan calls for a 43,392-acre park in the Mill Creek area of Del Norte County, including the present Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast State Parks. But when these State parks are included, only some 25,000 acres would be added to protected status; only 7,800 acres of additional virgin redwoods would be included, and much of this is either of mediocre quality or in the process of being cut.

This Mill Creek area is primarily important as watershed protection for the two existing State parks. It would not compare in quality or variety, in scenic or recreational features, with the 90,000-acre park at Redwood and Prairie Creeks which 28 of our colleagues in the House have joined me in calling for, and which 16 Members of the Senate introduced yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed about the plan to provide a separate unit of 1,400 acres in Humboldt County to protect the world's tallest trees. It is not that these trees do not need protection; they need it desperately. But this provision of only 1,400 acres raises false hopes that they could be preserved for long. Once the surrounding valley slopes are logged off, as they inevitably will be, the tallest redwoods will be exposed to wind and flood and soil erosion which will quickly number their years.

The most serious weakness in the administration's proposal, however, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of the Redwood and Prairie Creek Valleys, where sweeping vistas combine with primeval forest and wild, clear streams in a setting of unmatched grandeur. Here nearly 80,000 acres of unprotected forests are available, 33,000 of which are forested with virgin redwoods.

This is the area originally identified as most desirable for a redwood national park in a National Geographic Society study.

This is the area first recommended by the National Park Service.

This is the area for a redwood park supported by the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the National Audubon Society, the National Parks Association, the Men's Garden Clubs of America, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Nature Conservancy, Trustees for Conservation, Citizens for a Redwood National Park, and the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

This is the area provided for in bills introduced by 45 Members of the House and Senate.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that insufficient funds presently exist to acquire this entire area of primary desirability. But the answer to this limitation is not to put the limited funds available to second best use.

The answer is that if only \$56 million is available, it should be put to use in buying the best land available; \$56 million can make a very desirable start in acquiring an outstanding Redwood National Park in the Redwood Creek area, though certainly an even more desirable one could be purchased with more plentiful funds. And if we begin in the right place we can make appropriate additions as this becomes possible.

Compromise is not worthy of this great resource. Let us pursue its preservation with the vision, imagination and determination it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning, in an editorial entitled, "Retreat on Redwoods," comments thoughtfully and perceptively on this very problem. I commend it to our colleagues' attention:

RETREAT ON REDWOODS

In his message on conservation yesterday, President Johnson put forward an excellent program to combat water pollution, on which we will comment later, and he reaffirmed his support for several desirable bills now pending for national parks and seashores.

But on one of the most controversial of current issues in this field—the size of the proposed Redwood National Park in northern California—his stand is a sharp disappointment.

For some months the administration has been wavering between two plans. One, embodied in a bill by Representative COHELAN, of California, would establish a 90,000-acre park. More than a score of House Members have introduced similar bills. The alternative plan drafted within the Interior Department provided for a drastically smaller park. It would have afforded no protection to Redwood Creek Valley, which has the best surviving stand of primeval redwoods. But it would have been much more acceptable to the commercial interests that want to saw these ancient trees—some of them more than 2,000 years old—into lumber for use as building material, fenceposts, and similar purposes.

Public protests against this timidly conceived, grossly inadequate plan led to the last-minute compromise which the administration sent to Congress yesterday. It is a compromise that will satisfy no one who understands the values at stake in the preservation for all time of these unique, magnificent trees. We note with surprise and regret that Senator KUCHEL, of California, has agreed to sponsor this highly unsatisfactory bill, and with even more surprise and regret that Secretary Udall lends his reputation as a conservationist to such an unworthy compromise.

Only 43,000 acres are to be included in this proposed park. Since this acreage includes two existing State parks, little more than half of the land would be newly protected. Moreover, fewer than 7,000 acres would consist of primeval redwoods. The Redwood Creek Valley would remain available for private exploitation—except for one pathetically small enclosure of 1,400 acres, isolated from the rest of the park.

Buying up these redwood lands from private owners would be expensive, but dollars cannot be decisive when the asset is irreplaceable. As President Johnson so eloquently said in his message, "Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore." We urge Congress to take the President at his word and to create a Redwood National Park worthy of his rhetoric and of the great trees that are an indescribably beautiful part of America's natural heritage.

gram, and urge that the necessary funds be included in the 1967 fiscal year budget so this important construction program can continue without interruption.

FEDERAL REVENUES FOR USE IN STATE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my Republican colleagues in introducing legislation to share a portion of Federal revenues with each State for use in public elementary and secondary education.

The bill would establish an educational assistance trust fund, into which 1 percent of the revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule would be deposited the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year, and thereafter.

Tax sharing for education is based on a two-part formula: half of the money would be returned to the States on a per-student basis; the other half would be based on the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education. "Effort" is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education.

The concept of tax sharing to bolster the State's abilities to provide those services which are within its domain is an attractive one to all those who fear intervention by Washington in local matters. Education, along with other services, is becoming more and more difficult for States to afford. State taxes have risen steadily, from \$4.9 billion 20 years ago to \$24.2 billion in 1964. In 1963 alone, property taxes rose 7.3 percent over 1962 rates, sales taxes increased by 8.7 percent, corporation taxes by 7.5 percent, and personal income tax by 6.3 percent.

All this has been caused by the increase in State and local expenditures. These have risen by 600 percent since the mid-1940's. The cost of education alone has risen over 700 percent in that time, from \$3 billion in 1946 to \$22 billion. And this outlay for education is expected to double by 1972.

State and local taxes have risen about as high as they can go, with the Federal Government preempting so much of the national income through Federal income tax. This leaves State and local governments in the position of having no place to turn except to the Federal Government.

However, the knowledge of local situations, needs, and problems is at the local and State level. They are far better able to improve their educational programs themselves. Gigantic Federal programs too often result in Federal control and the imposition of rules which are not in the best interests of education in all areas.

This year we have seen several localities in the United States refuse aid under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because they feared

overcontrol by the Office of Education. They would rather struggle along in freedom than lose control of the education of their children to those in far-removed offices in Washington.

For experience has taught us that Federal subsidy brings Federal control. The tax-sharing plan, however, lets the Federal Government provide the funds and lets the States determine how these can best be used to supplement their own efforts.

Built into the formula is the assurance that no State will then decide to sit back and let Uncle Sam pay the bills, for the amount a State receives depends in great part upon its own per student expenditures. If anything, this will spur the States on to greater effort.

To assure that the money is spent for education, plans will be submitted by the Governor to the Comptroller General of the United States each year, and at the end of the year an audit must be submitted to show actual use. This approach gives a tremendous boost to the education of our young people. Per pupil expenditures can increase greatly through Federal contributions and at the same time, incentive will be provided for each State to make even more effort on its own.

There would be no need for a great expansion of Federal personnel in Washington to administer the program—it would be handled by the local officials already on the job. It would yield us the greatest return on our investment, for it would utilize the best capabilities of each level of government.

Our federal system is a precious freedom which we must strive to preserve and strengthen. It is built firmly upon the Federal-State cooperation and division of powers and responsibilities, such as I propose in this bill. And like every other precious thing we know in America, its strength is in the education of each new generation to carry it on and protect it. Surely, then, we can make no wiser investment in our Nation's future than by the speedy passage of this bill.

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

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

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

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

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday at page 3615, line 44, are the words:

Profound though, as prayer.

Certain words of my remarks were inadvertently deleted. The Record should read:

He was a profound theologian, as his prayers amply indicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be so corrected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. VANIK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

UN ROTATION NOW IN VIETNAM

Mr. SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that from thinly populated Wyoming, with less than 320,000 human beings, six families have been called upon to pay the supreme price of the escalation of our Vietnam military posture.

These six fatalities are:

First. Alma Jack Stumpp, Afton, Wyo.

Second. Ernest Taylor, Jr., Kaycee, Wyo.

Third. Robert Fred Guthrie, Cheyenne, Wyo.

Fourth. Craig Blackner, Lyman, Wyo.

Fifth. Sam Lee Delos, Ten Sleep, Wyo.

Sixth. Ladd Condry, Cheyenne, Wyo.

What is particularly tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that in the case of at least two of the above war casualties from Wyoming had there been some type of rotation policy in effect in Vietnam their lives might have been spared.

Mr. Guthrie, a young man from Cheyenne, Wyo., was killed within 30 days prior to the completion of his tour of duty—after a 4-year hitch as a corpsman in the U.S. Marines.

On November 17, 1965, Ernest E. Taylor—a specialist 4th class—from Kaycee, Wyo., was killed in action. Two days before, he had written to friends that he expected to be released from combat duty on December 10 to begin his trip home, following his stretch of duty. In this case he was killed less than 3 weeks prior to the completion of his tour.

These two deaths show again the necessity for a review now of the military policy that asks far too much of a few while far too many get by giving far too little in this process of defending America in time of its military engagements.

Because of my own personal experience in the 1st Infantry Division in World War II, Mr. Speaker, an American Regular Army Division again engaged in com-

three reasons that would explain the stubbornness. One is that a large trade surplus would be a great credit to the trade agreements program. It would bear out the predictions made on behalf of the program and the hopes centered in it. It would justify the undertaking by the fruits it had borne.

Not to be overlooked is the reflection that a large export surplus would also put a pleasing sheen on the feverish efforts and motions of the Department of Commerce to promote exports. With no surplus to show for these efforts it might be more difficult to coax more money out of Congress.

The third item is perhaps the most pernicious of the three. The so-called export surplus is used as evidence that the industries of this country are indeed competitive in world markets. Moreover, the high surplus shows that we could absorb further drastic tariff cuts with little risk of damage to our industries.

If the authentic results of our trade demonstrate that we are not really competitive abroad except in two or three products, our trade position takes on a wholly different complexion. The fact is that so far as exports of manufactured goods are concerned we have been experiencing a shrinking in our share compared with other countries. The principal exception is machinery. Our exports of this item have boomed hand in hand with the rising tide of investment of our industries abroad. This may be temporary and may result in shrinking foreign markets for goods shipped from this country in the future. Exports of farm products have also risen to record heights, but this swelling volume is attributable to shipments under Public Law 480, food for peace and similar programs. They do not reflect an improvement of our competitive position in agricultural products.

It seems unthinkable that under these circumstances we should offer to the world another 50-percent tariff reduction. Recently, Mr. William M. Roth, Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in a speech before the United States-Japan Trade Council, said:

Actually, much has been accomplished so far in Geneva. Items to be excepted from the across-the-board 50-percent cut in industrial tariffs were tabled in November 1964. Our exceptions were kept at the barest minimum consistent with considerations of overriding national security.

Referring to the so-called Kennedy round he also said:

This ambitious effort, the greatest in the 20-year history of GATT trade negotiations, will not fail because of any lack of will or determination of the United States to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion.

So, Mr. Speaker, the policy is to push through the 50-percent reduction in any event. If the facts of our nonexistent trade surplus that have recently come to light do not greatly temper the determination mentioned by Mr. Roth, we can only wonder what is the administration's real attitude toward domestic industry. Is it to be sacrificed willy-nilly because

Congress passed the Trade Act over 3 years ago under the false impression that we were riding high in foreign export markets?

I do not believe that we should plunge blindly ahead with further drastic tariff reductions when our trade statistics, if properly reported, would reveal our weak competitive position in world markets.

We would be ill advised, I am convinced, to proceed under the assumption that present high levels of production and employment in this country would justify opening up our market to growing volumes of imports when it is clear that so far as really competitive trade is concerned we are running a deficit. If there is any doubt about this deficit, I think it should be cleared up.

I am joining others who have introduced a joint resolution calling on the Commerce and Treasury Departments to issue summary trade reports that will show our true competitive standing in the world rather than obscuring the facts. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will hold early hearings so that all doubts can be resolved.

FRED BUSBEY, THE RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the passing of my very good friend, Fred Busbey, who served in this body with distinction in the 78th, 80th, 82d, and 83d Congresses. Inasmuch as he was elected from what is generally known as a politically marginal district, he was not able to have continuity of service and the opportunity to demonstrate his full worth. Notwithstanding this, in each Congress that he served he contributed immeasurably to its deliberations.

We frequently use the descriptive term "rugged individualist" without our always being quite certain what it means. But I think that anyone who was privileged to know Fred Busbey would understand exactly what is meant when we refer to him as a "rugged individualist." He was a man of convictions with courage of his convictions, and more than just ordinary courage. He would fight to the bitter end, even if he stood alone, for what he believed. Nothing could deter him.

During World War I he served as a Regular Army sergeant, and he participated in some of the hardest fought battles of that war. He was proud of this, and justly so. And as I fondly reflect on Fred's service in the Congress, he showed the same ruggedness and determination and ingenuity that somewhat typifies a military sergeant. He did not seek glory for glory's sake. He sought results, and he got results.

With the passing of Fred Busbey I have lost a very fine friend. He will never be forgotten by any of us privileged to know him.

McNENNY FISH HATCHERY AT SPEARFISH, S. DAK.

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate to find that the 1967 budget for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife does not include any proposed expenditure for the current building and expansion program being undertaken at the McNenny Fish Hatchery at Spearfish, S. Dak.

The McNenny hatchery, constructed in 1951, produces rainbow and brown trout primarily for stocking waters in the Black Hills trout management area. This area contains about 175 miles of trout streams and 1,900 acres of trout lakes, which provide an estimated 800,000 man-hours of angling annually. In addition to this, this hatchery supplies 17 counties in western South Dakota, 21 counties in western North Dakota, 10 counties in eastern Wyoming, and a large Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in Nebraska. The average annual production of all species is about 70,000 pounds.

During the past several years the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and State and local governments have constructed numerous new impoundments in South Dakota, and the three neighboring States. Many of these reservoirs provide excellent trout fishing; however, to maintain the fishery, frequent planting of fingerling fish are required. Requests for fingerling trout by management agencies exceed the present production capabilities of the hatchery.

The McNenny hatchery also serves as a production test center for the formulation and testing of fish diets. This has resulted in significant improvements in our ability to produce quality diets at substantial cost savings. A new building is needed to house testing and diet formulation equipment, and to provide additional fingerling production facilities. With funds provided in fiscal year 1966—\$25,000—a well is at the present time being drilled to supplement the hatchery's water supply.

The development program, which I shall outline in a moment, must be undertaken to increase the production of fish and to improve efficiency of operations immediately. The expanded facilities would mean about 100,000 pounds of trout could be produced annually, approximately doubling the present fingerling production.

The development program includes the following items:

Pipeline.....	\$10,000
Broodstock raceways.....	20,000
Production building and facilities..	120,000
Residence.....	20,000
Sewage disposal system.....	20,000
Equipment.....	15,000

Therefore, the total estimated cost of the program is \$205,000. I urge the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and each Member of this House to carefully consider this building pro-

bat in Vietnam—I believe it is proper to call to the attention of my colleagues at this time this glaring inequity in the Armed Forces of the United States. I have, accordingly, written to the Secretary of Defense suggesting a rotation policy for men in combat, and if none is forthcoming, I shall introduce legislation to that effect.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that these conflicts in policing the world—and particularly our Vietnam commitment—may extend for a long period of time. This being true, a certain number of set days in combat or “in contact with the enemy,” becomes the only real goal which a fighting man understands in carrying out the daily ordeals of combat.

We in the Halls of Congress, we in the safe, well-fed sectors of America, may be moved by the euphonious principals daily restated in these difficult times. But to men eating the C-rations and sleeping in swamps, to men digging holes in the jungle and fighting and dying—so many days in combat and then home—this is the only language they truly understand.

A man in combat feels one thing above all else—and that is that he stays alive in order to come home to his loved ones. If a rotation policy is in effect, he is a better soldier because of it. If one is not in effect, Mr. Speaker, he has no goal; he has only bleakness and a constantly doubtful moral factor at best, which will always affect his proficiency.

I stress again, Mr. Speaker, experience has taught us that the first thing for which any man fights is his self preservation. I believe we had better establish a firm and definite policy of rotation for our great fighting men now. It should be so many days in combat, during all of which they may look forward to returning home. Thus somebody in the training camps or civilian life in America, can take their place to carry on the fight which means so much to so many.

I believe a strong immediate rotation policy should be placed in effect so that at least five riflemen with the most overseas duty per company per month should be rotated home and replaced with recruits from stateside.

I believe these five men should come from every combat unit in South Vietnam, and I believe that at least two men should be rotated home from all support, supply, and other noncombat units now in these theaters of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I stress that this is a matter of equity and of the basic concepts of justice—and I hope my colleagues will take an interest in this vital matter.

In World War II in the Big Red One—the 1st Division—it was said that there were two ways to get home, by rotation or in a pine box—in a mattress cover, to be exact. In my sparsely populated district, which is the State of Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, six young men have come home so far via a pine box, it is time now to assure that the next six to come home to Wyoming come home alive and well, and able to know the respect and admiration of a grateful people.

THE WAR THAT FOREIGN AID FIGHTS

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am told by those who have visited the battlefronts in South Vietnam that average life expectancy in Vietnam is only 35 years. You may be surprised to learn, however, that this figure has nothing to do with the bullets of the Communist enemy. This figure is the result of the ravages of other enemies: disease, hunger, and ignorance. The United States is engaged in a war on these killers as well as the terror and death spread by the Vietcong.

The soldiers on this second front are the teams of doctors being trained with the help of U.S. medical personnel and equipment provided through our AID program. Medical centers in Hue and Saigon are now graduating 150 doctors a year to take charge of the country's expanding medical services. More than 12,000 health centers have been established and stocked with medicines in rural health programs manned by 8,000 newly-trained village health workers. When the United States started its battle against disease and squalor in Vietnam, there were fewer than 200 civilian doctors attending to the medical needs of 16 million people.

The importance of this effort is not diminished by the fact that Vietcong guerrillas destroy some of the new health units as soon as they are constructed. In every village where a Government health center is caring for the sick and undernourished there is visible proof of which side is concerned with the welfare of the people, proof which the Vietcong seek to obliterate.

The AID-supported health program started with the introduction of sanitary water supplies in the ancient capital of Hue, as well as in Saigon. In rural areas, outdoor sanitary facilities have been added.

A major campaign against malaria which was initiated with the help of U.S.-trained malaria teams, has reduced the incidence of new cases to less than 2 percent a year.

Deaths from malaria have been reduced from 35,000 in 1958 to 2,000 in 1965. Seven million people have been vaccinated against cholera, and 8 million more have received vaccinations and treatments for other diseases.

American civilians are responding increasingly to the Vietnamese Government's call for medical help. The latest group of American doctors to volunteer their services in Vietnam included 30 Cuban refugees. One hundred personnel from the U.S. Army Medical Civilian Action Program are also serving.

While there are many inadequacies and shortcomings in our AID program in Vietnam, there is no question but that this humanitarian effort equals or exceeds in importance our military effort

there. The Agency and the administration are now making a major effort to win the nonmilitary war in Vietnam—and are successfully persuading the South Vietnamese Government to place more emphasis in this direction. This effort as fully deserves our support as the military authorization on which we will shortly be acting.

SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS HELP

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which must be passed if the small businessmen of this Nation are to receive the assistance the Congress intends they receive. My bill would separate the revolving funds under the Small Business Act so that the Small Business Administration could not reach into direct business loan funds even if some widespread disaster would justify that action. In the case of a disaster requiring additional financial assistance from SBA, a separate supplemental appropriation would be required. The thrust of this bill is to keep inviolate the small business direct loan program which has been so important to the small businessmen of the Nation.

The legislation I have introduced would not increase the SBA appropriation but would divide it into three separate revolving funds reserved for specific purposes. The Small Business Act now provides for only one with allocations set administratively within SBA.

My bill would establish one revolving fund for direct business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, prime contract authority under section 8(a), and loans under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the amount of \$1 billion.

A second revolving fund totaling \$300 million is set up for disaster loans under section 7(b) and section 7(b)(2). The third separate revolving fund is set up for programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958—except for title IV of that act—and the bill authorizes \$461 million for this fund.

My bill also sets limits for the amounts of loans, guarantees and commitments which may be outstanding at any one time under each of the three funds.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation such as I have introduced today has been amply demonstrated on a number of occasions in recent years. The recent transit strike in New York City dramatized the seriousness of the failure of the Small Business Administration to seek funds necessary to maintain an effective direct loan program. Congress must take immediate action to provide these funds.

Although SBA suspended its direct loan last October 11, it took no steps to obtain sufficient funds to avert economic disaster should an emergency arise. When the transit strike became an ex-

tended emergency, thousands of small businessmen were faced with economic ruin and SBA had no resources to assist them. Instead, SBA was forced to hastily round up extra funds to provide direct loans. There is some question whether the \$20 million SBA raised from a revolving fund was enough to meet the need. But the main point is that SBA's mad dash for money was precisely the wrong approach and should not have been necessary.

Suspension of the direct loan program is now in its sixth month and SBA officials still are unable to tell us when they will be able to lift the moratorium. True, SBA is studying ways of better organizing the loan program, but that is little comfort to the businessman who needs a loan now.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me in taking positive action to put the small business direct loan program back on its feet. We can afford no further delay.

ESTONIA—INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to extend congratulations to the thousands of supporters in America of Estonian independence and to the captive people of Estonia on this February 24, the anniversary of their independence. While the Estonian nation has experienced many misfortunes since their 1918 declaration of independence, the ebullient quest for freedom and liberty that was once achieved, remains strong today.

Yes, Russia still wields its overpowering influence in Estonia, but even 22 consecutive years of Russian occupation have not succeeded in destroying the Estonian's determination to remain true to their own cultural heritage.

The shameful and sometimes barbaric treatment of the people of Estonia at the hands of the Russian Communists is surpassed perhaps only by that of Nazi Germany. Proof of Russian brutality and virtual extermination of much of Estonia's people lies in the stark population statistics of 1934 and 1959. During that 25-year interval the Estonian population decreased by approximately 120,000. Primary methods employed by the Soviets which account for those losses were purges, deportations and murders. Many Estonians were forced to become refugees, many of whom were able to come to America. But this policy of the Russians had another facet; the number of Russians in Estonia grew by more than 167,000 during the same period. It is estimated that more than 240,000 persons from the Soviet Union have "migrated" into Estonia. We are all aware that the purpose of this Russian program was to dilute Estonian nationalism through a tremendous influx of persons loyal to Mother Russia. However, strong Estonian resistance to this imperialist Russian subterfuge has been a leading factor in its failure and is quite

reminiscent of the historic failures during the 1721-1918 period of czarist Russian occupation.

Americans of Estonian descent have continued their activities in support of liberty for their captured brethren. America can take pride in the fact that she has welcomed to her shores more than 60,000 Estonian refugees from Nazi and Communist persecution. Though naturally concerned about events in Estonia, these Estonian-Americans have freely joined in the fight to improve man's condition wherever he is found.

While much of the world's attention has been focused on such vital issues as Vietnam and proliferation of nuclear weapons, we must not lose sight of the plain and overriding issue of fundamental human freedom. The people of Estonia are unfortunate victims who bear witness to the fact that the struggle for freedom is not limited to the "undeveloped" areas of the world. It is being carried out wherever one group of people uses force or intimidation to subject another group to its will. It is in this light we should consider the case of Estonia.

It is a travesty of the meaning of freedom that these people must be forced to observe the passing of another anniversary while in the cruel and vise-like grasp of Communist Russia. Let us in every way possible and at every opportunity call to the world's attention the plight of the people of Estonia and the rest of the souls Communist Russia still maintains in virtual bondage.

VASCO DE SOUSA JARDIM

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening in my hometown of Newark I was privileged to join with many of my friends in the community in paying tribute to one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, Vasco de Sousa Jardim. Founder, editor, publisher of New Jersey's weekly Portuguese language newspaper, Vasco Jardim's influence extends well beyond New Jersey and well beyond his ethnic associations. And for his more than 40 years of service to the community and to his fellow Portuguese-Americans, Vasco Jardim was singled out to receive the highest civilian honor that can be awarded by the Government of Portugal: Conferral of the Order of Prince Henry.

It was a joyous occasion, this dinner, and I was honored myself by being asked to participate in the events. His Excellency Vasco Viera Garin, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States, made the presentation to Mr. Jardim, while such leading figures within the Portuguese-American community as Father Jose L. Capote; Father Anthony Monteiro; Donald B. Gomes, the chairman; Frank Soares, cochairman; Dr. Manuel L. da Silva, toastmaster; Antonio Braga, recording secretary; Mrs. Daniel Rodrigues, corresponding secretary; and Mario Teixeira, Jr., treasurer, were re-

sponsible for the well organized success of the entire affair.

Vasco Jardim typifies the great men who have made America great since our early days. Born in the Madeira Islands of Portugal, he came to this country in 1920, settled and married in one of the largest Portuguese-American communities in southwestern Massachusetts, moving to Newark in 1928. Even as in Fall River and New Bedford, Vasco Jardim immediately became a powerful force for good in his new community.

As a reporter, he was always aware of his responsibility for truth; as a citizen, he helped weld into the community those of his own ethnic heritage and helped the community to wipe away the artificial barriers that are often set around ethnic groups.

Many years ago John Donne wrote:

No man is an island sufficient unto itself.

Each of us is touched, each of us is affected and changed, for better or for worse, by the actions of others. Because this is true, all of Newark, all of New Jersey and so many communities beyond our State lines stand in the debt of the man we honored last Saturday evening.

Good deeds are as the stars which shine brightly in the dark sky of night. We do not notice them in the sun-filled glare of day-to-day living; but they are there, nevertheless, to brighten the world at an hour when it most needs brightening. Saturday night we paid tribute publicly to one who so has brightened the world; to one who has given so much without reckoning the cost; to one who has labored so valiantly without regard for reward.

Vasco Jardim has made the world a little richer, a little warmer and a much, much better place for all of us. To which we can only add our sincere and heartfelt thanks and our prayers that he will long continue to do so.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I consider the setting aside today of our legislative duties for a few moments to recognize Estonia's independence anniversary as being a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. And yet, as I offer my congratulations to Estonia and to her many friends here in America, the occasion leaves me with mixed emotions. First, I am very privileged and grateful to wish Estonia well, but at the same time I am saddened when I reflect on the suffering and sacrifice that country has had to endure only to find itself still under the heel of Soviet Russia.

Estonia is a proud land. She endured almost 200 consecutive years of czarist domination before she achieved her independence on February 24, 1918. However, in spite of that fact, her nationalist fervor took root and culminated in the country's becoming independent in 1918. Ridding one's country of foreign troops almost singlehandedly is not an easy

February 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

nally on February 2, 1920, the Communists signed a treaty in which all previous claims over Estonian territory were renounced.

The next 20 years were busily spent on improving the domestic situation, but the Estonian people kept a constant vigil on Russian intentions. That policy was well founded as the infamous Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939 indicated. The treaty enabled Russian forces to legally occupy Estonian territory. Not content with the treaty provisions, Russia presented Estonia with an ultimatum on June 16, 1940 which amounted to complete capitulation. Through Russian manipulation and intimidation a new Estonian Government amenable to Moscow took over on June 21, 1940. In July this government proclaimed Estonia a Soviet Socialist Republic.

From mid-1941 to the end of 1944, nazism replaced Russian terror, murder, and deportation. But unfortunately for the Estonians, World War II's end resulted in the return of Russian occupation and membership in the Soviet Union.

The tragedy and suffering of Estonia's people under Soviet Russia are almost beyond belief. Their ability to endure and continue their own culture in light of Russian occupation and impositions is a truly marvelous feat. But how long can we expect that resistance to continue without more tangible aid from the free world? In an attempt to help alleviate this problem I have sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 290 which would have the President instruct our United Nations representative to initiate action on Russia's forced occupation of the Baltic States.

I know and feel what this day represents to men and women of Estonian origin the world over. I am privileged to represent a large number of these people living in the Rochester, N.Y., area. It is my fervent hope that as Estonians and their millions of supporters in America commemorate Estonia's 48th anniversary they will rededicate themselves to work together for their people's liberation and freedom.

TO IMPROVE THE WEATHER FORECASTING SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been besieged by the most violent storms in recent history during the past few months and costly damage to private, commercial, and military property has been widespread. Continued interruptions in air and land operations of the military have resulted from sudden storms and the same interferences have caused considerable indisposition to commercial and private traffic as well.

Agricultural operators have suffered greatly from the recent unusual weather conditions and all of these interests may

well have fared better if sufficient advance storm warnings had been available. Across the border in Mexico the damage from these storms has been even more devastating and the loss of life, far greater. The region south and southwest of San Diego seems to be the area from which a great many of these violent storms approach. It has long been recognized as a sparse data area for meteorological information, and this fact has recently been confirmed again to me by the Administrator of our Environmental Services Administration. Some information is obtained on an irregular basis through our cooperative program of taking observations by merchant ships and aircraft crews of international flights who report in-flight weather conditions when passing through that region. We also receive some satellite surveillance for the detection of major storms and weather systems.

Our Weather Bureau has, in the past, given consideration to the establishment of a weather station for both surface and upper air observations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, but the establishment of such a weather station has yet to be accomplished. The exorbitant financial loss suffered by our Government and our private citizens makes it imperative that the Congress act quickly to authorize the establishment of meteorological observation stations on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation aimed at accomplishing this purpose and the text of my bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to improve the weather forecasting service of the United States, the Administrator of the Environmental Science Services Administration shall take such action as may be necessary to establish a meteorological reporting station on Guadalupe Island, Mexico. In taking such action, he shall cooperate with the State Department and other departments and agencies of the United States, with the meteorological service of Mexico, and with the World Meteorological Organization.

FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ENGAGED IN TRADE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the 89th Congress I, along with other Members of the House from both political parties, have protested against the self-defeating policy of doing business with foreign-flag vessels which are engaged in trade with North Vietnam. It is exasperating enough to learn that free world trade with North Vietnam has increased about 138 percent since 1955, when the United States first began asking other non-Communist nations to help in exerting economic pressure on that avowed foe of the free world. But it has been downright discouraging to reflect that ships which profited from

trade with the United States had a business-as-usual policy with the mortal enemy of American soldiers in Vietnam.

The Department of Commerce has declared that it will deny Government-financed cargoes to foreign-flag vessels which called at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966. Although this certainly is a step in the right direction, I must agree with the presidents of the International Longshoremen's Union, the National Maritime Union, and the Seafarers International Union that the administration's directive black-listing ships transporting cargoes to North Vietnam is too weak and ineffective.

Following are details of the regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register of February 12, 1966:

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate U.S. Government departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through February 10, 1966.

Flag of registry, name of ship	Gross tonnage
British: Shienfoo	7, 127
Shirley Christine	6, 724
Wakasa Bay	7, 044
Cypriot: Amon	7, 229
Greek: Agenor	7, 139

Sec. 2. Vessels which called at North Vietnam on or after January 25, 1966, may reacquire eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States if the persons who control the vessels give satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) That such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the North Vietnam trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and

(b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the North Vietnam trade, except as provided in paragraph (c), and

(c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to January 25, 1966, requiring their employment in the North Vietnam trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

NICHOLAS JOHNSON,
Maritime Administrator.

VOLUNTARY WAGE GUIDEPOSTS REFUSED BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY AND HIS COLLEAGUES

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House must view with considerable concern the refusal of AFL-CIO President George Meany and his colleagues to accept the voluntary wage guideposts proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers for this year.

The idea of guideposts was first put forward in the 1962 Economic Report of the President. At that time President Kennedy said:

If labor leaders in our major industries will accept the productivity benchmark as

February 24, 1966

a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom.

Implicit in the late President's remarks was the fear that without this restraint, inflation could nullify whatever economic progress was made. Inflation continues to haunt our economy. With the growing number of people living on fixed incomes in their later years, the danger of inflationary pressures which reduce purchasing power and devalue the dollar is particularly acute. Thus the "productivity benchmark" referred to by President Kennedy must continue to be our standard for wage decisions.

Ideally, we would prefer that Government remain entirely neutral in the decisionmaking process that takes place in the private sector. But we must accept the fact that economic pressure at home and crises around the world demand the careful cooperation of business, labor, and Government.

The proposed guideposts will not guarantee wage-price stability and economic growth, but in my judgment, they represent reasonable standards to guide private decisionmakers in making responsible judgments in the public interest.

The administration should not use these voluntary standards as an excuse for questionable attempts at enforcement. Such recent attempts indicate that we need to review our stockpiling policy. They do not warrant abandonment of the guideposts.

Labor should not set itself above the national interest in sustaining economic growth within a framework of restraint. The times demand responsibility from us all.

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

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

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

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

A BILL TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, two major specters haunt the American people today, fear of a major war in Asia and the threat of widespread inflation.

The sad effects of inflation are especially felt by our senior citizens, most of

whom live on fixed incomes either through retirement or on social security. Although the social security check is the same each month, the cost of everything from food to footwear continues to rise at an alarming pace. From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security cash benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power.

To correct this unfortunate and unnecessary problem, I am introducing a bill today which will provide automatic increases in social security benefits as the cost of living rises. This bill calls for an increase of 3 percent in the benefits whenever the consumer price index reflects a similar jump in the cost of living.

This method alone among the many proposals for improved benefits can be accomplished without any further increase in social security taxes. According to cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the growth of the economy will provide the necessary revenues to make the cost-of-living adjustments proposed in my bill.

In my opinion this is a just and equitable bill that should be passed. We have an obligation to fulfill to our elderly constituents for we have created this hydra-headed monster and the responsibility is ours. After all, much of the cause of our present inflation can be directly attributed to the wild spending programs in which our Government is presently engaged.

Inflation, as we all know, means everything costs more.

While prices are spiraling so are the taxes. Social security taxes were boosted with the passage of medicare; excise taxes are being raised back to where they were before and the collection of income taxes is being accelerated. Now the President and his advisers are talking about increasing income taxes even more so that the poor taxpayer is left with less to pay for commodities which cost more.

At the current rate of climb, one-half per cent a month according to the Department of Commerce, the cost of living will go up a highly inflationary 6 percent this year. From the first of last year to the first of this month it rose 4.1 percent, and it looks like it will beat both the Russians and us to the moon. In terms we all understand this means on the average an individual has to lay down \$1.04 on the counter today for what he paid \$1.00 for a little over a year ago, and by the end of this year it will cost a dollar and a dime for what you could get with a dollar last year. Individual items have jumped more than others: bacon has jumped 61 percent in the last 10 years, a man's wool suit has increased 23 percent in price, and a loaf of bread costs 17 percent more.

Until a more responsible attitude toward government spending is assumed and inflation is stopped, we must do whatever we can to protect those who are hurt the most—the ones living on a fixed income like our social security folks. I hope Congress acts swiftly and favorably upon my proposal to raise benefits as inflation goes up.

EXPORT SURPLUS OR TRADE DEFICIT?

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

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, since 1960 the Department of Commerce has been announcing an export surplus year after year, ranging from \$4.5 billion to \$6.9 billion. Recently the 1965 trade surplus was given out as amounting to \$5.2 billion. Although this was still at a high level, it was a decline of \$1.7 billion from the high-water mark of \$6.9 billion in 1964.

These high surplus figures have been used both as a measure of the competitive force of our industries in foreign trade and of the great value of exports to our balance of payments deficit. The amounts reported each year have been set against the cost of foreign aid, tourist expenditures abroad, and so forth, to demonstrate the valuable function of exports and their service in offsetting deficits incurred from other sources.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have been deluding ourselves and singing high notes of optimism when there was little or nothing to be optimistic about, so far as our trade balance and our competitive standing in the world are concerned.

For one thing, our official export statistics have included all the sales and shipments arising from AID appropriations. In other words, our export reports include goods that we ourselves have paid for out of the Treasury. By this measure it would be easy to double our export surplus. We need do no more than increase foreign aid expenditures sufficiently.

Secondly, we have been reporting our imports at what they cost at the foreign point of shipment, neglecting to add freight and insurance costs incurred in bringing the goods to this country. This is a naive practice and we are one of the few countries that adhere to this method. With respect to imports coming from Europe, Asia, and Africa, this understates the cost by some 25 percent. On imports of \$21.3 billion, which was the level of our 1965 purchases abroad on the basis of foreign value, the undervaluation would be serious. The true figure would be closer to \$25 billion.

If we wash out these two unjustifiable practices from our trade statistics, our export surplus vanishes. This is to say, if we value our imports at their true cost and if we exclude from our exports the goods that we sell, not competitively but because we subsidize them or give them away, we actually incurred a deficit of some \$2 billion in 1965 in our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to be gained by deluding ourselves in this manner. On the other hand, much harm can come from such an odd practice. We generally pride ourselves on basing policies on facts, or trying to do so. Otherwise our judgment loses its value.

Why do we then persist in this practice of self-deception? I can think of

cruelty against the people to increase industrial output. Furthermore, this was done at the expense of providing consumer goods and a program for increasing the living standards of the Estonian people, areas in which the Soviets exercised almost total disinterest. It is estimated by competent authorities that the Estonian people are materially in worse condition today than they were 25 years ago.

It is conditions like these to which the free world must address itself in shedding light on actual conditions of the millions of people held captive by U.S.S.R. Our continued observance of the historic declaration of independence on February 24, 1918, is an indication to all the world that Estonia's plight is of concern to us and that we are committed to her liberty.

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

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

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM SUPPORTS A STRONG VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom—YAF—has been recognized as the leading student organization in the Nation supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. Practically since its founding in 1960, YAF has been regarded as a highly effective conservative youth organization, and YAF's position on the Vietnam question has given it greater recognition.

It goes without undue comment that I am highly interested in the student developments regarding Vietnam throughout the Nation, but the activities of college students both for and against the U.S. position in Vietnam on the college campuses of the Southern States are of particular interest to me.

It has been encouraging to learn of student organizations, like YAF, who are supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy. During the past year the student protest demonstrations from the left have grown in proportion, size, number, and volume. It is gratifying to a Member of Congress to hear of responsible student organizations like YAF, the Young Republicans, and even the Young Democrats in some instances, who are not only offsetting the leftwing student protests by having rallies supporting a strong Vietnam policy but who are also launching many constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, the position of YAF on foreign policy questions is derived from the Sharon statement which was adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9-11, 1960, at the founding of the organization. In the Sharon state-

ment are found the guidelines for determination of YAF's position on foreign policy questions:

In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.

We as young conservatives, believe:

That we will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure; that history shows periods of freedom rare, and can exist only when free citizens concertedly defend their rights against all enemies;

That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;

That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and

That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on the National Advisory Board of YAF along with many distinguished Members of the two Houses. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], serve with me on this Advisory Board. In addition to these Members from the Southern States, there are 30 more Members from the two Houses who also serve on that board.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I had the distinct pleasure of speaking at a testimonial dinner honoring one of the greatest men of the other House, the Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND. This testimonial dinner was held in Birmingham, Ala., a city of fond memories to the Senator.

At this testimonial dinner, the Senator made some pertinent comments regarding the Vietnam question. In part the Senator stated:

On the international scene, you are faced with dangers to freedom from a succession of little wars and the even more dangerous diplomatic remedies to terminate them, as is demonstrated by the events this year in the Dominican Republic, and, I fear, may be soon again demonstrated in Vietnam. The military action of the Communists in Vietnam is at this point of less peril to freedom than is the potential for concessions to the Communist aggressors which may be granted in the terms of a political termination of the military hostilities.

The Senator went on to comment:

The greatest threat is an idea, or, more precisely, a mental attitude or orientation, even a way of thinking, which is induced by an idea.

Mr. Speaker, the Senator concluded his moving address by a challenge to the

young people of America which bears directly on the Vietnam issue:

In your own time, however, you are faced with a prevalence of moral and political relativism, which is more extensive, more pervasive and more dangerous than ever before. It is your greatest obstacle in your struggle for freedom. You are the best hope for freedom. You can fulfill your promise if you will but resist moral and political relativism by continuing your disciplined adherence to an absolute code of spiritual and philosophical values. You must continue to refuse to compromise with expediency. You must maintain the courage to defy the consensus. You must continue to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong.

Young Americans for Freedom, as many other organizations throughout the South, have answered this call.

At the national convention of the organization, commemorating its fifth anniversary, here in the Nation's Capital early last fall, the YAF delegates unanimously passed a resolution calling for the commitment of sufficient number of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. YAF applauded the commitment of United States might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supported the recognition that the war must be won on the ground as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of the Communists to lure peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Whereas we share the administration's view that what the Communists chose to call "wars of national liberation" constitute nothing more than a new form of aggression which must be resisted as a threat to the establishment of true peace; and

Whereas the current aggression against South Vietnam takes its primary inspiration and direction from the north and has as its ultimate object the conquest of all of southeast Asia, a fact recognized by those countries in the area who have sent significant amounts of combat personnel to share in the burden of defeating the Communists; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation is required by considerations of national interest and by moral considerations of the highest order to come to the aid of the people of South Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia in their defense against aggression; and

Whereas while South Vietnam fails to measure up to the full standards of freedom to which we in this country have become accustomed, the present form of government nevertheless affords a greater opportunity for the ultimate development of truly liberal institutions than would a Communist regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Americans for Freedom applauds the commitment of U.S. might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supports the recognition that this war must be won on the ground in South Vietnam as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of Communist recruiters to lure local peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration demonstrate its intent to take whatever action proves tactically necessary to assure that the successful termination of the war will not be unduly delayed, including such measures as (a) the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam, (b) ef-

February 24, 1966

gressors, that is, forces which would destroy us if given a chance, had improved in the period since World War II and if our relative defensive strength had grown in recent years. But those propositions are highly doubtful, to say the least.

The Soviet Union devotes twice as large a share of gross national product to national defense as the United States, as Timothy Sosnovy, Soviet economy specialist at the Library of Congress, has pointed out and the threat from Red China is growing every year. Communist countries have vastly expanded their territory and population, their economic, technological and military power over the past 20 years, and they have been able to raise their status and influence in the rest of the world and make our position more vulnerable or at least more difficult.

The rapid dismantling of our Armed Forces after World War II invited the Communist takeover of Eastern Europe and large sections of Asia. Aggression in Korea, Vietnam, and other places was not unrelated to our seeming unpreparedness. In Korea our troops were almost pushed into the sea and the United States, for the first time in its history, had to settle for a draw. In Vietnam we have for some years now been unable to cope with a seemingly far inferior opponent.

The number of military projects or programs scrapped, deferred, or slowed down in recent years is in the hundreds. They were not discarded because military experts doubted their value or effectiveness in strengthening our defenses. The decisions fell against the military because the expansion of domestic services was deemed more urgent by the powers that be.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile, nuclear rocket Rover, manned space glider Dyna Soar, Puto ram jet rocket engine and numerous other projects were turned down although the leaders of our Armed Forces demanded them. Approval of nuclear carriers was denied and authorization of manned (follow-on) bombers too long delayed.

A fallout shelter program which could save millions of lives and might deter a would-be aggressor was deemed to be too expensive as was an effective anti-missile system. A few months ago the Nike X missile seemed to be on the verge of approval. When escalation in Vietnam called for larger funds, were offsetting savings to be made by tightening up on civilian type services? Not at all. The Nike X antimissile missile and other defense projects fell victim to budget cutting. Again, as in earlier years, the armed services lost out to more charmed services—domestic welfare programs. The consequences of such policy are awesome to contemplate.

Potentially more critical to national security than money are the time, attention, and efforts of our governmental leaders which are now overwhelmingly spent on domestic affairs. Inadequate study and consideration may have been responsible for the Bay of Pigs disaster and for many other troubles which flare up from time to time in distant parts of the world.

"Congress Needs Help" was the title of a recent investigation and TV review of the inability of "absurdly overworked" Congressmen to be adequately informed on the vital issues they are called upon to decide. Members of Congress cannot give sufficient time, study, and thought to defense and international affairs because they are overloaded with civilian projects. The President, according to the a Newsweek story of December 20, 1965, explained that in 1965 he had concentrated on civilian affairs "to get the domestic problems out of the way so that I could give more time to foreign problems." Some may regard this to be the wrong order of priority. In this day and age a President might conceivably be so occupied with our

national security that he could not devote most of his time to pushing the expansion of domestic public services.

Our safety at home is no better protected than our security abroad. In fact, it may be less so. An American, or a local resident, can walk the streets of most major foreign cities without fear, even at night. But that may not be advisable in some residential neighborhoods of Washington, Chicago, and other metropolitan centers. The failure of government to safeguard its citizens is now so widely recognized that a book "How To Protect Yourself on the Streets and in Your Home" (accompanied by a letter from the head of the FBI) seems to be on the way to becoming a bestseller. (This may be an interesting reverse shift in responsibility: from government to the individual.)

The United States, the country with the highest standards of living, is also the world's most crime ridden. The most powerful Nation which once set out to make the world safe for democracy seems unable or unwilling to make its city streets safe for walking home at night. Crime is rising six times as fast as the population according to the latest FBI report.

There is only one possible explanation for this phenomenon: we have not been able to convince would-be offenders that "crime doesn't pay." They expect to get away with it. And they may well have concluded from a study of reports on crimes, arrests, convictions and terms actually served, that the statistical odds are not too discouraging.

It is obvious that governmental action in combating and suppressing crime is woefully inadequate. But so far not enough has been done about it—nor about the fact that almost 50,000 men and women are killed each year in traffic accidents, largely because governmental attention and effort are preoccupied with other pursuits.

In conclusion: Government has multiplied its domestic activities in recent decades, making a steadily growing number of Americans dependent upon its benefits and favors, extending the area of coercion, while not adequately meeting its responsibility to protect the safety of the Nation and the individual. That course, if pursued much longer, gravely threatens personal and collective liberty and security. It is high time for us to quit devising new programs which Government may adopt or enlarge as substitutes for personal effort and to start thinking of means to strengthen the challenge to the individual to deal with his own problems.

Government can be and should be man's best friend—and it is, if it fulfills its primary tasks well. To the extent to which it neglects its foremost duties in order to expand recklessly in other directions and harms the body politic, it becomes a foe and should, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, be altered. The time has not come when we can afford to abolish it.

DOLLAR BLOCKADE OF CUBA NEEDED

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the United States to declare a dollar blockade of Cuba so that American taxpayer funds do not contribute to the export of Communist subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. I make this suggestion after observing plans by the United Nations to provide Cuba with over \$3 million in special funds for the University of Havana and an agricultural research station. Please keep in

mind that the United States contributes 40 percent of the funds used by that U.N. special agency.

It means that \$1.2 million of U.S. money would be used in the project. And what do they teach at Havana "U"? More subversion of the hemisphere, of course, because the university branch to be helped is headed by Russian and Cuban military personnel.

Brazil and Paraguay have strongly objected to helping Castro through the U.N., and for good reason. Brazil and Paraguay are both principal targets of Communist subversion directed from Cuba. Just last month the Communist tricontinental congress on subversion was held in Cuba and was formally designated as the headquarters of Communist subversion in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. If we contribute funds to this unwarranted U.N. project we will be underwriting that subversion.

A similar effort to provide U.N. funds for Castro's Cuba was scrapped 3 years ago due to protests from many of us in the Congress. Apparently the planners do not give up easily, but my opposition to such a scheme remains just as strong.

I was dismayed by the published reports of the official U.S. attitude toward such assistance to Cuba as stated by U.N. Ambassador Roosevelt. He says the United States will register an objection on principle, but will not withhold our share of the fund or demand rejection of the proposal. This is bureaucratic doubletalk of the worst order. It is inconceivable that any government can be against something as frightening as communism and still support it.

Mr. Speaker it is hoped that public and congressional indignation will defeat this latest proposal as it did 3 years ago.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in offering congratulations to the freedom-loving people of Estonia and her many sons and daughters in America as they observe February 24 as the anniversary of Estonia's declaration of independence. It is sincerely hoped that the encouragement and good wishes expressed by many today will serve to further inspire the Estonian people to resist communism.

The fact that modern Estonia has been under the heel of the U.S.S.R. continually since 1944 and has not succumbed to Soviet pressures to accept communism is a truly remarkable accomplishment.

Today I would like to call attention to one particular argument to which the Communists like to refer, namely, the allegation that since membership in the Soviet Union, Estonia's industrial expansion has increased. What is not said and what we should remember is that before the U.S.S.R. captured Estonia in 1944 the country had substantial industries of its own.

The Soviets applied enormous pressures and exercised almost inhuman

fective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, (c) the beginning, by calculated aerial and naval bombardment, of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, (d) by instituting a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam, all of these steps to be taken to induce North Vietnam to cease in its support of the troops in the south, and (e) the clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies such as Nationalist China.

YAF's activities in the Southern States have followed a well-designed pattern of constructive action. In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, YAF chapters have engaged in constructive activities supporting the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, a news article in the Wednesday, October 27, 1965, edition of the *Durham, N.C., Sun*, entitled, "Leader in YAF Hits Protesters," illustrates the attitude of YAF toward the leftwing protest demonstrations. The article follows:

LEADER IN YAF HITS PROTESTERS

WASHINGTON.—A leader of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) blasted the student anti-Vietnam protests here in the Nation's capital today as a deliberate attempt to defeat the cause of freedom in Asia and the world.

In making the denouncement, Randal C. Teague, a member of YAF's board of directors and the leader of its Southern program, said, "Students who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs to avoid the draft and to thwart the American effort against communism in Asia are in a minority on the college campus. What they are doing is wrong—legally and morally. Those who are in violation of Federal laws should be prosecuted and severely punished by the courts."

Teague, a student himself, went on to say, "These students are not conscientious objectors. Their actions show shades of absolute anarchy. As many national leaders have pointed out, there is strong evidence that many of these protests have been led by the extremists of the radical left who often associate themselves with Communist-leaning groups. Responsible students have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by burning their draft cards, by blocking troop and supply convoys, and worst of all, by demoralizing those valiant fighting men in Vietnam today who are risking their lives to insure the security of freemen."

The YAF leader concluded by saying, "When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond to it, whether we personally like it or not. Every American, from the youngest to the oldest, deserves to support his Government in time of national emergency, and surely the war in Vietnam is one of the gravest situations confronting the world today."

At its recent national convention in Washington, YAF passed a strong resolution unanimously calling for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. The resolution also called for effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, the beginning by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, and by the institution of naval and air blockade of North Vietnam. The resolution concluded with the call to issue a clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies.

In a telegram dated November 1, 1965, the Southern region of YAF called upon the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. The text of the telegram follows:

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

The Southern region of Young Americans for Freedom representing thousands of responsible college students strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes. These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89-152 against all draft card burners. We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad.

RANDAL C. TEAGUE,
Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate release to the newspapers, radio, and television media was issued subsequent to this telegram to make clear to the public the position of YAF on the draft-card burners. I ask unanimous consent that this release may appear in the RECORD at this point.

STUDENT LEADER ASKS KATZENBACH TO PROSECUTE DRAFT VIOLATORS—NOVEMBER 1, 1965

WASHINGTON.—A southern student leader today supported the Justice Department in arresting and prosecuting violators of Federal draft laws.

Randal C. Teague, a national board of directors member of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and its southern spokesman, advised Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in a telegram today that "the southern region of YAF, representing thousands of responsible college students, strongly supports Justice Department efforts to prosecute violators of Federal draft statutes."

Teague went on to say, "These violators must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail. We urge full execution of Public Law 89-152 against all draft-card violators." Public Law 89-152 is the law carrying a fine of \$10,000 or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person who knowingly destroys or mutilates his draft card. The law was enacted to carry a severe penalty against the draft-card burners at recent student demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The telegram concluded, "We commend efforts to prosecute those deliberately disrupting the American war effort. While we support the right to peaceful protests, we cannot condone riotous demonstrations. In our opinion, many of the recent protests border on sedition and treason. We support a strong administration policy on winning the war at home as well as abroad."

YAF is regarded as the leading student group supporting a strong policy in Vietnam. Its national chairman, Tom Huston, of Indiana, appeared on ABC's "Issues and Answers" this past Sunday to present the opinion of students supporting a strong U.S. policy in Asia.

YAF has a southernwide program of donating blood to American soldiers in Vietnam, aiding refugees and orphans fleeing from war-torn North Vietnam, sending mail praising our American soldiers to them to let them know the majority of American students are behind them, a petition campaign in support of a strong administration policy,

and the presentation of debates and speeches on Vietnam on various campuses.

During my recent tour of South Vietnam and southeast Asia, one of the problems of the war which struck me most clearly was the lack of sufficient material support from our allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from our Allies throughout the free world. While the Republic of South Korea and the Australian Government have sent troops to South Vietnam, the remainder of the free nations of Asia or the free world have contributed little to winning this war against aggression. Fortunately, Allied support is far from being at the level required to sustain the effort.

YAF realized this shortcoming in our foreign policy efforts, and in an attempt to inform the American people, on and off the college campus, of this inadequacy, the southern offices issued a call for more Allied support in Vietnam. This release follows:

STUDENT GROUP CALLS FOR ALLIED SUPPORT IN VIETNAM—NOVEMBER 8, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The southern spokesman of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) called for greater military and economic support in Vietnam from our Allies today. Randal C. Teague, a student at the American University in the Nation's Capital, called for expanded assistance to win the war in Vietnam from our Allies in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and from throughout the free world.

In making the pronouncement, Teague said, "Since 1961, the United States has borne the burden alone of defending South Vietnam and its people. Not only the security of all Asia but ultimately the security of all nations will depend on the outcome of this war. It is time that our Allies help the United States win the war. Mere moral support is not enough."

Teague went on to say, "We not only need more fighting men and materials, but winning the war in Vietnam will require greater commitments of medical corpsmen to doctor the civilians, schoolteachers to educate the children, engineers and construction teams to build roads and hospitals, and agricultural experts to increase food production. We must win the war with the people, and our Allies are surely in a position to supply the technicians required to help the people."

He concluded by saying, "President Johnson and the administration should not only encourage our allies to help us secure the freedom of South Vietnam because of Communist China's continual threat to Asia, but they should also encourage our allies to stop trading and shipping with Communist China and North Vietnam. Our American soldiers are being shot at and killed by North Vietnamese soldiers whose nation is being economically aided by our allies. It just doesn't make sense."

With the exception of troop commitments from South Korea and Australia, very little assistance has come from our allies.

YAF is regarded as one of the leading student organizations backing a strong policy in Vietnam. The student group has launched programs on college campuses in the Southern States to donate blood to American fighting men, to collect food and clothing for refugees fleeing war-torn North Vietnam, to have fraternities and sororities adopt Vietnamese orphans, and to offset the student protest demonstrations.

One of the problems in the college movement in this Nation in support of a strong administration policy has been proper coordination of activities. When

blood donation drives, petition campaigns, debates, speeches, and many other actions are going on simultaneously across the Nation and throughout the South, it is difficult to get across to the American people that these actions are more significant and more representative of true student opinion than the one-shot protest demonstrations lead by the radical left.

In order to obtain the needed coordination throughout the Southern States, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., is sponsoring the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—which is calling upon the support of all campus organizations supporting a strong policy. They have called upon support from the College Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, YAF chapters, and any other independent or affiliated group.

The purposes of SSVVC were outlined in a release of November 23, 1965, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the Record at this point.

SOUTHERN STUDENT VICTORY IN VIETNAM COMMITTEE FORMED—NOVEMBER 23, 1965

WASHINGTON.—The formation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee—SSVVC—to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam by the demonstration of student support was announced here in the Nation's Capital today. The new committee will operate on over a hundred college campuses in eight States of the South.

The committee's formation was announced by Randal C. Teague, the Southern spokesman for the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc. (YAF), a conservative youth group, and Alfred Regnery, the national director of the recently held symposium for freedom in Vietnam and YAF's national college director.

In announcing the formation of SSVVC, Teague, who is its southernwide field director, said, "We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican clubs, the Young Democratic clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Teague, a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., went on to say, "Much student activity has already been going on in the South, but during the next year this activity will greatly increase. It is not only desirable—but essential—that these activities be properly coordinated. SSVVC is such a coordinating unit."

SSVVC will undertake programs on college campuses to sponsor debaters and speakers on over 50 college campuses, to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam, to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses which serve as target sights, to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam, to have college fraternities and sororities adopt orphan children in Vietnam, to circulate petitions calling for a strong foreign policy position in southeast Asia, and several other constructive programs.

SSVVC and its cooperating groups will participate closely with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom in Vietnam with debate-in's on December 7 and student rallies supporting the war effort on January 7 and

8 of next year. YAF leaders are challenging members of leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards to debates on December 7, the anniversary of Pearl Harbor attack. Major rallies have been planned for January throughout the world.

In addition to Teague and Regnery, the steering committee of SSVVC will be composed of the field directors for each State within the jurisdiction of the new committee. The steering committee's membership was announced as Judy Whorton, a student at Samford University in Birmingham; Timothy C. Orr, a student at St. Petersburg, Fla., Junior College; Guy W. Mayes, Jr., a student at Emory University in Atlanta; James E. Green, a student at Duke University in Durham, N.C.; Charles C. Hooks, Jr., a recent graduate of the University of North Carolina now residing in Gaffney, S.C.; Michael Everhart, a student at Southwestern at Memphis; and Thomas B. Wright, Jr., a student at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va.

An indication of the substantial public support which the SSVVC received is an editorial which appeared in the Clearwater, Fla., Sun of Monday, December 6, 1965. This editorial follows:

PROTESTING THE PROTESTERS

With the activities of the right-leaning Young Americans for Freedom most middle-of-the-roads cannot always see eye to eye, but with the latest YAF project few can take exception—their creation of the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee.

The newest YAF project thus becomes part of a growing national protest against the draft dodgers, draft card burners, and peace demonstrators.

As announced by Randall C. Teague, a former Pinellas County resident and now a student at the American University in Washington, D.C., the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been organized to support a strong U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam, and will operate on a hundred college campuses in this country.

Teague details the aims of the new youth movement:

"We seek the earnest support and cooperation of all college students and organizations who are supporting a firm policy in southeast Asia. We will serve as the principal vehicle through which all student activities in support of the U.S. policy in South Vietnam can be channeled. We call for the support and cooperation from the college Young Republican Clubs, the Young Democratic Clubs, the YAF chapters, and any other student organization, affiliated or independent, which seeks victory in Vietnam."

Some of the projects of the SSVVC, reports Teague, will be to undertake programs on college campuses, sponsoring debates and speakers; to sponsor blood donation drives to give blood for American fighting men in South Vietnam; to form local Victory in Vietnam Committees on 107 campuses; to send food and clothing to refugees and orphans fleeing North Vietnam; to have college fraternities and sororities "adopt" orphan children in Vietnam; to circulate petitions calling for a strong policy position in southeast Asia.

Tomorrow, the 24th anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, will find the new group participating with the International Youth Crusade for Freedom for Vietnam with debates with leftwing student protest groups which have been instrumental in the burning of draft cards.

We welcome YAF to the fast-growing ranks of young people and Americans generally who are getting plenty fed up with this leftwing lunatic fringe, and who are letting our servicemen in Vietnam know in no uncertain terms that we are behind them all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern Student Victory in Vietnam Committee has been successful. Civic support of the campus program, as indicated in the Clearwater Sun article, has come from every area of the South.

At a regional conference of YAF's State officers for the Southern region, held in Atlanta on February 12, new Vietnam-related programs were formulated to spearhead an even larger program to support a strong policy in Vietnam.

YAF has been cautious in handling the Vietnamese situation. They are supporting a strong policy—not just an administration policy. They are prepared to deviate from the policy of any administration when that policy does not coincide with the necessary action required to sustain the war against Communist aggression. YAF has been and will continue to be, I am sure, committed to an administration policy only so long as that policy is consistent with that criterion set forth in the Sharon statement for determining American foreign policy: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

HORTON URGES REDEDICATION TO LIBERATION OF ESTONIA

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the observance by our fellow Americans of Estonia's 48th anniversary of its declaration of independence is a fitting tribute to the Estonian people. The hope is ever present that through commemorating this event of Estonian history, those Estonians now held captive and in virtual slavery by the Russian Communists will continue to be inspired to resist Russian efforts to make them reject their historic cultural heritage.

In man's quest for liberty few struggles surpass those of Estonian patriots. From Russian occupation between 1721–1918 Estonia not only succeeded in surmounting russification programs, but Estonian culture actually thrived. During that period even though under Russia's heavy oppressive control, Estonia's music, poetry, plays, and books flourished. A remarkable tribute to a tenacious people. In addition, this period also nurtured Estonian nationalism which showed itself in the Estonian rebellion of 1905. Though Russian soldiers ruthlessly crushed the revolt, the spark of nationalism still burned and emerged again in 1917–18.

Under Russia's provisional government of 1917, autonomy was granted to Estonia. She was given the right to elect a parliament and administer her own laws. German successes in pushing Russian troops out of much of the Baltic area encouraged the Estonian Government to proclaim Estonia an independent state. That declaration was issued on February 24, 1918, and for the next 2 years the fledgling nation was forced to fight both Germans and Russians in order to preserve its independence. Fi-

price for manufactured grade milk (currently at \$3.24 per cwt. for 3.72 percent butterfat milk). The increase in the support price for milk would be achieved by increasing the purchase prices for butter, cheese, and powder at which the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay for dairy products under the price support program.

U.S. milk production for October 1965 was 2.3 percent under the previous year; November, 3 percent; and December, 4 percent. Total production for this period in 1965 totaled 28.2 billion pounds; the lowest since 1960 when production for the same period was 27.7 billion pounds. If milk deliveries continue at these levels for 1966, total production could approximate 123 billion pounds—down 2.5 billion pounds from 1965. A decline in milk production on U.S. farms of this magnitude would reduce supplies to minimum levels.

Support purchases of dairy products for 1965 accounted for 5.7 billion pounds of milk equivalent—compared to 7.7 billion pounds in 1964. The 1965 figures are the lowest since 1960 when purchases amounted to 3 billion pounds of milk equivalent. If the decline in farm production materializes and commercial demand continues upward, there will not be adequate stocks of dairy products available to meet total demand for products in the fall months. Thus, support purchases would be nonexistent except for the flush (spring) months of production.

Dairy farmers' income would be improved through the increase in support price. Thus, dairy farmers would be in a stronger position to meet the ever rising production costs and the Nation would have ample supplies of milk and dairy products—essential for an adequate diet.

An immediate increase in the support price for milk is vital to the butter-powder industry. Currently, the butter and powder prices are near support levels and the gross return to a dairy plant for 100 pounds of 8.5 percent butterfat milk processed into butter-powder is approximately \$3.68 (59.33 cents times 4.2 pounds butter plus 14.54 cents times 8.2 pounds powder). However, because of the strong cheese market, Wisconsin butter-powder plants report paying prices from \$3.60 to 3.75 per hundredweight for farm bulk tank manufactured milk. Margins are barely adequate, if adequate, for defraying production costs (labor, depreciation, and supplies). Immediate relief is needed or many persons will suffer financial losses, plants will close, jobs will be lost, and farmers will be without markets.

The current cheddar cheese price is quoted at 41.75 cents per pound for 40-pound blocks—compared to a support price of 36.1 cents per pound. Thus, an upward adjustment in the support price will have no immediate effect on the cheese market, but will improve the financial position of the butter-powder plants.

If the dairy industry develops an export market (commercial and payment in kind) and the Government fulfills its obligation for dairy products in foreign lands, a steady supply is essential.

Supplemental to the price support program is the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture in section 709 of the 1965 act to purchase dairy products on the open market to fulfill commitments.

We cannot stress strongly enough the urgency of the depressed and chaotic conditions facing dairy farmers, the dairy industry and the economy of Wisconsin. Therefore, your deliberate and forthright action in raising the level of the support price for manufactured milk is solicited.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. FARR,
Dairy Economist.

No. 32—18

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
Brookfield, Wis., February 15, 1966.

HON. JOHN RACE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RACE: America's future rests squarely on the youth of today. To insure a steady growth in a strong, healthy, vigorous America, we must develop a strong, healthy, vigorous group of junior citizens. No other Federal programs have proven themselves like the school lunch and the school milk programs have, in providing the nutrition and proper diet, so necessary to the development of fertile minds and healthy bodies.

The proposed reduction in funds for the school lunch and school milk programs in the national budget, does not appear to be congruous with an increase in the budget for the poverty program and foreign aid. It is false reasoning to deprive schoolchildren of the nutritional benefits of their programs which have no readymade distribution supervision.

We urge you to use every avenue open to you to restore the budget on the school lunch and school milk programs to adequate levels.

Sincerely yours,

THE DAIRY COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
EDWIN SCHMIDT, Secretary.

ALLENTON, WIS.,
January 26, 1966.

HON. JOHN A. RACE,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RACE: I am a dairy farmer in the town of Wayne, Washington County, Wisc., and I urgently plead with you to make available sufficient funds for the school milk and lunch program. The cut in the budget is surely going to hurt the farmer and is not good for the youngsters in school. Milk is good, pure food. I'm sure it's money well spent.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. SCHMITT.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
Fond du Lac, Wis., January 26, 1966.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In behalf of some 15,000 dairy farmer members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative and hundreds of thousands of other farmers, school systems, children and their parents, this letter is to inform you that there is deep concern everywhere at efforts on the part of the executive branch of our Government to bring about the announced sharp reduction in the school lunch and school milk programs.

We are greatly concerned with the budget proposal which would cut the school milk appropriation for the coming fiscal year to little more than a third of current appropriations and reduce sharply the school lunch funds.

These programs have provided vital contributions to the nourishment of millions of schoolchildren who might otherwise suffer from malnutrition or lack of an adequate and balanced diet. To curtail these important programs, is to shortchange the children of our Nation, and to further encourage a lack of physical fitness on the part of youth of our country. It is inconceivable that we should shortchange our own children under the pretext of a balanced budget, while devoting hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign aid programs.

Not only are these school milk and school lunch programs important in meeting the

nutritional needs of our children, they are also important factors in the building of proper diet habits in citizens of the future, and in establishing and maintaining markets present and in the future for the hard-pressed dairy farmers who are the backbone of American agriculture. Reduction of these programs is another slap in the face of this important segment of agriculture. They, the dairy farmers and dairy industry are still dazed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's efforts to drive milk prices downward by the purchase of oleomargarine instead of butter for use in the diets of needy Americans and to fill domestic commitments.

We understand that the Bureau of the Budget has issued a directive to the USDA to withhold several million dollars of the money which Congress had already appropriated for use in the school milk program for the current year. We consider this a serious shortchanging of millions of underprivileged and improperly nourished schoolchildren. In addition, it thwarts the decisions in which Congress took action to provide proper funds for these programs.

We urge immediate action to correct the flagrant departures from the stated objectives of the Great Society program. This can be done by restoring to the programs the funds appropriated by Congress, and by restoring to the budget for the coming fiscal years the money necessary to maintain both the school milk and the school lunch programs at current operating levels.

Sincerely,

WM. C. ECKLES,
General Manager.

VIETNAM

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

MR. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, it is the source of no little satisfaction to a Member of Congress who supports his President on a matter of national urgency, to know that the people and the responsible press of his district also give the President their support.

On successive days, February 8 and February 9, two of the Nation's great newspapers editorially expressed such support. The two editorials spoke of two vital questions involved:

First, our justification for being in Vietnam, and the attitude of the Vietnamese, and second, the two-dimensional aspects of the conflict.

In its editorial, the Dallas Morning News supported wholeheartedly the President's statement that "were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

The News went on to say, "South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by the peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence."

The following afternoon, the Dallas Times Herald editorially commented on the President's conference in Hawaii and his statements, adding:

We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy.

And—

Judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

I am sure that many of my colleagues would like to read these excellent editorials in their entirety, and I am, therefore, attaching them to these remarks for the RECORD.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 8, 1966]

THE REASON WHY

The President's speech in welcome to South Vietnam's Premier represented pure Johnson. It was a tough, succinct, hard-hitting speech.

President Johnson used the occasion to blast those "special pleaders" who urge the country to sell out the South Vietnamese and our own troops. He used it to sum up, briefly and well, the reason why the defense of Vietnamese integrity is of critical importance to this country and to the world. The speech he made got the job done.

The South Vietnamese have given the lie to the earlier claims by peaceniks that their hearts were not in the fight for independence. They have continued to fight and die by the thousands in a war that seems to have no limits and no end. They fight, not only as soldiers, but as civil officials and administrators, who go to posts in Red-plagued areas where they are lucky to live for a month. The villagers themselves, whose lot is often harder and more terrifying than that of the soldiers, have continued to resist.

"They fight," the President said, "for the essential rights of human existence—and only the callous or timid can ignore their cause."

Unfortunately, there are some of both in the President's own country and he had some choice words for them:

"There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam. They belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope. Were we to follow their course, how many nations might fall before the aggressor? Where would our treaties be respected, our word honored, our commitment believed?"

Over and over again these special pleaders have asked: "Why are we in Vietnam?"

If the Vietnam critics were listening to the President's speech, they heard the reason explained to them. But it seems doubtful that they were because, as he pointed out, they are deaf to all save the gloomy sounds made by themselves and their kind.

However, the reason that this country has given the lives of more than 1,300 of its young men to defend Vietnam is a valid one, and the President stated it well. He said:

"Were the Communist aggressors to win in Vietnam, they would know they can accomplish through so-called wars of national liberation what they could not accomplish through naked aggression in Korea—or insurgency in the Philippines, Greece, and Malaya—or the threat of aggression in Turkey—or in a free election anywhere in the world."

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Feb. 9, 1966]

A TWO-DIMENSIONAL WAR

The degree of mutual understanding apparently achieved between President Johnson and South Vietnamese Premier Ky at their amicable Hawaii conference is encouraging. The two leaders may still differ on emphasis in the anti-Communist war, but fertile areas of agreement also have been found, judging from official statements, for a positive, grass-roots program to aid the Vietnamese people and thereby win their support for the Ky government.

The Saigon leadership still prefers to talk more of escalated military action than about the civilian reforms needed to win the ultimate struggle with the Vietcong at the individual and village level. But Ky and his aids have shown encouraging cooperativeness in Honolulu to President Johnson's insistence that more emphasis be placed on improving the conditions in all areas as they become secured from rebel terror by military conquest. This undertaking will be even more difficult—and less dramatic—than successful combat "search and clear" operations. But realistically, it will be impossible ever to win any thing but a tenuous temporary hold on any portion of Vietnam but a handful of cities by military means alone.

This is the paradox of the conflict. It can be lost through military weakness, but it cannot be won purely by military strength. The succession of Saigon governments dominated by military men have too long failed to face this reality of the dual struggle, and so have many American assistance strategists. Now, judging from President Johnson's insistence in Hawaii, the largely one-sided battle will gain this needed second dimension.

There can be no cause for overoptimism about the chances of quick success in the tedious task ahead in the villages. Similar efforts have been made before, with dismal results. But the critical situation demands a new and broader attempt, aimed at building model facilities for giving the backward, war-weary Vietnamese populace every reason to prefer Saigon leadership to Vietcong occupation. Ample American aid and know-how, skillfully applied, could still work wonders.

The United States has helped establish showcases of superior Western culture and living standards elsewhere, as in West Berlin—where the contrast with communism's meager offerings was so painful the Reds had to wall in their people to keep them from flocking to it. Admittedly the job is more difficult in a remote agrarian Asian setting—but so is fighting a war. We must work as diligently at easing hardships and improving the peasants' lives as we have at formulating military strategy. At the technological level, the Vietcong can't compete. We are not making fullest use of the best weapons we have for winning over the people who are real pawns in this struggle—and keeping them "won."

PROPOSED CODE OF ETHICS FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some hesitation and reluctance to discuss a matter that to me is both unpleasant and embarrassing. Perhaps I am breaking an unwritten rule. But the issue is of such burning importance that I hope I will be forgiven if my words seem out of order or improper in any way.

For the past few weeks I have been shocked to read a series of columns by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which have made serious charges against the alleged activities of a Member of the other body, and his alleged relationship with Julius Klein, a public relations man, lobbyist, and registered agent for Germany.

What I found particularly painful in these columns was the nature of the charges made. It was not easy for me to read that a Member of the other body stood accused of carrying out as-

signments for a registered foreign agent in behalf of a foreign government.

In other words, these columns purport to show that a strange and unexplained relationship existed—or still exists—between these two men.

One letter, which I found particularly offensive, was written by a Member of the other body to a member of the German Cabinet. It strongly suggested that Members of the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, endorsed Mr. Klein and habitually seek his advice. I considered this presumptuous statement an insult to me and many of my colleagues, since it presumed to speak for me and was totally untrue.

I found the stories related in these columns so hard to believe, as a matter of fact, that I telephoned Jack Anderson and demanded to see evidence of these charges. Mr. Anderson invited me to his office to inspect his files. I sent a member of my staff to Mr. Anderson's office. He was received cordially and given full cooperation. As a matter of fact, he spent over 3 hours going through Mr. Anderson's files, which consisted of copies of correspondence, telegrams, and memos between the two men, as well as the reports of private investigators. My assistant saw all of the original material quoted in the columns, all of which he told me was unquestionable authentic. He also saw material which has not yet appeared in print, and which he assures me is even stronger and more sensational than what has already been printed in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to judge or condemn other people. But it seems to me on the basis of what I have seen, and in the absence of refutations or denials by the parties concerned, that these newspaper accounts might indeed be true. And if they are, one cannot avoid speculating on their implications.

The American people have had their faith shaken in the past. Only a few months ago Congress received a very bad press when armies of lobbyists invaded Capitol Hill to get sugar quotas for their clients. And, of course, before that there was the Bobby Baker scandal, which needs no further amplification from me. Over the years, influence peddling and conflicts of interest have always been unwelcome—but hardly unknown—intruders in Washington.

No one questions the right—rather, I should say the absolute duty—of a Congressman to fight for the legitimate interests of his home district and his constituents. That is one of the reasons we are here. But we must all be constantly aware of the dangers of developing too close a relationship with people or companies, and being drawn into the web of opportunity.

These situations, and the suspicion and shame they bring to Congress, emphasize the need for a congressional code of ethics. The nature of the position of a Member of the Congress of the United States gives him virtually unlimited freedom of action. He should not be left completely to his own judgment—because judgment is elastic, and varies between individuals.

ing the following at the end of my remarks:

I have tried to help our unemployed, including our older workers. Some evidence of my efforts is shown by my statements and the tabulations on pages 2755 and 2760 of the February 13, 1964, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I quote two paragraphs from a letter written me by Senator PAT McNAMARA, March 25, 1964. He is chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging: "Thank you for calling my attention to the material you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13 concerning Federal employment of older workers. The staff of the Senate Special Committee on Aging tell me that they noted the data when you inserted it in the RECORD and that it is one of the best discussions of the subject.

"You are certainly to be commended for your zeal in combating age discrimination in Federal employment, and I wish you well in your further activities along this line."

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE NORTHEAST POWER FAILURE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Northeast Power Failure be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE FLIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR ADMIRAL NIMITZ

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time first to advise the House that memorial services for Admiral Nimitz

will be held in the Washington National Cathedral at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, February 25.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Bandstra	Farnsley	Powell
Baring	Fisher	Reuss
Blatnik	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, S.C.
Burleson	Hagen, Calif.	Roudebosh
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Scott
Cederberg	Harvey, Ind.	Smith, Iowa
Cheif	Hébert	Taylor
Cohenan	Jacobs	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Kee	Toll
Derwinski	Martin, Ala.	Vigorito
Dorn	Matthews	Walker, Miss.
Dowdy	Miller	White, Idaho
Dyal	Moorhead	Willis
Edwards, La.	Pool	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 742, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 742

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the rule on H.R. 12169 providing for 3 hours of debate.

H.R. 12169 will authorize the appropriation of \$415 million in supplemental funds for the economic assistance program of the Agency for International Development during the remainder of fiscal year 1966.

This authorization is essential to carry forward U.S. efforts to resist Communist aggression in South Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia and to build stability in the Dominican Republic. In addition, the authorization will replenish the contingency fund which provides funds to the President for use in unforeseen and emergency situations where vital U.S. interests are at stake.

H.R. 12169 provides \$315 million in new authority for supporting assistance, of which \$275 million is for Vietnam; \$15 million for Laos and Thailand; \$25 million for the Dominican Republic; and \$100 million for the contingency fund, for use in any part of the world where emergencies might arise.

There is a clear need for these funds. Appropriations now available for use in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are exhausted. The contingency fund is exhausted. In fact, AID has had to "borrow" from other funding categories to finance our efforts in Vietnam. These "borrowings" must be paid back.

I am assured by AID that there are no further sources of funds and, in fact, funds for Vietnam are dangerously low. Any delay or any cut in the authorization now before the House would seriously hinder our efforts to defeat the Communists in the crucial struggle for southeast Asia.

The \$275 million of supporting assistance for South Vietnam can be divided into two main elements. The first is \$175 million to finance commodity imports which will help to fight inflation. I think all my colleagues would agree rampant inflation poses a major threat to economic and political stability wherever it occurs. But in a war situation such as Vietnam, the effects are even more serious and an integral part of our program is designed to bring more goods into the economy to keep the forces of inflation in check.

The second major element of the program in Vietnam to be financed from the funds authorized in H.R. 12169 is \$100 million for counterinsurgency and rural construction. Included in these programs are public safety, logistic management, public works, refugee relief, agriculture and welfare, and development projects. As you can see from this brief listing, these funds will have a direct impact on the people of that war-torn land. These funds will support the outstanding work of the Agency for International Development in helping to build a better life and to give the Vietnamese hope for the future.

Approval of these funds will help support the military efforts in Vietnam and carry forward the pledge made in the declaration of Honolulu to win the crucial battle against disease, ignorance, and poverty in South Vietnam.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, D.D., Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth," saith the Lord.—Isaiah 55: 10-11.

We thank Thee, O Lord, that as the snow settles upon the earth, so Thy word can settle in our minds and hearts. Grant, O God, that as that word penetrates our thinking, it may bring forth the fruit of wise decisions and right actions.

We thank Thee today for him who, over the last several years, has led this body so often in prayer. We thank Thee for his witness and continuing influence. Grant Thy blessing upon his loved ones. May they be comforted by their memories of his life, and by their hope for the life to come.

We pray for the Nation for whom he prayed so often. We love our Nation, Lord. We thank Thee for its ideal of "liberty and justice for all." We confess we have not fully achieved the ideal, but, O God, keep us always moving in that direction. May no selfishness on our part, or lack of understanding, keep us from working for our Nation's welfare. We pray for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with an amendment to the bill S. 251, to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes, in which concurrence of the House is requested.

The message also announced that Mr. Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, appointed Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Prouty to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), appointed Mr. Bass and Mr. Pearson to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

COMPENSATION OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING POSITIONS UNDER THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OVERSEAS TEACHERS PAY AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES ACT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, UDALL, CORBETT, and BROYHILL of North Carolina.

PROPER LAND USE PROMISES LASTING BENEFIT

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

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly expanding urban and industrial area around Atlanta, we have come to appreciate the importance of wise land use planning to protect the community's valuable soil and water resources, and for the long-term benefit of investors in the Atlanta economy.

The Atlanta region is experiencing the same land use problems as those found in other dynamic metropolitan areas in the Nation. The answers to these problems are much the same everywhere. They are based on proper evaluation of the soils; following through with development programs that the particular type of soil will adequately support; taking the necessary steps to protect against erosion from land under development, and stabilizing the soil immediately following development.

Local governments, institutions, and urban and industrial developers in the Atlanta region have wisely sought, and have received, expert help from qualified soil and water conservation technicians in planning the best possible use of land under development.

The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State of Georgia, has provided vital technical assistance on soil and water conservation problems. In the State as a whole, SCS soil scientists last year completed soil surveys on about 1,370,000 acres of land.

I am confident that soil surveys will be used increasingly in Georgia's Fourth District to determine the best possible use of the land in a developing economy; to protect the land from erosion, the riv-

ers and streams in the area from siltation, and those who buy and build on the land from loss due to building on soil that is not suited to the purpose.

I heartily commend the Federal, State, and local cooperation which has made possible the soil surveys and other soil and water conservation measures in the Atlanta area and throughout Georgia's Fourth Congressional District. Through experience, we have come to appreciate the immense value of these services—for the lasting benefit of this important and rapidly growing region of the American Southland.

HEARINGS IN REGARD TO THE B-727 AIRPLANE

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to announce that next Tuesday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have before it in executive session the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to discuss the subject of the B-727 airplane.

All of us are aware that in the past few months there have been several regrettable accidents involving this type of aircraft. Many Members of the House have indicated to me their rightful concern over what has happened and what is being done to avoid repetition.

I wish to indicate that the formal investigations of the aviation authorities are going forward to determine what may have been the causes of the accidents and the steps that need to be taken to prevent recurrence. The record is not yet complete and definitive conclusions have not yet been reached.

The committee has no desire to anticipate what may be the findings, nor jump to any hasty opinions. We cannot overlook, however, our responsibilities to the people and to the Members of the House in the field of aviation operations and safety, as to what, if anything, should be done in the meantime. Accordingly, we are having these executive meetings so that we may be assured ourselves and in turn assure the Members that the proper measures have been and are being taken adequately to protect the public.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected insofar as my remarks of February 23, 1966, appearing on page 3578 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are concerned by includ-

The expanded AID program in Vietnam entails increased administrative expenses. AID has estimated that approximately \$1.4 million will be required to meet recruitment costs and pay for other administrative and support services. Therefore, the committee has included authority to use up to \$1.4 million of supporting assistance funds for administrative expenses incurred only in connection with Vietnam programs. This authority would require a determination by the President that such a transfer is necessary, which determination would be reported to the Congress.

The bill before the House also contains \$15 million to support counterinsurgency and rural development efforts in Thailand and Laos. The battle for these areas of southeast Asia has been increasing in tempo in recent months. Communist subversion is being stepped up and we must meet it.

H.R. 12169 thus will provide support for efforts to meet aggression and resist subversion in these key countries of southeast Asia—Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos. The funds being requested are small in comparison to our military efforts, but they are not less important.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House will help in the short-run struggle against communism and the long-run battle against the ancient enemies of man.

As President Johnson said in his foreign aid message to the Congress:

We extend assistance to nations because it is in the highest traditions of our heritage and our humanity. But even more because we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 12169, which will provide one more step toward a world of stability, peace, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a point on the rule?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and for his explanation of the bill which is to be considered here, H.R. 12169, as made in order by House Resolution 742. My question pertains to the rules of procedure of the House and particularly to lines 6 and 7 of the resolution, where "all points of order against that bill are hereby waived."

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts advise me, in his wisdom and that of the Committee on Rules, what there is in this bill that might be subject to a point of order and, secondly, who made the request that this be included in this rule and, thirdly, why it is good procedure under these particular circumstances?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Actually, I do not know where a point of order lies. All I do know is it is the procedure of the Committee on Rules, when we have a rule to write we tell the Par-

liamentarian and he writes it for us, and we go on from there. I do not know whether there is a point of order that lies against the bill. As I recall it, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, having gone over the bill with the Parliamentarian, that he knew of no points of order but that they thought it was best because of the importance of the bill that they waive points of order so, in case there is a technicality ruled against it, it would protect it.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. But, is the distinguished gentleman telling the House that the Committee on Rules does not write the rules under which we consider legislation in this House?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Of course, we have as an adviser on matters of this nature the Parliamentarian, as do all the Members of the House.

Mr. HALL. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind as to whether or not there is anything in this bill that is not germane? Was any point submitted that would require waiver of all points of order against the bill?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No. I would submit there was not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a poor way to legislate. We have adequate rules of procedure which are updated every 2 years and which have been our rules since the time of Jefferson for the handling of matters pertaining to rules of germaneness, the Ramseyer rule, and every other indication that we ordinarily concern ourselves with concerning points of order. If they are to come in here, as they did indeed yesterday, when we had a protest vote against the rule requested by the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if all supplementals or deficiencies and appropriations come in with waivers of points of order and "gag rules" preventing amendment—and this is a perfectly good rule here except for the waiver of all points of order—there are bound to be objections, no action "without objection," and none will be considered under unanimous consent, and I place the House on notice that there will be protest votes all along.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. All I can say to the gentleman from Missouri is that to my knowledge there are no points of order in this legislation. However, the committee felt that the bill was of such import that it did not want to take any chances, and so the waiver of points of order was placed in the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying—this was inserted by the Parliamentarian or by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it was passed routinely, without consideration by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was suggested by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is nothing in the bill itself that might be subject to a point of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. It was inserted by the Committee on Rules at

the suggestion of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom can determine later whether the bill contains areas therein and whether it might be subject to a point of order. But with this resolution passing as written we have no right to work our will under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman presently in the well of the House, and the Committee on Rules, am I to believe now that it is becoming fashionable to simply write waivers of points of order in the rules clearing bills to the House floor?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. There was a request that this be done.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, is it just fashionable to do it?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Iowa was in the Committee on Rules when the debate transpired yesterday. The gentleman was there, and he knows that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked for this particular rule, after he had talked with the Parliamentarian. At that time the gentleman could have, if he so desired, opposed the rule and the granting of the waiving of points of order that the gentleman's chairman offered before the Committee on Rules, but the gentleman sat there mute.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, let us get the record straight. I sat immediately back of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania said he did not know of any reason why points of order should be waived on the bill, and I thought that was sufficient.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But, nevertheless, he asked for this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he" who asked for a waiver of points of order?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. I presume he was speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Who is "he"? The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee? The chairman of that committee said that he was not asking that the points of order be waived.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. But Dr. MORGAN explained to us that he had requested the rule that was suggested to him, after he had consultation with the Parliamentarian. For that reason he was offering that rule, and that is why we adopted it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not know when that happened, and I insist he did not make such a request. If there is a rollcall vote on the rule I will vote against adoption for the reason that no case has been made for a waiver of points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 742 provides for a 3-hour rule for the consideration of H.R. 12169, which is a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It does waive points of order, but it is open for amendment.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the appropriation of \$415 million for the remainder of fiscal 1966 to support U.S. operations in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and to build up the contingency fund. None of the money is for military assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the funds are intended for the following purposes: \$275 million for Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos, \$7.5 for Thailand, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, and \$100 million for the contingency fund, which makes a total of \$415 million.

Mr. Speaker, of these funds for Vietnam, \$175 million will be used to import essential consumer goods and industrial materials required to keep the economy going. The remaining \$100 million is for the rebuilding of war-damaged villages, roads and bridges, increased refugee relief, and to finance increased counterinsurgency operations.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million for Laos will be used to finance a civilian air transport to outlying areas cut off from direct government contact, and to purchase the supplies carried in by the airlift.

Mr. Speaker, the \$7.5 million earmarked for Thailand is to be used to expand programs aimed at strengthening the exposed northeast area against Communist subversion from neighboring Laos just across the Mekong River. Training of local police improved communications and expanded health, education, and agriculture programs are planned.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. The sum of \$15 million will be used to help finance the Government and the remaining \$10 million is earmarked to continue such projects as road repairs, community development, and irrigation programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes \$100 million to be added to the contingency fund for use in the last 3 months of fiscal 1966. The funds are to meet unexpected needs, not known ones, or programs Congress has previously rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not have any requests for time but do reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to order the previous question.

The motion was agreed to.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks previously made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker. I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was going to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had declared the resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet and I want to object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be fair and wants to protect the rights of Members. Since the gentleman states that he was on his feet for that purpose, without objection the actions by which the resolution was agreed to and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table are vacated.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the resolution on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 359, nays 11, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]
YEAS—359

Abbutt	Aspinall	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.	Herlong	Philbin
Abernethy	Ayres	Bolton	Cabell	Hicks	Pickle
Adair	Baldwin	Bow	Cahill	Holland	Pike
Adams	Baring	Brademas	Callan	Horton	Petrie
Addabbo	Barrett	Bray	Callaway	Hosmer	Poage
Albert	Bates	Brock	Cameron	Howard	Poff
Anderson, Ill.	Battin	Brooks	Carey	Hull	Price
Anderson, Tenn.	Beckworth	Broomfield	Carter	Hungate	Pucinski
Andrews,	Belcher	Brown, Ohio	Celler	Huot	Quie
George W.	Bell	Broyhill, N.C.	Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Race
Andrews,	Bennett	Broyhill, Va.	Clancy	Ichord	Randall
N. Dak.	Berry	Buchanan	Clark	Jacobs	Redlin
Aanunzio	Betts	Burke	Clawson, Del.	Jarman	Rees
Arends	Bingham	Burton, Calif.	Clevenger	Jennings	Reid, Ill.
Ashmore	Boggs	Burton, Utah	Collier	Joelson	Reid, N.Y.
	Boland	Byrne, Pa.	Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Reifel
			Conable	Johnson, Okla.	Reinecke
			Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
			Conyers	Jonas	Rhodes, Ariz.
			Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
			Craley	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, Alaska
			Cramer	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
			Culver	Karsten	Robison
			Cunningham	Karth	Rodino
			Curtin	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Colo.
			Curtis	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
			Daddario	Kelly	Ronan
			Dague	Keogh	Roncalio
			Daniels	King, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
			Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.
			Davis, Wis.	King, Utah	Rosenthal
			de la Garza	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
			Delaney	Kornegay	Roush
			Dent	Krebs	Roybal
			Denton	Kunkel	Rumsfeld
			Derwinski	Kupferman	Ryan
			Devine	Laird	Satterfield
			Diggs	Langen	St. Germain
			Dingell	Latta	St. Onge
			Dole	Leggett	Saylor
			Donohue	Lennon	Scheuer
			Dow	Lipscomb	Schlesler
			Downing	Long, La.	Schmidhauser
			Dulski	Love	Schneebeil
			Duncan, Oreg.	McCarthy	Schweiker
			Duncan, Tenn.	McClary	Secrest
			Dwyer	McCulloch	Shibley
			Edmondson	McDade	Shriver
			Edwards, Ala.	McDowell	Sickles
			Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Sikes
			Ellsworth	McFall	Sisk
			Erlenborn	McGrath	Skubitz
			Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Slack
			Everett	McVicker	Smith, Calif.
			Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald	Smith, N.Y.
			Fallon	MacGregor	Smith, Va.
			Farbstein	Machen	Springer
			Farnum	Mackay	Stafford
			Fascell	Mackie	Staggers
			Feighan	Madden	Stalbaum
			Findley	Mahon	Stanton
			Flood	Mailliard	Steed
			Flynt	Marsh	Stephens
			Fogarty	Martin, Ala.	Stratton
			Foley	Martin, Mass.	Stubblefield
			Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Nebr.	Sullivan
			Ford,	Mathias	Sweeney
			William D.	Matsunaga	Talcott
			Fountain	May	Taylor
			Fraser	Meeds	Teague, Calif.
			Frelinghuysen	Michel	Tenzer
			Friedel	Mills	Thompson, N.J.
			Fulton, Pa.	Minish	Thompson, Tex.
			Fuqua	Mink	Thomson, Wis.
			Gallagher	Minshall	Todd
			Garnatz	Mize	Trimble
			Gathings	Moeller	Tuck
			Gettys	Monagan	Tunney
			Gjalmo	Moore	Tupper
			Gibbons	Morgan	Tuten
			Gilbert	Morris	Udall
			Gilligan	Morrison	Ullman
			Gonzalez	Morse	Utt
			Gray	Morton	Van Deerlin
			Green, Oreg.	Mosher	Vanik
			Green, Pa.	Moss	Vivian
			Greigg	Murphy, Ill.	Waggoner
			Grider	Murphy, N.Y.	Walker, N. Mex.
			Griffin	Murray	Watkins
			Griffiths	Natcher	Watts
			Hagen, Calif.	Nedzi	Weltner
			Haley	Nelsen	Whalley
			Halpern	Nix	White, Tex.
			Hamilton	O'Brien	Whitener
			Hanley	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitten
			Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Mich.	Widnall
			Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	Williams
			Hardy	Olsen, Mont.	Wilson, Bob
			Harsha	O'Neal, Ga.	Wolf
			Harvey, Mich.	O'Neill, Mass.	Wright
			Hathaway	Ottinger	Wyatt
			Hawkins	Patman	Wyder
			Hechler	Patten	Yates
			Helstoski	Pelly	Young
			Henderson	Perkins	Younger

NAYS—11

Andrews,	Gross	Pool
Glenn	Gurney	Quillen
Ashbrook	Hall	Rogers, Tex.
Dickinson	Passman	Watson

NOT VOTING—62

Ashley	Fulton, Tenn.	Olson, Minn.
Bandstra	Goodell	Pepper
Blatnik	Grabowski	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Grover	Purcell
Burleson	Gubser	Resnick
Casey	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, S.C.
Cederberg	Halleck	Roudebush
Chelf	Hanna	Scott
Clausen,	Hansen, Iowa	Selden
Don H.	Harvey, Ind.	Senner
Cleveland	Hays	Smith, Iowa
Cohelan	Hébert	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Hollifield	Toll
Corman	Irwin	Vigorito
Dawson	Kee	Walker, Miss.
Dorn	Kirwan	White, Idaho
Dowdy	Landrum	Willis
Dyal	Long, Md.	Wilson,
Edwards, La.	Matthews	Charles H.
Farnsley	Miller	Zablocki
Fino	Moorhead	
Fisher	Multer	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Miller with Mr. Grover.
- Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.
- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
- Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Cederberg.
- Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.
- Mr. Toll with Mr. Goodell.
- Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
- Mr. Hays with Mr. Fino.
- Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Gubser.
- Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
- Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
- Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Scott.
- Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kee.
- Mr. Multer with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
- Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Dowdy.
- Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
- Mr. Chelf with Mr. Irwin.
- Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Selden.
- Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Ashley.
- Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Casey.
- Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hanna.
- Mr. Matthews with Mr. Long of Maryland.
- Mr. Landrum with Mr. Teague of Texas.
- Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dorn.
- Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
- Mr. Willis with Mr. Farnsley.
- Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fisher.
- Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Purcell.
- Mr. Senner with Mr. Powell.
- Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Resnick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12169, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12169 authorizes \$415 million of additional funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Most of this money is for Vietnam, and I believe it is fair to say that if it were not for the war in Vietnam, we would not have this bill before us.

Now I know that there are some of us who disagree with the policy our Government is following in Vietnam, but I do not believe that even those who disagree with our policy will find themselves in opposition to this bill.

As far as I am aware, none of the critics of our policy has advocated an immediate pullout of U.S. forces and termination of U.S. assistance.

I believe everyone will agree that as long as our boys are fighting in Vietnam, we must back them up, and, although this bill provides no military assistance, the funds which it authorizes are absolutely essential if the civilian population is to cope with the devastation of war and the demoralization caused by inflation in that country.

The funds authorized by this bill are to be used as follows:

For Vietnam.....	\$275,000,000
For Laos.....	7,500,000
For Thailand.....	7,500,000
For the Dominican Republic.....	25,000,000
To replenish the contingency fund.....	100,000,000
Total.....	415,000,000

VIETNAM

It is not necessary for me to describe the effect which the war has had on the economy of Vietnam. Villages, roads, and bridges have been destroyed. Crops have been damaged and the movement of rice to markets has been interrupted. The Government is not able to collect its normal revenues, and it needs more money than ever to carry on the war effort.

This bill authorizes funds to assist the rural population to deal with war devastation and to finance the import of additional supplies of very essential commodities. The sale of these commodities will absorb some of the rapidly expanding purchasing power resulting from the presence of U.S. personnel and the large-scale construction program made necessary to supply and to shelter our forces in that country.

At the same time, the proceeds of the sale of these commodities will augment the war budget of the Government of Vietnam.

As I pointed out a minute ago, there is no money in this bill for military assistance. The organization and procedures of the military assistance program are not designed to support combat

operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs agrees with the recommendation of the President that the supply of military equipment and services to the Vietnam forces should be at the discretion of our commander in the field and that the same logistics system should serve both United States and Vietnam forces while this present war is going on. Authorization of the funds to finance military equipment for the use of our own forces in Vietnam and for the Vietnamese forces is now under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

Just yesterday morning I appeared before the Committee on Rules at the same time the Armed Forces representatives appeared, and a rule was granted on their bill. I am sure under the leadership of the House, it will be up for discussion next week.

LAOS

The \$7,500,000 for Laos is needed primarily to meet the problems of supplying the civilian population of that war-torn country. There are a considerable number of refugees who have to be taken care of, and many villages inhabited by people who are strongly anti-Communist are cut off except for air transport. The United States finances civilian air transport to supply these people and the expansion of airport facilities in order to carry the load.

THAILAND

The Communist campaign of terrorism and subversion in Thailand has been accelerated, particularly in the northeast and the extreme south. The \$7,500,000 provided for Thailand is to finance the expansion of the civil police, including additional helicopters and a village radio network, and to extend the rural development program to more villages.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The funds authorized in the bill will provide \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. Most of it will go to pay salaries and other expenses to keep government services going until the revenues of the Government of the Dominican Republic can be restored, and the rest to finance such essential economic programs as road maintenance, repair of irrigation ditches, and community development.

CONTINGENCY FUND

The large item in this bill that is not programed is the contingency fund.

The bill authorizes \$100 million to replenish the contingency fund. Last summer, the President requested and Congress voted \$50 million for the contingency fund. This was the first time in 10 years that the Executive had asked for less than \$150 million for the contingency fund, although in some years the actual drawings on the contingency fund were substantially lower.

The \$50 million has not been enough to meet the demands on the contingency fund this year. It has all been programed, and the bill provides \$100 million to take care of unforeseen situations or to deal with problems which are known to exist but where the amount of money required cannot yet be determined.

The Congress has established the policy, which is accepted by the Executive,

that the contingency fund will not be used to finance projects or operations which are already programed or for which Congress has refused to provide funds.

There is no way we can tell whether \$100 million will be enough or whether it will be too much. The Agency for International Development has in recent years made a good record of returning to the Treasury any unneeded portion of the contingency fund.

The committee believes that, considering the present world situation, it is in the national interest to provide the full amount requested, with the understanding that if all the money is not needed, it will not be spent.

The expanded Vietnam program has increased the cost of administration to pay the salaries of additional personnel, to meet the cost of recruiting the limited number of people with the necessary qualifications who are available for service in Vietnam and provide the necessary office space, equipment, and rental of quarters.

Section 610(b) of existing law prohibits the use of the transfer authority or other discretionary authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act to augment appropriations for administrative expenses. For this reason, an additional authorization is required for this purpose, and the bill makes \$1,400,000 available for such use.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is very, very important to our effort in South Vietnam. As I said before, no military assistance is provided in the bill, but it is important to carry on our effort there. I hope that the House will pass the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that this money is being requested and authorized on an "illustrative" basis, in that if the administration does not need this money for southeast Asia, it could be allocated to and spent in any other country in any part of the world where we have an AID program or even in countries where we do not have an AID program at the present time?

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure if the gentleman from Louisiana will read the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he will find that the President has already had to draw on funds temporarily unused to the amount of \$64 million to keep the program going. The money in this bill will have to replace what has already been drawn and spent. The money is actually needed right now.

Mr. PASSMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's response; but is it not true that this money in this bill is being requested on an "illustrative" basis, and that it is not earmarked for South Vietnam or any other country? It is not like all other foreign aid: It is on an "illustrative" basis and may be spent wherever the AID agency pleases? If it is not true, please point out where in this bill you have earmarked money for South Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. I have already pointed out to the gentleman from Louisiana that \$64 million is earmarked to replace funds already spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is that provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has already been spent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is there such a provision in this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It has been explained in the hearings.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am talking about this specific bill. The program is on an "illustrative" basis. I have been handling the appropriations bill for this program for a long, long time, and it is still on an "illustrative" basis. Funds in the annual appropriation and in this bill are not earmarked for any particular country. Also the contingency fund of \$100 million can be used in any country around the world. In fact, AID testified before my subcommittee that they may not need it and may not spend it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. Is it not a fact that the appropriation bill considered by the gentleman from Louisiana is also on an illustrative basis and that it does give transferability authority?

Mr. MORGAN. This particular authorization has been justified on the basis that the need exists in South Vietnam and in the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I always seem to get this monstrosity of a program through the House on that basis. But when you, the authorization committee, make it legal to appropriate on an illustrative basis, we have no other alternative other than to go along with such a flexible procedure.

This is just another piece of the giveaway program. If you earmark these funds for South Vietnam, I will vote for it and apologize to this House for making this statement. You are not going to earmark these funds, and AID will have the right to spend it wherever they please.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman, who has not always been a supporter of the program, has not been able to earmark it down through the years, I believe that what we must do is trust the administration now, as we have in the past.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has made my point for me. I want to thank him for it. We understand it is not earmarked, and you have no assurance that 15 cents of it will be spent in South Vietnam, so far as the language of the bill is concerned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman's own bill is always set up on an illustrative basis. I believe the chairman made a point that the money has already been borrowed from other areas in order to fund the activities in South Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. I read the hearings, and I still do not know where the money has been spent. It is the same old cabbage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that if the contingency fund in the amount of \$100 million is approved it can be spent in Indonesia or on behalf of Nasser or Sukarno, or in any other place around the world?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman understands the definition of "contingency fund." Of course, it can be used anywhere there are unforeseen emergencies, anywhere around the world. The gentleman knows, as I know, that in the bill of last year we established a special contingency fund for South Vietnam in the amount of \$89 million. It has all been allocated to that area. This is the reason why none of the \$50 million from the contingency fund was used in South Vietnam. The gentleman can be sure, without that special contingency fund for South Vietnam, the \$50 million would have been used in South Vietnam.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today presents a very serious question for many people, including myself, who have been critical of our foreign aid programs for many years. If this bill is to be supported—and I think it should be—it should be supported on the basis of the fact that we are in Vietnam. Whether we like it or not, we are there. If we are there, we should provide every resource, every facility for our fighting men there.

It may be said, perhaps, that in this bill we are being overgenerous. I think we are. In my judgment there is a place where this bill can be reduced and should be reduced. But we must not err on the side of denying any dollars to the activity in Vietnam which will lead to its speedier conclusion and may in any sense result in the saving of lives. Upon that sober basis, I think this legislation should be considered.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is not perfect. It is not without fault. It does not do many of the things that ought to be done. It leaves unanswered certain questions.

However, it is a step in the right direction and possibly, only possibly, the best step that we can take at this time. There are areas about which several of us on the committee who filed supplemental views were deeply concerned. First of all, we are concerned that ships of friendly nations, ships of countries

to which we have given assistance, are even now continuing to carry goods and cargoes into North Vietnam, into the harbor at Haiphong. We feel something should be done about that, something far more than has been done and is being done.

Secondly, although we did not go into this in the supplemental views, we are aware that great delays are being encountered in the offloading of cargos at Saigon and Da Nang and elsewhere. We think this is inexcusable. If, during World War II, we could, by the use of breakwaters and otherwise, unload fantastic amounts of cargo and great numbers of men onto the Normandy beaches in a combat situation, then there is absolutely no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that cargo ships are lined up waiting to be offloaded in Saigon and elsewhere in Vietnam. This, I say, is inexcusable.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, everyone who has visited Vietnam comes back with reports that there is a black market there. Admittedly, in a wartime economy, it is difficult to stop black-market operations, but if they cannot be stopped entirely, at least they can be limited. We who filed supplemental views suggested a means by which this could be done. We suggested that all civilian dependents be sent home. There are no civilian dependents there now of U.S. Government personnel, military and civilian, but there are some contractors' civilian dependents there. We have reason to believe that if these dependents were sent home, at least one type of black-market operation would be curtailed, if indeed not done away with completely.

Reference has been made to the contingency fund. For this fiscal year there was provided \$50 million, which was all committed or at least earmarked in the first 7 months of the fiscal year, none of it for Vietnam.

At the request of the President, special funds for southeast Asia were made available which were or are being used in Vietnam. Now we are asked to provide another \$100 million in contingency funds for the balance of this fiscal year. At the maximum this will only be 4 months. I think that is far too much. In a period when we are tightening our belts and we are trying to continue programs here at home and do a great deal for people abroad the contingency fund should be and can be severely limited. I am sure that an opportunity will be offered to the Members of this House to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude as I began by saying that although this bill before us is one which presents many questions and raises many doubts and leaves issues unanswered, if we take the position that the war in Vietnam must be won, if we take the position that we cannot deny anything which will contribute either directly or indirectly to victory there, then I think we must support this bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his very excellent statement as to his reasons for supporting this legislation.

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169.

I fail to see how Congress could do otherwise, any more than it could fail to authorize payment of the water bill for the fire department while it was in the midst of attempting to stamp out dangerous fires in many parts of the city.

The bill before us today is emergency legislation. It is designed to authorize the expenditure of \$415 million in tax dollars, most of it to be spent in the short space of the next 4 months, in order to repair the damages caused in many parts of the world by ignorance, by unconcern, by miscalculation and misunderstanding.

It even provides an additional \$100 million for our \$50 million "petty cash drawer" in case dollars are needed to sprinkle on other brush fires which might erupt in any part of the world.

I am sure that the Congress will enact this bill into law rapidly, as it should. This money is needed, and quickly, in such places as South Vietnam, Laos, the Dominican Republic and Thailand.

But throwing dollars at our problems is not a solution to them, no matter how many dollars we have and however, tempting this solution may appear. The best that dollars can buy is time. The worst is complacency and the failure to even see problems as they develop.

We need more fire prevention as well as fire control in the world, and we can't have it unless and until we start using these dollars as tools to implement foreign policy rather than as replacements for a foreign policy.

Unfortunately, the funds we are authorizing today are not tools, not implementations, but payments for mistakes. Let us hope we have fewer of them in the future.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Will the gentleman in the well please give me a few hypothetical illustrations on which this money from the \$100 million contingency fund could be spent?

Mr. ADAIR. I think the chairman of the committee answered that a little earlier. I could only use generally the same illustrations. A contingency fund is, as its name implies, a fund to be used for unseen eventualities. We in the Congress and particularly in the House and those of us on the Committee on Foreign Affairs have been in the past—and I count myself among those—particularly critical of the way that the contingency fund can be used, but there are—and I will say to the gentleman very few—limitations, as long as it falls within the broadest outlines of foreign aid, on the manner in which this fund can be used. It can be used for situations which arise,

for example, in a country which is newly threatened with revolt. It can be used for problems which present themselves in the field of education or matters of that sort. It is subject to the very widest use.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.
Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman heard the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for foreign aid. Is it accurate that these funds are not tied down on that this authorization of funds is not tied down to Vietnam?

Mr. ADAIR. It is true that by the terms of this bill it is not tied down to Vietnam nor indeed to southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. ADAIR. Let me continue. However, if you read the record of the hearings, and if you consult the report, there is no question as to the intent. Since the gentleman has opened the question let me state that we are acting upon this as a measure apart from some money for the Dominican Republic, a measure basically for southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Accordingly, I would think that the administration which has presented it to the Congress in that way as a measure to contribute to stability in southeast Asia would feel bound to use it for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, why would not the administration have this in this bill?

Mr. ADAIR. That is a question which the gentleman, I believe, should address to the author of the bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am quite interested in this question.

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am very happy to point out that of the money which has been earmarked, \$275 million of this request has been justified on the basis of its need in South Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, but—no, no, if I could interrupt there just a minute. You are not responsive to the issue. You say "earmarked," and that struck my interest.

But then you go on, as has just been talked about, and say something else. I want to find out why it is not actually tied down and actually earmarked by language, and not on the basis of just these statements.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, it has never been earmarked in such fashion in any of the history of the foreign aid bill. During the history of the foreign aid bill it has never been specifically earmarked.

Mr. CURTIS. I know, and that is one of the troubles with this bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Or any other appropriation.

Mr. MORGAN. Or in the appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri wants to change the rules on matters of this kind.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe that is one reason our foreign aid programs have been so poor, if I may draw that conclusion. Certainly, to come here at a time when we are in war over there, and say that this is for Vietnam and if you expect to get the vote on the assurance that that is what it is, I certainly believe that this rule should be changed and we should tie it down.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I will vote for this unless it is tied down, because I have seen instances in these programs and I am about to conclude that the administration does not follow what it says in those examples which it gives us to where the money is to be spent. We could not rely upon this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. I say in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that it is my understanding we will have an opportunity to connect these more closely and explicitly with Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will a possible amendment be offered?

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that such is the case.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to develop one other point, if I may. I was trying to find—and I have not had an opportunity to look through all of the hearings, although I have read the report—I was interested in seeing what balances we have not just in the foreign aid funds, but Public Law 480 funds, and how this money that we recently voted for the Asian Bank, which I hope will be available particularly in Vietnam, how this is coordinated. But I find no discussion of it contained in the report. As I stated earlier, insofar as I have been able to ascertain from the report, and I have not read the hearings, there has been no interrogation on this point.

Could the gentleman tell me whether the committee did go into all aspects of financing that is available in Vietnam, not just through this bill, but through the use of Public Law 480 funds, the lending that might be available in the Asian Bank, and so forth?

Mr. ADAIR. Having in mind the great multiplicity of lending institutions that are available for activities here and elsewhere, I would have to say to the gentleman, it would be almost impossible to go into all of them. Some of them do not even come within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We did give some consideration—perhaps not enough—to the general subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would permit me to make this observation before he yields further, it seems to me that is what we would expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs

to do even though it is not within their jurisdiction—at least to have a knowledge of the funds that would be going in to hit at the same problem so at least there would be some consensus of this whole problem that the House could consider.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. GALLAGHER. There is a complete report on all of the expenditures available for all Members. But if I might follow up what the gentleman from Indiana has already said and nail it down, we are talking about funds primarily to be used in Vietnam. For instance, the \$100 million of this request is for additional economic assistance that will be used for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. AID needs \$175 million for Vietnam to help finance the import of essential commodities in order to help combat inflation.

Rice imports needs \$21 million.

Medicines and pharmaceuticals requires \$9 million.

Needed for petroleum products, \$12 million.

Needed for iron and steel, \$50 million.

Needed for fertilizer imports, \$4.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside of Saigon. All of the \$275 million is pinpointed for use in Vietnam.

Mr. CURTIS. In what way is this tied down? This is simply a statement. How can the Congress know that this actually is the way this money will be spent?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We would assume, of course, that the administration is telling the truth, as we have during all the time that we have had this program in operation.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further just for this observation, that is the whole point that the gentleman from Louisiana made, as I understand it, and to the extent that I have been able to study this matter of expenditures, the administration—and this is not just this administration, it was true in the Eisenhower administration as well.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. There was not this kind of followthrough on how they spent the money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There has been that kind of followthrough and that is why we have confidence that the money will be properly used.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the gentleman is saying that he feels I am in error in concluding that there has not been a followthrough?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I would conclude that the gentleman is in error if he says that there has not been a followthrough on this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] raised the question of committee consideration of the Southeast Asian Development Bank.

That was subsequent to the hearings held by the committee on this bill. Moreover, we are never consulted by the Committee on Banking and Currency, so far as I know, with respect to financing any of these wonderful giveaways around the world that they get into.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell us whether or not there is any existing statutory authority at the present time to permit the President or someone to order the dependents of the U.S. citizens back home?

Mr. ADAIR. The President in my opinion has the authority. I think there is no doubt about it. It has been exercised, I am told, in a number of instances.

Mr. CAHILL. Can the gentleman advance any logical reason as to why this authority would be utilized as far as military personnel are concerned and not so far as civilian dependents are concerned.

Mr. ADAIR. Not at all. That is the point I was trying to make earlier and I appreciate the gentleman's concurrence in my views.

Mr. CAHILL. I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. One of the things that I have observed is that there is a tremendous housing shortage in Saigon particularly. I think this is one of the elements involved in the black market and certainly it is something that needs looking into. I think the gentleman has made a very valuable contribution to the discussion of these problems.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to point out that all civilian personnel of the Government have been ordered home. The only civilian personnel remaining there or family of personnel are the wives and families of the private contractors who are there.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for his constructive criticism. I have always had a great deal of respect for his position in this regard and for his sincere endeavor. I would like to ask the gentleman a question at this point. Is it not true that the criticism that you have brought out on the floor at this time regarding civilian dependents and supplies was thoroughly discussed by us in the consideration of this bill and that at the present time we have the statements to the effect that the supplies have been speeded up and that we might take up the problem of civilian dependents?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentlewoman is correct. Efforts are being made. My point is that they are tardy and far too little. If we can get cargoes across beaches under combat conditions, I see no reason

why we cannot do the same in areas where there is no danger of aerial attack.

Mrs. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I think we sometimes tend to forget when we talk about AID appropriations, and funding, and economic development and all the other technical jargon, that at the grassroots, out where the action is, the AID program means people at work—dedicated people; people with a job to do; people who get tired and scared and shot at and worried and who keep right on doing their jobs the best way they can. I would like to tell you about just one of these men I met during my recent trip to Vietnam.

I spent 1 day in the Mekong Delta with the U.S. operations mission there. I could not get in the area I was supposed to visit because they were afraid for my safety. The man running that area was Eduardo Navarro.

Eduardo Navarro is a retired U.S. Army colonel. He knows how to use a gun if he has to but he does not carry one. He is a civilian working for the Agency for International Development as a Provincial representative in Vietnam near the Cambodian border. He is concerned with the welfare of 250,000 Vietnamese in an area infested with Vietcong. After being ambushed several times on the road to Saigon, he finally gave up driving. He has had several narrow escapes from daytime bombings in the streets of the city.

The villagers regard Ed Navarro as their friend. He works closely with the Province chief and American and Vietnamese military personnel to improve life in the Province while maintaining the best possible security. About 30 of his villages are considered secure and have qualified for Government help by routing out the Vietcong and agreeing to carry out self-help projects.

He is proud of the more than 100 schools which have been built by the village parents with cement and roofing supplied by AID. Nearly 200 teachers have been trained in short courses. Several clinics have been built and stocked with medical supplies from the AID commodity import program. Occasionally, the Vietcong steal them but the people know where they come from.

He uses his warehouse of food-for-peace wheat, oils, and dried milk as payment for work to benefit the community and make life worth fighting for.

On a demonstration farm 2 miles out of town, production is being increased by use of fertilizer and new seed. The Provincial hospital has a new surgical wing built by AID, staffed by a team of Filipino doctors and nurses paid by their own Government.

In fact, no aspect of life is overlooked. All the resources of AID in Vietnam are available to Eduardo Navarro to help the Vietnamese people build a better life. Not many Americans will ever hear of Ed Navarro or of his counterparts in

every Vietnamese Province. But we in the Congress must not only know of what they are doing, we must support them. Perhaps this war cannot be won by civilians armed with seed, cement, and goodwill, but neither can it be won without them.

I believe the budget requests for AID are minimal and I call for their speedy approval.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would address a question to the chairman of the committee, if I might have his attention. This bill, as I understand it, and as I believe the Members of the House understand it, is to provide additional funds for economic aid to the Vietnamese and contiguous territory, plus \$25 million for the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORGAN. Plus \$100 million for the contingency fund.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But is not the bill designed for the purpose of aid to Vietnam? There is nothing whatever for the military effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy percent of the funds in the bill are designed to support the war effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then why should we be dealing in this supplemental with any other areas other than those enumerated in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. We are not. That is my opinion. I understand that all of the supplemental appropriations requested in this bill are for areas that are of vital importance to the security of this country.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the distinguished chairman agree with me that there is nothing whatever in the language of this bill that holds its provisions to Vietnam or any other specific place in the world?

Mr. MORGAN. As the gentleman knows, this is a supplemental authorization and is an amendment to the regular foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; it is an addition to the regular foreign handout.

Mr. MORGAN. This is the procedure. Any other method would require us to bring out a separate AID bill for South Vietnam. Is that what the gentleman is suggesting? This is an amendment to the regular AID bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think a substantial number of the Members of the House are willing to vote for a bill today supplementing the foreign aid appropriations where such funds are designated for the purpose of doing something about aiding and brining about a successful conclusion of the Vietnamese situation and sorry state of affairs in the Dominican Republic. It will be my purpose later on to offer an amendment to the bill to restrict the expenditures to those areas. It will be my further purpose to move to strike out all of the contingency fund increase, and I will argue that point later, because as the supplementary views in the report clearly show, not one dime of the \$50 million previously appropriated—

and this was the statement of the distinguished chairman before the Rules Committee yesterday—was used in Vietnam. So it is incredible that we should be called upon today to provide \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund when we are dealing with a bill specifically designed to take care of the situations in the Dominican Republic, in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention, on Tuesday next, when H.R. 12335 comes to the House, containing approximately \$4 billion for military use in southeast Asia planning, to do the same thing and to pinpoint it in the same way?

Mr. GROSS. There is a great difference between military assistance and the giveaway program.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not believe there is. It is all part of the same thing.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the giveaway program can go to any country in the world under the terms of this bill—to any country in the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it the gentleman's intention to pinpoint each item in the military authorization for Vietnam?

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman is not trying to compare military assistance with this bill, which happens to come from the committee of which I am a member. I know a little something about this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is making an argument about the economic portion of the bill, but I still would like to have an answer to my question in regard to military funds authorized for the same area.

Mr. GROSS. I happen to know something about this bill. I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee and, therefore, I cannot say that I know as much about military assistance needs in the areas covered by this bill.

Does the gentleman know about the military bill? I shall be glad to support amendments, if the gentleman will offer them, with regard to military assistance, if he can find anyplace where we are going to give military assistance to anyone outside the southeast Asia area unless that country is fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has no intention to offer amendments. What I am trying to say to you, Mr. Gross, is that I have confidence in my President. When he says he is going to spend \$275 million in Vietnam I have confidence that he is going to spend it in Vietnam.

Mr. GROSS. Then suppose you tell me what happened to the \$50 million in the contingency fund which was expended last year? Suppose you tell me where the President is going to use the \$100 million in 120 days or less. Suppose you give me some idea as to that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Gross, there was a contingency fund every year of the Eisenhower administration and every year since, and not one dime of this authorization has ever been programed in advance. If you will allow me the

time, I will read that information into the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. No; the gentleman controls ample time for that.

Mr. MORGAN. As to all of the expenses since 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute, now. You have ample time or time of your own.

Mr. MORGAN. And not one dime out of the contingency fund has been programmed. You know the definition of "contingency fund" and I know it. It is for unforeseen emergencies.

I do not know today where one dime of this money is going to be spent, and I do not believe the administration does.

Mr. GROSS. We put \$50 million into the contingency fund last year.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; and I know where every dime of it was spent. So do you.

Mr. GROSS. Let us get it in the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. You know and I know that security is involved, and we cannot introduce it in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Much of it ought to go in the RECORD. Much of it should not be classified. It should be made available to the people who pay the bills.

Mr. MORGAN. You know very well that it cannot be put in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. You know that there is plenty of it that ought to be put in the RECORD.

I believe we ought to take a look at the help we are not getting in Vietnam these days, along with the tremendous expenditure of money we are making and being called upon to make under the terms of this bill.

So far as I know, there are only three countries—Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea—which are supplying any combat troops at all. New Zealand is supplying one battery of artillery. Australia is supplying a battalion of combat troops. And South Korea, on the basis of the last information I have is supplying a division of combat troops.

I have not seen any figures with regard to casualties of Koreans. I suppose they are engaged somewhere in Vietnam, but the newspapers do not provide us with the casualty figures insofar as the Koreans, the Australians, and the New Zealanders are concerned.

Otherwise they are deeply gratified—as Henry Cabot Lodge said when he appeared before the committee not too long ago—the other countries of the world are deeply gratified that we are doing the fighting and dying in Vietnam, along with the South Vietnamese.

Let us consider the Philippines, for instance. At present the Philippines have 70 personnel in Vietnam. These consist of military and civilian medical teams and a military psychological warfare detachment. Would one not believe that the Philippines could make some kind of combat contribution to the war in Vietnam, to some of the fighting and dying going on over there?

Japan has provided over \$55 million worth of economic assistance to Vietnam. This is money. We are talking about money exclusively now. This is reparations money they owe the Vietna-

mese as a result of their defeat in World War II that they would pay under any circumstances. Yet the State Department has the colossal gall to hand out a statement of this kind indicating that the Japanese are making a contribution in Vietnam when they give them \$55 million of money which they owe them as reparations for damage when they occupied the country in the last war.

You talk about having confidence in people. Let us have a decent and a fair story from some of these people in the State Department and in the White House.

Greece has contributed medical supplies. I do not know how much. This is the State Department report which says Greece has contributed medical supplies. I hope it is remembered that we put a lot of money into Greece in other years, yet we get no real help in stopping communism elsewhere.

Turkey has provided medicines and has also offered to provide some cement. Some cement—no troops.

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Vietnam and has dispatched a medical team.

Hundreds of millions of American dollars are going into India, a country that had 5 million or more under arms in World War II yet it will not provide a single combat soldier to help us out in Vietnam. India has provided cloth for flood relief, says the State Department, and has under study the creation in Vietnam of a factory for the preparation of tea and another for sugar so they will have tea with their sugar and sugar with their tea. This is within the framework of a program of technical assistance and economic cooperation. India is also considering providing equipment for what? For a blood transfusion center. They do not offer to give any blood, but will provide the center for somebody else to give their blood. How nice. Pakistan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the additional time.

Pakistan has contributed some financial relief for flood victims, and it, too, donated some clothing to Vietnam. No troops.

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies and has offered to train Vietnamese in Israel in various fields, whatever that means. No troops.

Belgium provided medicines. How much? The State Department does not say. No troops.

Canada is providing a professor of orthopedics at Saigon University. A big help. Also about 200 scholarships both academic and technical. They are also providing about \$150,000 worth of flour. If I remember correctly, Canada has been selling about \$400 million worth of wheat a year to Red China, but they cannot afford to get into Vietnam on a bloodletting basis. So, no troops. I almost forgot—Canada has agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Vietnam's Hue University.

Denmark has provided medical supplies and is willing to train Vietnamese nurses in Denmark. No troops.

France since 1956, says the State Department, contributed \$111 million in assistance to South Vietnam. That is since 1956. A big contribution. No troops.

Germany has provided 12 personnel in Vietnam and has agreed to provide 14 more for a total of 26. They, too, are providing a large amount of help. No troops.

Ireland has contributed 1,000 pounds to Vietnam through their Red Cross. No troops.

Italy, where we have dumped more billions of dollars—and I mean billions—have provided a nine-man surgical team and are providing science scholarships. No troops.

The Netherlands. The Dutch have given antibiotics. No troops.

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines and has agreed to send a military medical team to Vietnam. No troops.

Switzerland, the home of a lot of our gold and bank accounts. I wish there were some way we could find out how many of the black marketeers and corruptionists in Vietnam have unnumbered bank accounts in Switzerland as well as some other people. However, the Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. No troops.

Now we get down to Britain, which is threatening to invade little Rhodesia and bring that friendly country to its knees. In one of the most outrageous enterprises in the history of this country, President Johnson has joined the British in their boycott of Rhodesia. The British have provided six civilians for the British advisory mission in Vietnam and a professor of English at Hue University. With 8 Vietnamese already in training in England, Britain has agreed to provide for 12 more this year.

That is the British Empire or what is left of it. They are perfectly willing, apparently, if all else fails and they are losing their boycott of Rhodesia—they are perfectly willing it seems to send two divisions there to beat that little country down and stir up more ferment and more trouble in Africa in the process. Apparently the explosion and massacres in Nigeria have not given the United States enough to handle for awhile, so this administration has to help stir up more trouble in Rhodesia.

Now getting to Latin America, the Argentines have sent two observers to Vietnam to examine the possibilities for Argentine assistance. They are going to send some observers down to find out whether there is any place for them to do any fighting or dying in Vietnam.

Brazil has provided coffee and medical supplies. No troops.

In the Dominican Republic they are having their own troubles, but they have offered some cement.

So it goes around the world where we have frittered away at least \$130 billion trying to buy friends and influence people. Yes, as Lodge reports, most of the rest of the world is deeply gratified that we are fighting and financing the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

(Mr. KING of Utah asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, there are some who may be reluctant to approve further public funds for non-military purposes in South Vietnam until they are assured that private philanthropic agencies are also given a full opportunity to assist. Let me assure the members of this committee that private philanthropic groups are giving valuable assistance in South Vietnam. Their story is a noble one, that deserves to be told.

A recent on-the-spot survey by representatives of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service reported that "the refugee situation in Vietnam is in good hands." They found 43 voluntary agencies with either operational or supporting interest in Vietnam. Their varied programs are supplementing that of the Government of Vietnam and the Agency for International Development. These nongovernmental groups serve special needs and establish direct person-to-person relationships where Government programs cannot operate so easily. Twenty-eight private agencies were running refugee relief programs.

For example: CARE is distributing packages financed by donations of the American people, including school supplies, tools and seeds; needle trade kits to accompany sewing machines, and rice, salt, and fish, purchased locally.

Catholic Relief Services is expanding its services by 2 percent for school lunch programs, family feeding stations, and relief of war victims. It will quadruple its shipments of medicines, expand its vocational schools and cooperatives, and increase orphanages and social welfare services.

Church World Service took part in the initial refugee program in 1954 when 800,000 Vietnamese fled south. It has returned to Vietnam to serve the new influx of refugees, providing nurses and medical units, community development and agricultural teams, and some supplies for direct relief.

Other church-related agencies providing similar services and supplies include the Christian Children's Fund, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Mennonite Central Committee. Other agencies with special competence are helping with the blind, lepers, orphans, foster parents, public health, and rural electrification.

The International Rescue Committee, in cooperation with AID, has accepted the responsibility for six medical teams to be assigned to refugee areas. Leading American drug companies already have donated a substantial supply of drugs for civilian use, and the Medical Civic Action Program will distribute them throughout Vietnam.

International Voluntary Services has been operating a program in Vietnam since 1957. Under an AID contract, IVS has 50 young men serving throughout

the rural regions, working on projects in agriculture, science education, teaching English, and in work with youth and refugees.

The number of refugees will soon exceed a million, and will seriously tax the resources of all agencies. The most pressing need, according to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, is for more personnel. Supplies there are, but people are needed to help in the camps where 450,000 refugees are now being cared for, and in the villages to which they return or are resettled. Doctors, nurses, administrators, social welfare, and community development experts are wanted on short- and long-term assignments both by voluntary agencies and by AID.

In spite of all the difficulties, the refugee problem in Vietnam is being handled with vigor, and great self-sacrifice. I, for one, want to see that every cent of the AID request is provided for this vital work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment and commend the gentleman from Utah for pointing out to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and to the country, the splendid effort being made by the private, voluntary, and religious organizations in Vietnam and in the rest of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would add to the remarks of the gentleman, if I may, that our Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has studied the scope of organizational contributions to human betterment, in the areas of economic well-being, education, health, and all others. Our study fully corroborates what the gentleman has reported about the voluntary agency and religious group effort to help in South Vietnam. The report shows that there are several thousand such organizations in the United States helping throughout the entire world, and it is estimated that such private assistance amounts to about \$600 million a year.

This represents a substantial and knowledgeable effort on the part of U.S. citizens to express their interest in the welfare and freedom of other people of the world.

This is a story which ought to be told more frequently. It is a story that all of the American people ought to understand and in which they ought to take great pride.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because I believe it is necessary that the U.S. Congress provide all necessary funds for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We people on the Foreign Affairs Com-

mittee of the House have had adequate hearings and have discussed this legislation and the need for it. I would say to the House, I believe this is a good bill and should be passed so that there will be adequate supplemental foreign assistance authorization for the fiscal year 1966 under H.R. 12169.

I have several amendments I think should be placed in the legislation. The first one refers to the \$25 million for the Dominican Republic which is shown on page 3 of the section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12169.

I recommend that item should be specifically made by the United States not as a grant, but on a loan basis. The reason being this item is not just for current expenses but is to help on capital budget costs in the Dominican Republic. Capital expenditures should as a policy be advanced on a short- or long-term basis.

As a matter of fact, in the hearings we had the statement from Mr. Bell of AID as follows:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance and to more permanent construction and long-range efforts to establish a stronger economy in the Dominican Republic.

When the purpose of the \$25 million is for longtime capital purpose, then I believe Congress should specify it should be on a loan.

But you say to me—FULTON, are we going to be depriving the Dominican Republic Government of needed assistance? The answer is "No."

If you will look at page 20 of the committee hearings, you will find that since the date of the revolution which occurred on April 24, 1965, through January 10, 1966, the great U.S. Government and the greater U.S. taxpayers have put in \$86.3 million as grants to the Dominican Republic. These were supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance.

In addition to that, there is \$50 million current 1966 authorized money in the President's contingency fund plus \$4.1 million carryover from 1965. I am not allowed to give you the details of it, but there is an allocation of \$37.3 million to the Dominican Republic out of \$54.1 million remaining in that contingency fund as of this time. That is not obligation—that is allocation. So that adding the \$86.3 million makes a total of \$123.6 million that the United States is providing now to the Dominican Republic.

The President now proposes to add \$25 million more as a grant. So this addition will mean since April 24, 1965, U.S. grants of \$148,622,000.

I believe that is one of the highest rates of grants we have ever had to a country of this size.

But you say to me—How about the present loans of the Dominican Republic? They have some loans under 1 year—\$30 million worth of loans due under 1 year. Those loans are owed to foreign banks. So we in Congress are just simply going to pick up the \$25 million of commercial foreign bank loans.

The Dominican Republic Government owes \$153.5 million on loans that are

from 1 to 8 years maturity. The United States could make a 40-year loan to the Dominican Republic with 1-percent interest for 10 years, and 2½-percent interest for 30 years. This type of loan is authorized under present Federal acts. So that if the United States gives the Dominican Republic \$25 million as a loan on a long-term basis, they are not in such bad shape, as the United States has really given wonderful help to the Dominican people as follows:

U.S. assistance to the Dominican Republic, Apr. 24, 1965, to Jan. 10, 1966

Supporting assistance grants for Government operations and maintenance-----\$66,300,000

Administered through OAS--- 57,000,000
Administered through AID--- 29,300,000

Approximately \$49 million of these funds have been used to pay salaries of employees who were on Government payrolls, or were employed by municipalities or Government-owned corporations before April 24, 1965; \$12 million was made available to the Government-owned sugar corporation through a loan by the Organization of American States. The balance was provided for disaster relief including food and medical supplies and emergency public works activities which are being undertaken by the provisional Government and AID.

Technical assistance grants totaled-----\$4,438,000

Agriculture----- 941,000
Education----- 396,000
Transportation----- 212,000
Public administration----- 1,161,000
Community development----- 128,000
Other projects----- 1,600,000

Development loans authorized:
National Housing Bank----- 5,000,000
Food for peace----- 7,858,000

Title II emergency program----- 3,007,000
Title III approved fiscal year 1966----- 4,851,000

Another question you should ask me is who are the creditors of the Dominican Government and to whom are those loans owed? Obligations from 1- to 8-year maturity are owed to the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank and the U.S. Treasury.

On loans over 8 years, obligations of the Dominican Republic Government are owed to the International Bank, AID, Export-Import Bank, and to the U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, title IV.

Why should the United States adopt a business basis and free enterprise policy toward the Dominican Republic at this time? The reason is that the Dominican Government is holding many businesses that are now Government owned and Government operated. These businesses are being operated at a deficit. The Dominican economic situation is this. First, there is a low rate of savings and investment. Nobody much in the Dominican Republic is saving or trying to help their government by avoiding inflation and seeking stable economic conditions.

Second, the Dominican exports are still being emphasized on commodities like sugar and cocoa which are in great oversupply at the present time and low priced on the international markets.

The Dominicans have not changed their agricultural programs to realism and effective demand. This should be done at once both at home and abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let us face it. Too large a share of the economy of the Dominican Republic is owned and operated by the Government at a loss. If we will simply insist in this Congress that the Dominican Republic change over and make immediate plans for changing to a private economy, the U.S. taxpayers will be much better off, rather than financing indefinitely the \$5 million a month Government deficit, and deficiencies in foreign trade because of inflation at home and continued deficits caused by excessive imports compared to exports.

My other point is this: I propose to offer an amendment to cut the President's contingency fund for from \$150 million, which it would be if Congress adds \$100 million more under this bill, to \$100 million total for the 3-month period to the end of the current fiscal year or June 30, 1964. As has been pointed out, this contingency fund will be spent over a 3-month period—over April, May, and June of this year—so that if the President has \$50 million added on by this bill as I propose he will be getting undesignated contingency funds at the rate of \$200 million a year. This is in addition to the \$89 million special contingency fund for southeast Asia we in Congress have given the President for use in this current fiscal year, which is all the President asked.

In the current fiscal year we have in the contingency fund \$50 million currently authorized and appropriated, and allocated but not yet obligated. In this fiscal year 1966 we have also \$4.1 million of contingency funds carried over from 1965. That means a total of \$54.1 million presidential contingency funds on hand now, of which about \$37 million has been allocated to the Dominican Republic and the rest to other places, which I should not give specifically.

My amendment will give the President \$50 million more for the remaining 3 months of this fiscal year, until June 30, and I believe that is enough. If it is any larger, if the crisis anywhere abroad is any larger, I believe the President should come to Congress and get an authorization.

So I would say to this House of Representatives that we should hold the purse strings and watch expenditures closely. We should not move this contingency fund back up to the \$200 million contingency fund annually as it had been some time previously, several years ago, when the amount authorized any appropriated was not fully used.

The reason I say that is as follows: In fiscal year 1965, \$150 million was authorized for the President's contingency fund; \$99.2 million was appropriated and, as a matter of fact, the obligations were only \$57 million. In 1966 there was \$50 million authorized and appropriated, which appears to have carried the con-

tingency fund for 9 months. So I believe \$100 million extra added on for a 3-month period is at too great a rate for the President's contingency fund. I therefore recommend by my amendment that \$50 million now be added by the Congress to the President's contingency fund for the remaining 3 months after enactment until June 30, 1966. This will result by my amendment in a budget saving of \$50 million.

I do not favor Congress blindly authorizing and appropriating large sums of undesignated, unallocated, and unprogrammed funds.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee, with his typically accurate and effective argument, has stated the basic reasons for this legislation. Most of the money in this bill is for the economic support of South Vietnam. This little country is wartorn and threatened with runaway inflation. She has committed thousands and tens of thousands of her sons to battle, and all reports that have come to my attention have indicated that her men are fighting with ever-increasing effectiveness, and that they are giving magnificent accounts of themselves in the field.

But this bill is also a part of a wider effort about which our President spoke in his great address in New York City last night. He said:

The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—we are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

As this House acts on supplemental legislation for supporting our civilian and military men in Vietnam, I have no doubt that there will be vigorous debate. But let there be no mistake about our determination to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam. We have not sacrificed in Western Europe, in Berlin, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, in the China Straits, in the missile crisis in Cuba, and now in Vietnam in vain. We are going to be true to our great principles of freedom, and to our commitments to help others preserve their independence.

I have heard it said that this is not a popular war, as if any war were popular. Some say the public does not understand why we are fighting—why we have such a vital interest in southeast Asia. And I say, as the President said last night—if you do not know, if you are not sure, ask the men who are there. They know.

Or ask the South Vietnamese, who have fought so valiantly to defend themselves. Ask the widows of the village chiefs who have been murdered by the Communists. Ask their sons and daughters. And they will tell you what Communist terror really means.

Or go through southeast Asia and ask leaders of Thailand, Malaya, the Philip-

piners, Japan, why the war in Vietnam is important, and they will tell you.

Or, if you still do not believe, ask the Communists. They know what they are doing. They are not just fighting to win in Vietnam. They are fighting a so-called war of liberation which is a prelude to similar wars in every other underdeveloped country in the world. As the commanding general of North Vietnam said recently:

If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world.

Let us be clear on this point—we are not fighting against a Democratic revolution within South Vietnam. We are not even fighting just the Vietcong. We are fighting Communist aggression. It is a different form of aggression than we faced in Berlin or Korea, or Cuba, but for that reason it is even more dangerous. Earlier forms of Communist aggression were easier to combat. People's emotions are more readily aroused in a war of invasion than they are in a war of infiltration. The Communists know that, and they are counting on us not to have the will to fight.

By passing this legislation by an overwhelming vote the House will demonstrate once again to the entire world, and especially to the Communists, the resolve of our country to stand firm against communism.

As the most powerful democratic nation on earth, we must bear the heavy responsibilities and burdens of leadership. The price of leadership is sacrifice—of men, of resources, of the normal pursuits of life. But these are small compared to the costs of failure. We have shouldered burdens before, and there is a long, hard road ahead.

But there is a human greatness in the democratic spirit, and in the soul of America, which will sustain us now as it has in the past. Without heroics, but with quiet courage and determination, Vietnamese and American men and women are proving once more the strength of free societies.

Sergeant Walling, U.S. Army, was such a man. You may remember what the President said about him:

On the 19th day of June, this year, a young and brave American set out into the jungles of a distant land—half a world away. He walked at the side of a patrol of young and brave Vietnamese.

Their purpose—and his—was to defend freedom against its aggressors.

The name of that American was Harry A. Walling.

He was a sergeant of the U.S. Army—and a proud member of the proud Special Forces who wear the green beret.

When the Vietnamese patrol came under attack, the only thought of Sergeant Walling was for the patrol—and its success. He gave no thought to safety or to self. Those who recovered his body found that, before he died, Sergeant Walling had fired his every round of ammunition.

We have come today to bestow upon Sergeant Walling one of our country's highest honors. No medal, no words, no eulogies of ours can honor him so highly as he has honored our country and our cause.

But we can—and we must always—honor ourselves by working everywhere we can, in every way we can, for a world of peace in

which the young and the brave need not die in war.

When Sergeant Walling fell, he left behind his young widow and three young children—the oldest age 3, the youngest now 4 months. Mrs. Walling's bravery is no less than her husband's.

Two nights after she learned her husband would never return, Mrs. Walling wrote out a message to the other wives of her husband's unit. That remarkable letter has deeply touched all who have read it—including the Commander in Chief. I would like to read these lines from it:

"I know you are all afraid for your husbands and love them as much as I loved my husband. He loved me just as your husbands do you, and he didn't want to die. He had so much to live for. But he was a brave man and a fighting man. My husband died for what he believed in, and if he had a choice of where and how he would die, he would choose the same place—fighting for a decent world for his children to grow up in.

"So don't let the world, the loneliness, the despair, and the fear get you down. Stand as tall as that man of yours who wears the beret and thank God you got him * * * my prayers are that all of your husbands come home to you safe and well."

I am proud now on behalf of the Nation to bestow the Silver Star posthumously upon Sgt. Harry A. Walling.

Mr. Chairman, Sergeant Walling knew why he was in Vietnam. Now is the time for this House to show, once again, that it does too.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader's yielding to me at this point. I subscribe almost entirely to what the gentleman from Oklahoma has just said. I want to emphasize that we on our side of the aisle strongly favor a position of strength against Communist aggression in South Vietnam, southeast Asia, Berlin, or anywhere else throughout the world. We have in the past and will in the future.

I am proud of the fact that the House of Representatives is taking up this important legislation today, acting upon it, I believe, constructively, acting upon it promptly, with a minimum of controversy and, I trust, with a minimum of opposition.

It does deeply disturb me, however, that some Senators at the other end of the Capitol—I do not question their motives—are delaying the consideration of and the approval of legislation that is important to the execution of a policy of strength in Southeast Asia. The enactment of this legislation will have an important impact, a favorable one, on the morale of our troops and our South Vietnam allies. Prompt action in the Congress will demonstrate to our enemies that the elected representatives of the American people can act affirmatively and constructively with the backing of a majority of the citizens in this great country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman for what he has said. Certainly the House can demonstrate this afternoon, by the size of its vote

and by the expeditious manner in which it acts, how it stands on this matter.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to direct constructive criticism toward this bill and the general problem which we face. I first wish to compliment the chairman of our committee for the very scholarly, the very distinguished, and the very statesmanlike manner in which he has conducted the operations on this side of the Congress. I would think the very least I could say about this bill as we process it this afternoon is that we are proceeding in a more practical way than our counterpart committee on the other side of the Congress and in a more practicable and reasonable fashion. I do commend the chairman, therefore, for his leadership and his sobriety, even though I may not always agree with where he is leading us.

I should like to point out that there is really no argument for the passage of this bill. It is a \$415 million blank check for 4 months; that is, for the remaining 4 months of this fiscal year. If we had assurance that this money was intended entirely for South Vietnam in direct and practical support of our efforts there, I would have no criticism of it, but the fact of the matter is, as it was brought out in the discussion earlier by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], that there is not a single dollar of this that must reach Vietnam. It could be diverted to any place in the world.

For the Congress to hand the AID agency or the State Department a blank check for \$415 million is, in my opinion, an abdication of legislative responsibility. If we were to pin this money down without any doubt and were in effect to say to the American public the situation in Vietnam is so complicated and so dangerous in all its ramifications that we absolutely need \$415 million for that world trouble spot, then I would not object. But that is not what we are saying here this afternoon. I suppose it would be asking too much for the Members to have their attention directed to the supplemental views. However, if you will note, this report was written because we wanted to provide some constructive suggestions and voice some practical ideas on how this bill should be analyzed by the Members. I should like to reemphasize a number of points. For example, the question of AID borrowing millions of dollars from other sources supposedly to assist programs in Vietnam; the completely loose bookkeeping procedures followed in the various agencies with which we are working. None of these charges in the supplemental views have been answered because they cannot be answered. At the same time I am sure the Members are not really asking for an answer. From what I have gathered, the determination of the President—and I am commending him in it—has been greatly fortified by the return of the Vice Presi-

dent from a recent trip to eight capitals where he was received enthusiastically and some degree of at least verbal, if not actual, support was given to our efforts. I would certainly hope that any vote here this afternoon would be interpreted as support of the basic position of our country as outlined by the President and not the unfortunate and headline-hunting type of procedure followed by the other body. But I do not think it is at all practical or wise for the House of Representatives to have its action interpreted as handing the AID agency \$415 million to spend as they please. In the atmosphere of the crisis in Vietnam, we are giving this agency, which probably has the poorest overall record for efficiency and effectiveness, this huge sum without any practice conditions attached. I do not believe any sober reflection could sustain this. I do hope when we finally get to the bill for fiscal 1967, there we emphasize the fact that we ought to keep stringent congressional control of these funds. Secondly, we ought to study these funds in the light of their practical use and not the blind support which is demanded by the executive branch.

We could do a far more reasonable task of supporting the President if we would ask more constructive and necessary questions, not in the spirit of unnecessary criticism but in the spirit of helpful criticism, which he sorely needs.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, not to invoke an unharmonious note into this discussion, I do not want the Record to state, as indicated, that the majority view was less than sober, as the gentleman has said, and to reflect here and there upon the sobriety of the decision of the majority members of the committee.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct that impression. No agency in the history of our Government has been more closely scrutinized, down through the years, than has the AID agency. To say it has the poorest record in efficiency is not quite accurate. All of us look it over very carefully. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], looks at it very thoroughly, this House reviews it very thoroughly. I believe the record of efficiency of the AID agency is really one of the high-water marks of governmental efficiency, especially under the able direction of Mr. David Bell.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I say when I used the term "sober," it is to compare our actions with those of the committee of the other body. That is the context in which it is used.

However, Mr. Chairman, when we think of this \$415 million blank check and the fact that it is being requested to support a war effort in South Vietnam, it raises many other additional questions, I relate an incident which supposedly occurred in a parliament of a so-called friendly country.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that during debate in this parliamentary body, one of the parliamentarians rose with a resolution asking or demanding that its government declare war on the United

States. When the shocked members wanted to know why, he explained it thusly: That their government was bankrupt, their people were grumbling at the lack of progress and comfort, and he felt that by declaring war on the United States and immediately losing the war, the country would then qualify for massive rehabilitation at U.S. expense.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that this resolution was going to pass in this parliamentary body and that they would have declared war on the United States, so as to reap the benefits which they hoped would follow. At that point a very astute member of that body rose and raised one question. This question was: What will we do if we win the war?

Mr. Chairman, what will it take to put South Vietnam back into its normal, quiet, sleepy, traditional basis? I do not believe it is at all realistic for the United States to be pumping these millions of dollars into dubious domestic programs in South Vietnam, when their economy, their traditions, and everything else involved in the history of that country, will show that they are not equipped to absorb it.

To sum it up, logical support of the President is an act of statesmanship. This blank check is irresponsibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GRIDER].

(Mr. GRIDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

COMMODITY IMPORTS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has before it an urgent supplemental request from the Agency for International Development for \$275 million in order to carry on its program of supporting assistance in Vietnam.

The bulk of this appropriation will be used to finance imports of essential commodities.

During 1966 it will be critically important to step up the export of American steel, oil, medicine, building supplies, and machinery to support the general economy and avoid disastrous inflation in South Vietnam.

Inflationary pressures will mount in 1966 unless Vietnam can import roughly double its 1965 imports and unless other stabilization measures are taken. If not checked, runaway inflation in Vietnam could cancel many of our most important gains.

We must see to it that the shoe is not lost for want of a nail.

With a war-disrupted economy, South Vietnam has been unable to earn the foreign exchange needed to pay for these imports. Without them, the economy cannot function. Without enough of them, the already serious burden of inflation would become backbreaking.

Most of the commodity imports financed by AID move through regular commercial channels—meaning about 2,000 licensed importers in Vietnam. These merchants pay for aid-financed imports with their own currency, the piaster. The payment goes to the Vietnamese Government which uses the

money to finance the war effort. AID requires that these imports be American made and that the American supplier be paid in dollars by AID when he ships his merchandise to Vietnam. Thus, AID is not providing dollars to Vietnam that can feed a black market in currency.

There is a black market in Vietnam, but it is not being fed by our aid. U.S. personnel in Vietnam, both civilian and military, are paid in script to avoid currency inflation. But in any country where foreign exchange is rationed for essential purposes, there are those who seek to obtain hard currencies for their personal use and are willing to pay high prices for dollars or pounds or francs. American officials and the South Vietnamese Government are attacking these problems at their source, and the improvement of the Vietnamese administrative ability and strengthening of controls will tend to dry up black market operations.

But the surest way to eliminate such operations is to bring supply more nearly in balance with demand—and this is what the commodity import program is designed to do. It may seem a small part, but let me assure you it is an extremely important part—of the total effort to help repel Communist aggression and to help the Government of Vietnam develop a society resistant to subversion and capable of independent progress.

AID's commodity import program for Vietnam may be as important to our ultimate success as any of our military weaponry. I fully support the supplemental request to carry this program forward.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR. In light of the statement that the gentleman has made about the commodity import program strengthening the Cao Ky government, I wonder if the gentleman would comment on the testimony of Mr. Bell, the AID administrator, which is found on page 8 of the hearings where Mr. Bell stated:

But I would not argue in the slightest there is not some diversion both in the sense of people putting money outside the country in Hong Kong and Switzerland, and in the sense of significant amounts of resources being obtained by the Vietcong from Saigon and the import system.

I assume he was referring to the fact that we are not dealing here in the commodity import program with the South Vietnamese Government but rather with private importers who may in many cases misuse the privilege they have of exchanging piasters for military pay certificates at very profitable rates.

Mr. GRIDER. I will say to the gentleman, this of course is a possibility. I mentioned in my remarks that this condition was being improved. I would not suggest, and I do not think the gentleman would suggest that the whole import program be turned over to the Government. We are trying to stimulate private enterprise in South Vietnam.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. The gentleman indicated in his statement that the

recipient of this aid is the Government of South Vietnam. It is my understanding that the direct recipient, and properly so if we are going to recognize the value of the profit motive, is the private business sector in South Vietnam. That sector, of course, pays taxes on many of these commodities—rice is not one of them—but on many of these items included in the commodity import program. Is that not a correct statement of how the commodity import program works?

Mr. GRIDER. That is not to say that we should abandon the program because some of the people importing have been guilty of misfeasance; no.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And that the gentleman from Minnesota did not say or suggest.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169, the supplemental foreign assistance authorization for fiscal year 1966.

Having just returned from an official but brief trip to South Vietnam for the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, I believe it is important to report briefly on a few of the matters before the House today.

It is correct that this overall authorization of \$415 million is essential to the success of our joint efforts in South Vietnam—for financing the import of essential commodities, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for general development.

The conflict in Vietnam cannot be won by military means alone because the military operations there are important largely as they allow the country to proceed with its social and economic reconstruction programs. Given the defeat of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese main force units, the civil actions programs in the villages and hamlets may have the security with which to proceed.

I would like to stress to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, the seriousness and the magnitude of the problem—and the major job that has to be done.

First, a word about the general logistic situation and the port of Saigon. We are some 3 to 4 months behind in catching up with our supply effort and our logistic needs. This has not been clearly stated, and I think it should be. The administration did not anticipate—even though this may have been difficult to foresee—the magnitude of the supply buildup. They did not get on top of it fast enough nor establish clear priorities.

Moreover, the Government in Saigon has been very slow to organize and direct the actual port operations. For many years there have been six or more different agencies involved—a system that is inefficient if not worse. At last I think we have had some serious discussions with the Government in Saigon on the need for single port management, and we are now starting to take corrective and vigorous measures to catch up. The new port at Cam Ranh Bay is encouraging, and new port and airfield facilities now under construction will markedly help. However, it is still a major problem.

Second, the question of inflation is real. During the past year the price of rice to the consumer in Saigon has gone up about 40 percent. Hopefully Prime Minister Ky, with a budget of 55 billion piasters, will try to keep expenses in line.

It is something of a commentary on the conflict in South Vietnam, and also an element in this import financing program, to note that a few years ago South Vietnam exported about 300,000 tons of rice. It was a significant part of the rice bowl in southeast Asia.

Today, because of Vietcong terrorism and the actions of main force units, Saigon has to import about 400,000 tons of rice. This is a measure of the problem.

The real job ahead, however, lies in the rural areas; in the villages and hamlets of South Vietnam representing about 80 percent of the people. We should recognize in this House that this is very nearly a lost revolution. For almost 20 years or more, very little has been done by the Government in Saigon to meet the revolution of rising expectations, to reach and work with the people in the villages, to offer them genuine participation in their Government and their future.

Hopefully, and at last, a program has been started that will give the people of South Vietnam some hope that the Government cares about their concerns, is going to work with them, and is going to meet the problem. During my recent trip I visited a village where the civil action program is in operation and a camp where political action workers are being trained. In the camp there are 3,000 students enrolled. The women are being trained in first aid, teaching, and health education; and the men are being taught construction and trade skills, the elements of rebuilding hamlet government, and necessary paramilitary skills.

Once trained, the students are divided into teams of approximately 40 members and sent back into the province from where they were recruited by the South Vietnamese province chief. They will work, live, and sleep in their villages. All too often in the past because of the Vietcong terror, village and hamlet chiefs left their village in time of peril to seek sanctuary in the district or provincial capital. Needless to say, this did not always enhance respect for them in their own villages. By the end of 1966 it is expected that civil action teams will be in 1,000 of the country's 12,000 villages and hamlets in four areas.

But I do not think we should kid ourselves about the nature, the character, or the extent of this commitment. We are dealing with a situation that is political and military—unless there is real security in the villages and hamlets, the pacification program will not really get off the ground. Over 20,000 village and hamlet chiefs have been assassinated in the last 3 years—one of the most recent was the tragic assassination of the popular mayor of Ap Quang Nam, a quiet, peaceful village which appeared to be on the road to pacification.

Equally the civil action program and rural reconstruction are long range and will take at least 5 years—possibly 10 or more.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would state that unless the central government in Saigon initiates genuine and far-reaching reforms in education, in land reform, in opening opportunities to the refugees, and in creating a sense and a conviction as to opportunity and participation for all people in South Vietnam, the work in the villages will not be supported and hope will be dashed.

We and our allies are committed in South Vietnam. We must fully back our men in the field—whose morale is magnificent—and we must do all we can to encourage South Vietnamese efforts at reform and reconstruction. Hence the need for this authorization which I support today.

And at all times we must utilize every resource of diplomacy—including the United Nations—to reach the conference table and an honorable peace.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if I have been surprised by anything in this discussion today, I must confess that what surprises me most is the unanimity of opinion that seems to be apparent. If I had a hat, I think I would take it off in salute to those gentlemen who have joined in a bipartisan foreign policy effort which is so vital to the security of the United States and to the free world. I would trust that we would have more of this kind of support of our effort on the part of both sides of the aisle.

I am a strong one for dissent, and I am a firm believer in discussion. I think the discussion here today, however, has made it extremely clear—at least to me—that everyone recognizes full well the depth of the crisis. We might have doubts; we might have reservations; we might have wishes; we might have our "druthers"; but it looks like what we are going to do is to support this authorization as a matter of correct policy for the United States of America just as we supported the resolution giving the President the full authority in 1964 to use armed force in Vietnam. And we ought to support this authorization because it is the right thing to do.

I do not know what is going to happen in the other body or what kind of debate will take place in the other body from this time forward. But for me here today I am perfectly satisfied with the discussion and the debate which has transpired in behalf of the American people.

We have been holding hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee almost daily since we reconvened this year. We have had full debate and discussion either in the full committee on the authorization or in one subcommittee or another on this entire subject of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. Everyone has had ample opportunity to get their viewpoint across, to be heard, to criticize, to delve, to contradict, to distract, or to do anything they want to do.

All members certainly have ample opportunity here on the floor, to say any-

thing they wanted to about the policy of this country. But we are at the crux of United States-Vietnam policy today with the vote on this particular authorization. With the transpiring of the events since we last convened here in this body, we know a major change has taken place not only in Vietnam and around the world but also in the thinking of the American people. That is why this vote is important.

When we vote today we give a resounding vote of support to the President, and we are giving a resounding vote of support to the policy of this country.

I shall support this authorization and the necessary appropriation and the subsequent defense supplemental authorization and appropriation, because, as far as I am concerned, the military effort and the economic effort in Vietnam are inseparable in the policy of the United States in dealing with the problem of Vietnam, southeast Asia, the free world, and the security of the United States.

I am delighted at the courageous statement on the part of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], who says he will support, if I understood him correctly, this authorization for those very same reasons.

We all have recognized the tremendous cost of doing a job that needs to be done and that has never been done before in the history of the world, in waging the kind of fight we are fighting in Vietnam and at the same time trying to help in maintaining a government and reconstruct the country while the warfare is going on. This only points out what we should have recognized and do now recognize, that we—the United States and the free world—must have a nonmilitary answer to the subversive thrusts of communism anywhere in the world.

I disagree with those who say that we ought to always support the status quo, or that we should let people stew in their own juice, or that we should let the rest of the people of the world wallow in the depths of their own misery. This indicates to me a kind of blindspot, that we in the United States can live in some way apart from the rest of the world, and that we can bulldoze our allies into doing what we want to do when we want to do it, as if they have no sovereign rights, no right to independent thought, no right to independent action.

Certainly I get aggravated because other countries do not agree with me and my country at a time when I think they ought to. But is this not the very strength of our free and democratic system? The United States makes no claim of having a totalitarian hold on the rest of the free world. We act in concert but do so voluntarily. Is not this the kind of freedom we fight for? We are trying now to help the people of South Vietnam, who have fought for 100 years to throw off the yoke of oppression. Is this not what we are trying to do? Of course it is. We know it—the whole world knows it.

Most of the American people care, support this principle, and the price not only to assure the security of the United

States, but also to assure that freedom as such—the concepts that we hold so dear and that we have fought for and that we are fighting for right now—have a chance to live. Because without that, then the money does not have any meaning.

So I want to join all of you today on the floor of this House who say: "We trust our President, our military and political leaders who support this request pending here." I believe that we have to do what is necessary, in what is a war zone, not only in the military sense but in the political sense.

Mr. Chairman, I have one concluding thought, I trust this authorization will be overwhelmingly approved. It should be.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

(Mr. CAHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, my participation in this debate, completely unexpected, was prompted by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who made a disclosure on the floor of this House which, to say the least, surprised if not amazed me, when he recited the participation of other nations to the war in Vietnam.

Now let it be known, I have supported the administration completely in its views on Vietnam because I believe if Vietnam falls, so does all of Asia fall. I also believe that our Nation should keep its word. We were a signator to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. I quote from that treaty. Article IV reads:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger, etc.

This document is one of the legal and moral basis for our involvement. We are keeping our pledge. But what about the other signators to the treaty? What about the other nations in Asia who are so vitally affected?

I would like to propound three questions either to the Chairman or to any member of the Committee. In view of the reasons advanced as to why we are in Vietnam I would like to know, first, what are the Asian countries doing to protect Asia? It seems to me that if there were a flood in Pennsylvania and I were asked to come over and help the people of Pennsylvania to still the floodwaters, I would expect every Pennsylvanian to be there helping me. Our people want to know why Asia is not helping Asia.

The second question is this: What are the other signatories to this treaty doing to help implement the treaty and to carry out their word of honor that they would participate and oppose aggression?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Third, and I guess the most important question, because I think the first two questions are already answered by the disclosures of the gentleman from Iowa—the most important question is this, in my judgment, and I believe it is in the judgment of the American people: What is the administration doing to—and for want of a better word I say—to persuade the Asian countries and the signatories under this treaty to make a comparable—if not an equal at least a comparable—contribution to the one which we are making by giving each day that goes by our men in order to save southeast Asia for the Asian countries and for the world and to carry out our pledge?

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] for an answer to those questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that there is a considerable effort being made on the part of our allies to bring stability and peace to southeast Asia. While one of the gentlemen on the other side has derided the efforts of some of these nations, nevertheless Australia is making a substantial contribution. Australia has sustained casualties and men have been killed. South Korea is making a substantial contribution. They have 20,000 troops there and there is an additional troop contingent earmarked for Vietnam. The British, as signatories to the treaty, have 50,000 troops in Malaysia fighting the same kind of problem which we have. We have significant forces in Japan. The Philippines are our great friend and ally. They are sending troops.

I am sure history will record that Thailand is making one of the great and valiant contributions to the activities in Vietnam. New Zealand has troops there. India and Pakistan, of course, we recognize have problems of their own, but by and large there is a great contribution being made by our allies there.

I think our Secretary of State and our Vice President, on the recent trip he made, have had some encouraging reports on the contribution which is going to be made on the part of our allies. I think we should start to focus on what is being done instead of what is not being done.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish the last minute by making this observation. I have particular reference to the signatories to the treaty. The United Kingdom, New Zealand, France, Australia, Pakistan, and, of course, what the gentleman from Iowa put into the Record which is represented by him at least to have come from the State Department delineating what their contributions are. My only point is this, Mr. GALLAGHER. I, of course, as I say, have supported the administration but I think there ought to be a greater effort made on the part of the administration to bring to the attention of these countries in southeast Asia the great danger which is facing them. They should be urged, if not persuaded, to make a contribution of military forces. I think the signatories to this treaty also ought to be urged to

do likewise, because until they do that our people at home do not realize and do not appreciate that they are making what should be one of the real contributions to this overall effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, today, as we all know, some 200,000 American men are engaged in a war on the mainland of Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores. Last night the President of the United States said he could not predict how long we would bear this burden. There is mounting evidence that the more men we involve in the jungles of Vietnam, the more men North Vietnam and the Vietcong are committing.

The escalation continues.

Mr. Chairman, it is reliably reported that the United States may have to double its manpower in Vietnam to 400,000 men, or even 600,000 men, in order to stabilize the situation and to bring under control any significant part of the territory of South Vietnam.

The callup of Reserves appears to be imminent.

Mr. Chairman, on past occasions on the floor of this House I have expressed my reservations and my misgivings about our policy in southeast Asia. I have proposed alternatives. On June 10, 1964, during debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, I urged a negotiated settlement and spelled out specific proposals. I pointed out then that any solution must be accompanied by genuine economic and political reform. Now we are engaged in a land war in Asia, a war that prominent U.S. military experts have advised us against. Since May 5 of last year when I opposed the \$700 million supplemental appropriation for military activities in Vietnam, a war in which we were supposedly performing an advisory capacity under the military assistance program, has been converted to an American war which we are in fact waging on a much larger scale.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it has been a fundamental error to rely, as we have, upon a military solution and to have underestimated the economic aspects, the social aspects, and the political aspects of this struggle.

We are today considering a bill which is concerned with the economic aspects, concerned with the social aspects, and concerned with the political aspects of this struggle. It provides \$175 million for the commercial import assistance program, which in effect is a program to support the war-torn economy. It provides \$100 million for what is called rural construction.

In the past our AID programs have not put sufficient emphasis on this rural construction effort. They have not given enough attention to the need to reach the people out in the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill. I do so even though much of the money and effort will be drained off by the growing conflict.

I hope we will be able to see some daylight in reaching into the hearts and the minds of the people in South Vietnam.

This is a struggle which, if it is going to be won, is going to have to be won politically; it is going to have to be won diplomatically, and in terms which the people themselves will be able to understand.

However, as long as the war escalates, our economic assistance program tends to become an extension of the military program since it is used to meet the effects of the war, not to develop a future peacetime economy.

U.S. military expenses in Vietnam are running at about \$10 billion a year, while economic aid for Vietnam is costing about half a billion dollars a year.

In yesterday's New York Times, Seymour Topping, respected southeast Asia correspondent, writes:

The South Vietnamese population is, according to all accounts, suffering more from military operations, terrorism, economic dislocation and corruption than at any other time during more than two decades of intermittent war.

He goes on to say that the social fabric of the country "seems to be unraveling."

We should recognize that the \$275 million increase in AID funds are unlikely to bring about significant changes in the dreary and frustrating picture described by the New York Times correspondent as long as the war continues to expand.

The American people should not be misled into thinking that our AID dollars will build a Great Society in South Vietnam. The fact is that, of necessity, more, and more AID money is going into the support of the war economy and not on economic development that will have long-range benefits for the Vietnamese people.

Eighty percent of the population lives in rural villages, but AID, because of the war, can take only token steps to improve the lot of the peasants.

In appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 26, Secretary of State Dean Rusk said:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID.

He added that he regarded economic assistance programs in Vietnam as of equal importance with military assistance efforts.

An increasingly larger share of AID funds will have to be directed to the task of keeping the Vietnam economy from collapsing under the inflationary pressures produced by the war. Rural construction programs in the villages and rural areas to develop school systems, water supplies, health stations, and agricultural know-how will be affected by the need to use funds to check the runaway inflation and by the realities of the military situation. Vietcong terror and destruction will prevent their implementation in 75 percent of the country.

David E. Bell, Administrator of AID, in appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that our supporting assistance obligations had reached \$235 million by the end of 1965. This is almost the entire amount—\$255 million—appropriated for fiscal 1966.

To cope with rampant inflation, AID has expanded the financing of commercial imports. Of the additional \$275 million that is sought, a total of \$175 million will be allocated to this import program. And Mr. Bell states that he expects these inflationary pressures to be far more severe in 1966.

Assuming the supplemental funds authorized by the bill before us are appropriated, it is estimated that some \$370 million of the total \$530 million AID funds for Vietnam for fiscal year 1966 will be used for this import program. For fiscal 1967 this figure is expected to increase to \$420 million.

This program finances the import of both consumer goods and industrial materials to keep manufacturing and construction going, and to absorb the increased purchasing power. The disruption of the economy by the war necessitates this expanded assistance.

In addition to the \$175 million to finance an expanded import program, a total of \$100 million is asked for an expansion of counterinsurgency efforts or for "logistics, construction, welfare, and development projects." Here again, it is clear that these efforts for the most part are related to the military situation in the country and are war-support measures, involving construction projects to ease critical problems caused by damaged bridges, highways, clogged ports and warehouses. Also some \$20 million is needed to operate the growing refugee program, again a war-related project.

Only about \$50 million of the total \$530 million available is intended for the rural pacification or rural construction programs that attempt to satisfy some of the basis needs of the 13 million Vietnamese peasants.

It has been reliably estimated that at least \$390 million of the total \$530 million will be spent on programs and projects that can be attributed to the deterioration of the Vietnam economy because of the war. Therefore, only some \$140 million is to be used for economic development programs, either of the rural variety or of the type involving the construction of highways or the training of teachers.

While I support this supplementary authorization, we should not be deluded into believing that these funds will somehow open up a new era in the economic development of Vietnam and that this will turn the military tide.

Can war be waged and meaningful, grassroot economic development of a peasant economy be carried out concurrently? More than \$2.7 billion has been poured into economic assistance programs in Vietnam in the last decade. Because it has mainly been used to support the savage war, there are precious few results to show for our munificence.

February 24, 1966

Let us not expect any dramatic results from the \$275 million that we are asked to approve for Vietnam today. Let us be frank with ourselves and with our fellow Americans.

The war in Vietnam has claimed many victims, including Great Society programs at home. The long-range purpose of the AID program is one of the casualties. I fear that this will continue to be the case until there is peace in that war-torn country or at the very least until there is a cessation of hostilities.

The goals outlined by the President at the Honolulu conference are both admirable and praiseworthy. Plans were articulated for more intensive efforts to pacify the countryside by economic and political means so that a government apparatus can be set up that might be responsive to the needs of the vast majority of the population.

President Johnson has said:

The war we are helping them fight must be won on two fronts. One is military. The other front is the struggle against social injustice; against hunger, disease, and ignorance; against political apathy and indifference.

Of course, we ought to direct our energies and efforts to the second front that the President talks about.

However, it is going to be almost impossible to succeed against political apathy and indifference while the Vietnamese peasant is trapped and buffeted by this war. One day the Vietcong attack his village and destroy his home; the next day American bombers wreak havoc in his hamlet, in quest of the Vietcong.

The limited rural pacification program that AID is undertaking may be about all that can be done in the incredibly difficult circumstances of a full-scale land war. If the Vietnamese peasant is to be persuaded, if imaginative programs concerned with the welfare of the Vietnamese people are to be set up in the provinces, then first a way to end the fighting will have to be found. Only then can meaningful economic development of the country be carried out.

If the Saigon Government hopes to be successful when free elections are finally held, it must forge firm political, economic, and social links with the people.

Mr. Chairman, the United States is now encouraging the central government to adopt a program which will build hospitals, and health stations and schools, and help with the development of the agricultural economy. This, the President talked about at Honolulu as the second front in this war. But let us face the fact that we are really not going to be able to succeed with this second front so long as it is operated concurrently with an enlarged and escalated military effort.

The second front to gain the support of the people, the war to conquer disease and hunger in South Vietnam, is hamstrung by this total involvement in military operations. As long as the South Vietnamese peasant is caught between the Vietcong on the one hand and the U.S. military forces on the other, he simply is not going to have an opportunity

to develop the relationship which is needed with his own government.

So, Mr. Chairman, while it is necessary to expand and extend our economic assistance, nevertheless, we should not believe that this will open up any Great Society for the people of South Vietnam. This is doing nothing more than enabling them to keep their heads above water economically. It should be recognized and supported for what it is.

It is imperative that we spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to reach a peaceful solution of this tragic conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for yielding me the additional time.

In summary, I believe the objectives of this proposal, particularly of the rural construction program, are meaningful objectives, and I hope that from this point on a great deal more effort will be put into political and social programs which should, if properly carried out, reach the people. This is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In the long run it will be won by the power of our ideals.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today has indicated quite clearly why we can be confident that there will be virtual unanimity in favor of this bill. I surely hope that will be the case because in my opinion, this is a most important bill. It is important also that we move with reasonable speed.

There has been some indication during the debate today about whether or not we are wise in mounting the military effort that we have been making in Vietnam. However, there can be little debate however on the advisability of the funds which are being sought in this bill. These funds are not being requested to prosecute a war, although they are, as President Johnson indicated, of equal basic importance to our military effort there. Unquestionably, the aid which will be provided in this bill will be used to help provide a strong front against aggression. As Vice President HUMPHREY said at a briefing at the White House today, we are concerned both with a war against aggression and a war on misery.

Quite briefly, these funds are to help us in the latter struggle.

I should like very briefly to report what the Secretary of State said before the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he justified the funds. I quote:

The free Vietnam we seek to preserve through military efforts and sacrifices must not be undermined by economic and social chaos and despair. The expanding scale of Communist aggression and our military response have added new dimensions to the task of AID. Without our AID programs we

could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

For this reason I regard our economic assistance programs in Vietnam as equal in importance, although not nearly so large in scale, with our military assistance.

I should also like to give the two major reasons why the Secretary of State appealed for these funds.

He says the first reason is to meet, and I quote:

First, to meet the rising and severe threat of inflationary pressures, additional funds are needed to finance imported goods; \$175 million are now needed to finance importation for commercial sale of goods such as rice, construction materials, petroleum products, fertilizer, drugs, and many other commodities. In this way we contribute to economic and political stability, by offsetting shortages in local production and maintaining morale essential to the entire effort.

Second, \$100 million is needed to fund new or expanded activities to strengthen the Government of Vietnam's work in contested rural areas. These AID operations include refugee relief—

And we have heard of the many hundreds of thousands of refugees who are presently in South Vietnam—

provision of medical teams and individual doctors and nurses; building or repairing of hospitals and veterans' rehabilitation centers; leasing of ships for coastal and ocean supply operations; expanding civil airlift capacity; building of warehouses, bridges, roads; repair of war-damaged rail and other facilities; installation of temporary and permanent electric power services; construction of workers' housing and training centers; police equipment and training—

Quite obviously, the list is long. The needs of South Vietnam are tremendous. It is quite evident that if we do authorize the money, it will be spent in that country and, of course, in the countries around Vietnam in the amounts which have been requested.

I myself believe that an argument can be made to support earmarking funds in a foreign aid bill. In this case, however, it is unrealistic for us to argue that there is any need to earmark these particular funds. It is quite obvious that the basic necessity is there. The necessity is obvious from the fact that we have already borrowed almost \$64 million from other funds within the foreign aid program. From the amount being requested, that sum must be reimbursed. So the basic issue should be, not how much might be diverted to areas not of primary concern such as Vietnam, but how much more will be needed in that country.

Whether or not language is put in the bill to require earmarking, it is quite clear the administration will do as it has indicated. We have every reason to trust them.

One final point, Mr. Chairman. There has been some indication of dissatisfaction with the contributions of our allies to the effort we are making in Vietnam. Of course, our effort is tremendous. Of course, every effort should be made to have that burden shared with our friends and allies and others who have an interest in southeast Asia. Yet we do ourselves no good and we surely are not recognizing the contributions that our

allies have made, or that they might make, by in effect belittling and sneering at what they have done.

In many cases these countries are poor and primarily concerned with their own problems. In many cases there has been a substantial contribution already made, and more are evidently in the works. Without any question the neighbors of Vietnam realize the importance of what is going on there. There is an increasing awareness of the practical problem that we have faced up to so deliberately.

Quite practically, one of the reasons why some of our small allies or our less wealthy allies have not done more may be because they are somewhat intimidated by the nature and the size of the effort of the United States. When we can afford to pour the billions of dollars that we do into this effort of ours—and it is primarily our effort—it does make any minor contribution from a small country seem like very little. Yet the sacrifices involved in order to make those small contributions should, I believe, not only be recognized but should be received with thankfulness.

In conclusion I should simply like to reiterate that the funds we are requesting here today are a relatively small part of the fight and the effort which we are making in southeast Asia. But these funds are of equal importance and significance to our military efforts in the success of our efforts. I hope we are virtually unanimous in supporting the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I had the good fortune of going on a study mission to the Orient during the last congressional recess.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12169. I do so because I have seen what our dedicated AID people have done and are continuing to do in our friendly Asian countries. They have performed and are continuing to perform near miracles in helping our Asian friends to help themselves.

In Taiwan, for example, our AID people have helped to create such a viable agricultural economy that the farmer and the farmworker enjoy a higher income than the factory worker.

In Korea, our AID program under Public Law 480 has been so successful that we have virtually wiped out hunger and so-called spring scarcity in Suwon Valley and other once poverty stricken areas. I was never so proud of being an American as I was last November, as I stood atop a knoll overlooking the rice fields of Suwon Valley, and the Governor of Kyonggi Province pinned a medal on my chest as he conferred an honorary citizenship on me. I knew then that I was being so honored, not because I looked like one of them, or because I spoke their language, but be-

cause I was an American and represented that country which had helped them to live the better life that they are now enjoying.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Korea are truly grateful for what we have done to help them through our AID programs.

And so are the people of Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and South Vietnam. But there is much more that needs to be done and must be done, if we are to win the peace, especially in South Vietnam.

In South Vietnam the farmer cultivates a land capable of great productivity. Despite a primitive system of agriculture, inadequate tools, and lack of technical knowledge, South Vietnam used to be the rice bowl of southeast Asia. The Vietcong with their acts of terrorism have changed it from a land of abundance to a land of hunger.

Plagued by mass murders, fire, and destruction, South Vietnam has become an importer instead of an exporter of rice.

With the assistance of American AID programs the people of South Vietnam are striving to make the land productive once more in the midst of war. AID seeks to give the Vietnamese farmer a stake in his country and a chance to live in peace and security. More than 1,000 agricultural extension agents have been trained with U.S. help since 1955. More than 800 of these are working in the rural areas of the country. Three new vocational agriculture schools have more than 1,500 students enrolled. And an increasing number of skilled specialists have been graduated from agricultural colleges since 1962. Experimental stations in agriculture have been established with U.S. help in a nationwide network.

A national seed board has been organized to plan and expedite the multiplication of superior seed varieties, tested and produced by the experimental stations. Improved rice seed has been distributed to more than 50,000 families. Where fertilizer has been distributed, crop yields have increased by as much as 40 percent; and these programs are continuing. Pesticides, too, are helping the farmer increase his yields—he can take advantage of these benefits through liberal credit programs—and he does.

He has been able to get breeder pigs, corn to fatten them, and concrete to build sties. An AID-sponsored veterinary program has eliminated hog cholera—a serious killer disease, and the farmer now has new income from the sale of his pigs, and he can continue moving toward a better life.

Until peace comes to the land, however, its fullest productivity cannot be realized. And so, we give to our allies in South Vietnam the benefits of crops grown in our own land. Through the food-for-peace program, in what must be the most graphic illustration of what the program can mean, we are making a number of our products—such as sweetened condensed milk, wheat flour, rice, and vegetable oil—available to supplement the produce of South Vietnam.

Progress has been made in the fishing industry, too. At least 14 major fish

markets and wharves have been built and put into operation. More than 10,000 boats have been equipped with motors, and all time highs are being reached in the catches. Thus fishing is becoming a major source of income and the increase means that food is available at lower cost to the Vietnamese consumer.

Mr. Chairman, through AID programs we have been able to show the South Vietnamese that he now has a stake in the outcome of the war. By helping himself and learning new and better methods, the Vietnamese farmer realizes now that he is building for a better future for himself and his loved ones.

If we are to win the war in Vietnam we must continue to expand our efforts to improve Vietnamese agriculture and provide a solid basis of security for the Vietnamese people. If we are to win the peace we must increase our efforts to export our know-how and show-how to those in need. This our dedicated AID people have done most commendably, and through the support of Congress must continue to do.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his excellent statement. It is a pleasure to report to the House on the great service that he rendered our country on his tour of the Far East during the congressional recess. He was certainly a one-man ambassador of good will for the United States and the American people in all the friendly Asian countries we on the committee visited.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I have been deeply interested through all of this debate, interested particularly in the unanimity that seems to pervade this Chamber. We do not agree on all of this bill, and a good many of us would like to see the contingency fund changed. We will see what happens when the amendments are suggested.

The war there is something that we are quite unable to understand unless we have been fortunate enough to have gone over there, as I was fortunate enough to go to Europe during the war, and to have seen the way things really happen.

You have seen what it does to our men. I hope you saw what I have had told to me so many times—the tremendous courage of our soldiers and their certainty that they are fighting the fight for right, for freedom, for everything that matters in living, and that they propose to win.

I hope this bill will make possible in our explanation of it to our people at home, and of the use that is made of the money—that we will be able to demonstrate more and more each day that we are there because we were invited; that we are still there because we cannot betray those people over there and leave them to the Communists.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill may be passed practically, if not entirely, unanimously.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to share in this rising tide of unanimity and to announce my support of this legislation that we are considering here today.

I, too, want to compliment those Members on the other side of the aisle who have recognized that support of our country and support of the President in these difficult days does require that we join together at times like this with the objective of backing up our men in uniform and our civilian administrators who are in the field in southeast Asia and at the same time helping to strengthen the social fabric of our friends in South Vietnam.

It is particularly important in considering this legislation to see just what it does in its significant sections.

Mention has already been made of the \$175 million that would go for the financing of additional imports, but it is in the \$100 million section, I think, that most of the impact resides. This section affects people. It involves refugee relief. It involves activities to improve conditions in rural areas. It involves the provision of doctors and nurses and medical teams. It involves the construction or the repair of bridges, roads, and rail facilities. It involves the construction of hospitals and workers' housing. Finally, it involves training of police and security forces who will help to bring to the countryside and to the people protection from the depredations of the Vietcong which have terrorized them for so long.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] said that we are not going to build a great society with this program. That is true, but I am sure that no one connected with this bill at any stage had any idea that we would do such a thing. First of all this is an emergency program and is limited in scope. Second, the element that has been preventing us from moving into the field of assistance where we could consider cooperation on a peacetime program has not been any activity of ours but the aggression of North Vietnam and the terroristic activities of the Vietcong. Certainly we could cooperate in a peacetime constructive program if these destructive activities were curtailed or eliminated.

This then is foreign aid, but it is foreign aid that is specialized and limited. I certainly have no doubt, even though doubt has been expressed here today by some people, as to what will be the destination of the funds that are authorized in this legislation. There is no question in my mind that not only these funds but several times the amount of the funds provided in this authorization could be and will be probably used in a relatively brief time in South Vietnam.

Of course, we are dealing through this bill and through the defense appropriation bill which will come to us very shortly with the aggressive Communist imperialism. Certainly we want to do everything we can to repel this imperialism.

Incidentally, in considering the activities and contributions of some of our

allies and associates I should like to add to what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], said about some of them; namely that there are two other countries who have very substantial problems of their own and are still dealing with them. One of these is Malaysia where the British have contributed 50,000 troops, and the other is Indonesia which is going through revolutionary throes now because of the Communist aggression in that country.

So I think this legislation does say that this program is important. It does say that it is needed now. It does say that it is so important that it cannot wait for regular legislation to be taken up in the normal process of things. It is serving a vital program of our Nation. It is backing up the 500,000 men of the Republic of South Vietnam who are in the field and are saying by their presence there that they are worthy of our support. I am sure that the House will do no less than give its overwhelming and I hope unanimous backing to this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to say that I am pleased at the unanimity that is shown here this afternoon on this particular piece of legislation. There may be disagreements on some elements of it. I think the House is aware of the fact that I have been as much of a critic and watchdog of the AID administration as most anybody in the House. I asked the Secretary of State when he was testifying before our committee on this bill about the black marketing in Saigon. I pointed out that when the staff director of our committee and I were there we had been apprised of one person who sent a substantial sum of money back to the United States. The Secretary assured us that day he would have the matter looked into very closely. I have learned only today that one civilian employee of a contractor out there has been ordered out of the country and has had his passport invalidated because he sent back \$30,000 to the United States and could not explain how he got it.

This sort of thing is, unfortunately, almost inevitable in a situation like this, but I am delighted to be able to say that the people responsible for the AID program and for our conduct out there are alert and that when these matters are brought to their attention they do something about them. I believe that is a helpful thing, as far as I am personally concerned, and should be as far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to mention. I would like to sort of apologize to the House of Representatives. There have been a lot of remarks made on the other side of this building which I believe have aided our enemies out there, because I believe they are hoping for us to get tired of this war and quit. I further believe that is the reason they think they are winning.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the junior Senator from my State made a personal attack upon the Secretary of State and said that he ought to resign. On be-

half of the people of my district I want to apologize, because I supported the junior Senator a year ago last fall. He ran 1,025,000 votes behind the President in Ohio, the junior Senator's majority in the entire State of Ohio was 16,000 votes. He received a larger majority than that in my district.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents I want to apologize for his intemperate attack upon the Secretary of State, whom I think is doing a great job under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am delighted to yield to my fine colleague from Ohio, the Congressman at Large, and who represents all of the State of Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] for the courageous position he has taken here today in offering an apology to the House of Representatives and to the Nation for the quite intemperate remarks of the junior Senator from the State of Ohio made in the other body here yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, I would like to join with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel we can be doves and hawks and of various opinions without resorting to such disagreeable tones.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida [Mr. FASCELL] said earlier this afternoon, these are times when great unanimity must be displayed by those of us on the side of freedom.

I feel that the intemperate personal attack upon the most distinguished foreign minister this Republic has had in many years is certainly out of order, and I certainly offer an extreme apology on the part of the people of the Buckeye State.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished and hard-working gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this legislation, and I support the President's position. As I told a member of the administration today, the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol who are attacking us, who are attacking our being in South Vietnam, have nothing to lose politically, because if we win this thing they have 4 or 5 years to go before they are up for election, and everyone will forget their position.

Mr. Chairman, if, God forbid, we should lose it, they can say "I told you so."

So, Mr. Chairman, they have nothing to lose politically; they cannot lose.

In conclusion, I would like to allude to one remark that our junior Senator made. He said he would sleep better at night if somebody else were Secretary of State. Well, if he sleeps at the switch much more than he does now, he will be asleep 24 hours a day.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement on H.R. 12169, a bill to authorize the appropriation of supplemental funds for fiscal year 1966 AID economic assistance programs totaling \$415 million.

A significant portion of this supplemental request, \$275 million, is designed for use in South Vietnam. I traveled to Vietnam after the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned last year because I wanted to see for myself the existing conditions in this distant land where our servicemen are fighting to preserve and protect the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

It is apparent that the mood of good will which prevailed when American troops first landed is showing definite signs of deterioration. There is a possibility that our relationship with the South Vietnamese people could further deteriorate as the full impact of American spending hits the economy and more of the technically skilled South Vietnamese move to cities adjacent to U.S. military installations where huge construction projects are being pushed to provide logistical support for our combat troops. One Cabinet Minister in the South Vietnam Government told me with a trace of irony in his voice, "An American staff sergeant earns more per month than I do."

In my opinion, the only way the war in South Vietnam can be won is to win the battle for the hearts and the minds of the people.

The past year has demonstrated that a clear and unequivocal military policy by the United States could produce a rapport with the South Vietnamese Government for the benefit of the country. If our policy is just as clear with respect to the South Vietnamese Government instituting social, political, and economic reforms, can we not expect a greater response in this direction than ever has occurred in the past? I think that the United States must not only implore, but demand, that the Ky government overhaul its policies and the apparatus of its administration to guarantee a maximum of public acceptance and identification with the national government in Saigon. We must insist on general elections at the earliest possible time. We should not be satisfied with lip service being given to reform. We should insist that positive steps be taken.

It is not an easy task to remake a poor nation into a developed nation. Nor is it easy for the government of a poor nation to gain the confidence of its people. I was told by U.S. officials in Vietnam that 70 percent of the people are illiterate. A majority of South Vietnam's 15½ million population is tied to the land in little better than subsistence agriculture. Only 18 percent of the children who complete primary school go on to secondary school and a significant proportion of the children never go to school at all. There are over 1 million refugees from the combat zones banded together in numerous camps awaiting relocation of the cessation of hostilities to return to their own farms and villages. There are few schools available for children of refugees and sanitation conditions in the camps are primitive at best. Disease is widespread throughout the country. One Navy corpsman told me that if there were enough soap available for the people in the villages and if they would use it, disease could be cut down 50 percent.

The people do not have a sense of national identity the way Americans do. The nation-state is for us the focal point of political loyalty, economic strength, social order, and defense against foreign enemies. The Vietnamese have social and cultural homogeneity; but never having known true statehood, and after being a colony of France from 1885 to 1954, they have but limited loyalty to the National Government. An overwhelming majority of village dwellers in the countryside have never seen a high National Government official, let alone never having voted for one. Too often the only contact the people have with the Federal Government is the payment of taxes, with no services or security being provided in return. Living as many of them do in wretched physical circumstances, they are relatively easy targets for Communist propaganda and promises. There is no way of avoiding the fact that 22 percent of the population and over 50 percent of the land in South Vietnam would not be under the control of the Vietcong if the people themselves were not actively or tacitly accepting the Communist presence. The problem is intensified because of poor communications between villages. Roads are few in number and travel is made hazardous as a result of repeated Vietcong ambushes along the highways. Telephones and telegraph are nonexistent in many parts of the countryside. The fact that the people have no national identity does not mean this must always be so.

The United States has entered into a substantial economic aid program for Vietnam. In fiscal year 1965, we contributed \$283.2 million. We have already obligated all of the \$255.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1966 and we are asking for supplemental funds in the amount of \$275 million. The object of our program is to develop the resources of the country and to give the rural and urban population a feeling that there is a better life obtainable in the future and that their own government is better able to provide it than the Communists. Among other things, the United States is supplying agriculture extension services, fertilizers, pesticides, and medical care; building roads, schools, and hospitals, and helping develop local government administration in rural areas.

In my opinion, we are not doing enough for the approximately 800,000 refugees that are currently in the South Vietnam Government controlled areas. I visited a number of camps where the conditions were very poor. Sanitation facilities are often nonexistent and educational opportunities for the children are totally unsatisfactory. A small vocational training course has been initiated to provide technical training for less than 1,500 persons. This is insufficient to have any real impact upon the refugee population. There is no question that South Vietnam is going to need an increasingly large number of trained technicians to support industrial growth. An effort should be made to train these refugees who sit in their camps all day without work. By doing so, many of these homeless people could be kept temporarily occupied and made productive members of the society, rather than charity cases draining off an

inordinant amount of the nation's limited capital resources to keep them alive. It is commonly pointed out by AID officials that most of the refugees are women and children who are waiting to return to their villages and to their agricultural way of life. This does not mean, however, that many of these refugees would not prefer an education and vocational training so that they could take up a new life in the urban areas.

It has also been suggested by AID officials that if life is made too pleasant in the refugee camps that the refugees will not want to go back to their farms and work for a living. No one is suggesting that the refugees be made permanent welfare cases. What I am saying is that the refugee children should be able to receive as good an education as other children in the country. To date the children of the refugees are offered a substantially inferior education, with many refugee camps not providing any schools at all. Only an infinitesimal percentage go to secondary school upon the completion of primary school. This situation must be corrected.

I am disappointed that of the \$275 million requested for supplemental economic assistance to South Vietnam in a current fiscal year, only \$11.6 million is allocated to refugee programs. What is more, \$10 million of the \$11.6 million is already obligated to pay past debts. This leaves only \$1½ million in fiscal year 1966 to finance programs designed to aid approximately 800,000 refugees. This is dangerously insufficient to ease their condition and to promote their allegiance to the Government of South Vietnam.

It is significant that the refugees are made homeless by terrorist activities of the Vietcong, American and South Vietnamese bombardment and combat in and around their villages. The refugees have made a positive commitment to come over to the side of the South Vietnamese Government. They did not go to the Vietcong secured areas. We must not allow this large population of tired, frightened, and homeless people to become so frustrated in their refugee camps by lack of concern for their well-being and inability to carry on productive lives that they become a force for sedition rather than a force in support of the South Vietnamese Government. There can be no excuse for failure to take positive action regarding the present condition and future destiny of the 800,000 refugees in South Vietnam today.

I am voting in favor of this supplemental appropriation bill because I feel that it is needed. It is essential that an economic and social revolution accompany our military efforts in Vietnam. Our economic assistance is the critical prerequisite to such a revolution taking place. Although we know there is a corruption in South Vietnam and although we know that much of our AID funds are siphoned off to the personal advantage of numerous corrupt officials, still the program is necessary. We must work to tighten up the administration of the program, but we must not sacrifice the program itself because of certain failures in that administration. I would like to say in conclusion that I think that David

Bell, the Director of AID, has done a magnificent job in bringing new imagination, talent, and leadership to our economic assistance program. I am confident that he has the ability, if any man has it, to insure the success of the AID program in South Vietnam.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join with my colleague in urging favorable consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill before us. I should like to speak particularly on behalf of the \$25 million amount contained in that bill for assistance to the Dominican Republic.

It is worth noting, that the provisional government of Hector Godoy operates under the most severe handicaps. Thirty years of dictatorship followed by political instability and the destruction and hatred of civil war have left the Dominican Republic ill prepared to create a democratic society.

Yet, that is what the Organization of American States, the United States and Dominicans of good faith are committed to today. Elements of both left and right would exploit the heritage of tyranny and the present unrest to gain control for themselves, but the provisional government is determined to steer a course toward democracy, and it is in this, that additional assistance is needed from the United States.

Support of the provisional government and of the Organization of American States by the United States has helped to prevent anarchy in the country. Gradually, that assistance is being shifted from emergency stopgap aid to development assistance that will build a foundation upon which the people of the Dominican Republic can create a democratic society.

The provisional government has had the support of OAS troops from the United States and Latin American countries. Technical and economic assistance has been given to prevent economic deterioration and to give the Dominicans themselves time to raise from the ashes a new society.

The cost has been great. Yet, if dollars, and technical assistance, and an understanding heart can be substituted for bloodshed and destruction, we must be prepared to pay the price. A hemisphere at peace, where men may lead good lives and may know social justice is our goal. It was the goal of the nations that met at Punta del Este in 1961. It is the goal of the Alliance for Progress. It must remain our goal until every vestige of hopelessness and violence born of desperation is banished from our hemisphere.

We are asked now to do that which is deemed necessary to give the Dominicans time to conduct an orderly election in June and to install a democratic government. For now, I am convinced that the immediate task of supporting the provisional government warrants our making available the supplementary amount requested by the President.

I urge my colleagues to approve the supplemental appropriation that is before us.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I support the administration's

request for a \$25 million supplemental appropriation for the Dominican Republic.

The Dominican economy has been beset with a number of enormous problems in recent years. Following the fall of Trujillo, the Dominican people demanded a better way of life and something more than a subsistence wage. High wage levels, however, created increased demands for imports, the meeting of which created balance-of-payments difficulties. Spending for consumption of imported goods left little for capital investments, public or private.

In 1964, this situation was further complicated by a spectacular drop in sugar prices, in which the economic health of the country rests.

The civil war has severely dislocated economic activity in the country. Total production of goods and services has declined and unemployment has increased. Commercial activity in Santo Domingo still suffers from the turmoil of last April. Strikes and other disturbances continue to plague the country.

The U.S. objective in assisting the Dominican Republic is twofold. On the one hand we are providing aid to relieve immediate suffering, to build stable conditions conducive to the holding of free elections, and get a society moving again. One example is assistance to repair of irrigation ditches which both liberates a material resource and provides the opportunity to put human resources to work again. To this effort other nations of the hemisphere have contributed medical personnel and emergency food supplies.

At the same time, we are looking beyond immediate measures in an effort to help the Dominicans start the task of building for the long-term growth of their country. The United States is providing technical cooperation to advise the Dominican Government in long-range problems of administrative, fiscal, and monetary reform. We are assisting the stimulation and expansion of food crops and the diversification of agriculture. We are helping community development projects including rural access roads, reforestation, and community centers, in all of which the great part of the job is borne by the local populace. Teacher training and vocational education are also being assisted in other efforts to reach the people directly.

While today, the most immediate need is for short-term assistance, assistance which has to date directly affected more than 200,000 people, this effort is a step only in a long-term drive to help a nation help itself. I urge support of this appropriation as a measure vital not in putting out a fire but as a link in a program to build an environment in which fires will become less likely.

The threat of Communist subversion is still very real in the Dominican Republic. Cuba stands in the Caribbean as a constant reminder of Communist ability to seize power by force and fraud.

Economic stability in the Dominican Republic and throughout Latin America is the best possible insurance against communism and that is the purpose of this appropriation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past several years I have voted against foreign aid legislation. My reason has had a single purpose; namely, to register a protest against a program which in sum has been too often poorly conceived and poorly administered. By this I do not mean to say that there has been no good in our foreign aid programs. But I determined some time ago that the only way to encourage the necessary reforms was to put the executive branch on notice that there were those in Congress who are dissatisfied enough with its overall operation to give it a vote of no confidence.

The bill before the House today is a supplemental request to the bill which I voted against last session. Its basic purpose is to support our efforts in southeast Asia and especially in South Vietnam. While I am certain there are many aspects of this program that could and should be improved, I do not believe that this crucial hour with so many boys in daily combat is the time to register a protest which might in any way be construed to indicate a lack of support on my part for our overall effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, because the attention of the American people is generally focused on reports from the war front in Vietnam, little is known of our fight to provide a permanent line of defense in the struggle for men's minds in Vietnam.

With cement, roofing materials, and technical assistance supplied by AID, the people of Vietnam are building thousands of classrooms throughout the countryside. Of 9,000 classrooms constructed in the last 5 years, 1,600 were put together by the villagers themselves—a fact which has not been lost on the Vietcong. Knowing the value that the Vietnamese people place on the education of their children, the Communist guerrillas hesitate to destroy these new schools.

The steady accumulation of teaching facilities—made possible by the assistance of U.S. aid—now embraces half of all the primary school aged children of the country. And AID is introducing practical subjects into the public school system to help the people solve their immediate problems; to grow better crops, improve their health, and raise standards of nutrition.

More than 14 million textbooks have been distributed by AID, and in the nation's four normal schools and 21 industrial schools, AID is helping to train teachers in new techniques of practical instruction. The normal schools are now graduating more than 2,000 teachers a year.

In addition to equipping and improving these permanent training institutions, AID is helping to set up rural training programs to meet the demand for teachers in the villages. Local citizens are being prepared to take over classrooms after 3 months of intensive instruction. In one region of the country, the emergency sessions have provided nearly 600 new teachers. By way of incentive, the Vietnamese Government has increased the monthly rate of pay from \$6 to \$14—well above the average

per capita income of the people as a whole.

A U.S.-financed television network is being set up to extend public education to every hamlet in the country. "Airborne classrooms" will be broadcasting courses to television receivers in community centers around the country. This new TV circuit represents an important advance in the war on ignorance as well as a way of answering the Communist propaganda being circulated by the Vietcong.

These are additional reasons why we must support H.R. 12169—to win the peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the request for supplemental AID appropriations which we are considering today will make possible the expansion of certain AID programs, particularly in the field of agriculture.

As a result of the President's Honolulu meeting with Premier Ky and the Vice President's tour through southeast Asia, the United States is planning to step up its programs of assistance to the rural areas of Vietnam.

In addition to the food-for-freedom program, AID is already conducting numerous other programs to help raise the level of living of rural people in Vietnam. These existing programs will form the basis of the expanded programs.

In Vietnam today, AID is conducting programs in four agricultural subject-matter areas as follows: First, agricultural service and extension; second, crops and livestock production; third, credit and cooperatives; and fourth, agricultural resources development.

Some accomplishments to date are:

First. Extension training: The 1,004 Vietnamese agricultural extension agents have received valuable training from AID specialists through a systematic in-service training program. After having their own skills upgraded, these Vietnamese extension workers have assisted 1 million farmers in increasing their agricultural production and in raising their level of living.

Second. Assistance to youth: During 1965, the number of 4-T club members reached 46,454 in 1,200 clubs. These are the equivalent of 4-H Clubs in this country.

Third. Agricultural research: Since 1962, agricultural research stations released more than 20 high-yielding varieties of field crops and vegetables.

Fourth. Participant training: Between 1951 and 1965, 611 Vietnamese received special agricultural training in the United States or in a third country under the AID participant training program.

Fifth. Information program: In 1965, AID assisted the GVN in producing over 3 million leaflets and booklets and over 230,000 posters and wall newspapers. Also, AID helped to produce 45 radio tapes, 514 radio broadcasts, and 22,000 technical magazines for use by professional agricultural workers.

Sixth. Sewing machines: In 1965, our AID mission distributed 1,000 sewing machines to needy rural families and leaders.

Seventh. Fisheries: In the fisheries program, AID assisted in establishing 79

fishing cooperatives with 17,000 members. Also, fish production has increased from 52,000 tons in 1955, valued at VN\$3.3 billion, to 368,000 tons in 1965, valued at VN\$15 billion. Approximately 10,500 powered junks are now in operation, an increase of 6,900 since 1962, and 50,000 sets of improved fishing gear have been distributed. There are now 15 fish-landing facilities to assist marine fishermen.

Eighth. Livestock: Swine production increased from 1,694,000 head in 1955 to 3,600,000 in 1964. The chicken population increased from 16,655,000 in 1960 to 22,401,000 in 1964. About 33,000 improved chickens and 315,000 hatching eggs were distributed or sold at nominal prices from January 1964 to May 1965. There are 27 commercial farms with an average flock of 5,000 birds each.

Ninth. Fertilizer: Approximately 276,000 metric tons of fertilizer were imported in fiscal year 1965 as compared to 42,877 metric tons in 1955. This fertilizer was used by 700,000 farmers on about 2 million acres and provided approximately VN\$1.5 million additional farm income.

Tenth. Plant protection: For the purpose of increasing agricultural production, assistance was given in setting up a plant protection service, training the local staff, and providing necessary equipment. Through this system, crop losses from insects, diseases, and rats were reduced by 50 percent between 1961 and 1965. About 360,000 farmers participated in antirrat campaigns in 1964 using 39,000 tons of rat poison. They killed an estimated 38 million rats, saving about 95,000 tons of food. In 1964, about 600 tons of insecticides were used by 500,000 rice farmers and 2,000 vegetable farmers. The program saved about 150,000 tons of rice.

Eleventh. Irrigation and water resources: Since 1954, improved practices in irrigation canals, flood protection, and salt water control have been applied to 610,000 acres. In 1965, approximately 24 miles of new irrigation canals were completed and 5 miles rehabilitated; 42 dams were built or restored which benefited 27,740 acres of land.

These accomplishments under existing AID agricultural programs should be a source of pride and satisfaction to all of us. Our affirmative vote on this request for supplemental appropriations will make possible the expansion of these vital programs and bring new hope and progress to the rural people of Vietnam.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before the House of Representatives, H.R. 12169 to authorize appropriations of supplemental funds of \$415 million for fiscal year 1966 for economic assistance programs.

The funds previously appropriated to AID for this fiscal year have not met the needs in a few of the important danger areas of the world, particularly Vietnam, for which the bill now under consideration provides \$275 million in supporting assistance funds.

We know that the problem in South Vietnam is the determined effort of North Vietnam to impose its will by force. We know that Hanoi has sent arms, and

tens of thousands of armed and trained men—including units of the North Vietnamese Regular Army—into South Vietnam. This is why U.S. forces are in that country. We will continue to repel this aggression while we persist in our efforts toward a peaceful solution. These efforts to date have been numerous, and in the past months have been carried into every major capital of the world. They have brought no encouraging response from Hanoi. Even while we halted our bombing of North Vietnam, the military operations of the north continued.

The expansion of Communist aggression has called for the increased military response of the United States and, thus, added to the task of AID. Our economic assistance programs in South Vietnam are as important as our military assistance. We must, together with other free nations of the world, reinforce economic and social progress in that country, so that a social revolution—as well as peace and freedom—can be obtained in southeast Asia.

I have said that the funds appropriated by Congress have not met the needs of AID; in fact, they do not cover even one-half of the currently estimated requirements for fiscal year 1966. Two principal elements are involved in the request for supplemental funds: First, to meet the rising threat of inflation, \$175 million is needed to finance the importation of food, drugs, and other commodities; and second, \$100 million is required for new or enlarged Government activities in rural areas.

I also support the request for the following additional funds included in H.R. 12169: First, \$7.5 million each in supporting assistance for Thailand and Laos, to assist them in developing and maintaining economic and political stability, and to withstand increasing Communist pressures; Second, \$25 million for the Dominican Republic, where last April's revolution resulted in economic and political instability, and where we—with the Organization of American States—are determined to help the provisional government reach a stable environment prior to the coming elections; and third, \$100 million to replenish the now-exhausted AID contingency fund.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure in its entirety.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the Republic of Vietnam is presently engaged in a courageous struggle for survival against the threat of Communist subversion. Despite the long and difficult war, the Vietnamese are determined to create a new nation, and the institutions essential to sustain that nation, during the years ahead. Whether you talk to a farmer working in the ricefields or to a high government official, you will quickly learn that the people of Vietnam place a high value upon educational opportunity. Consequently, the war against the Vietcong has not obliterated this goal or weakened the resolve of the people to improve educational opportunity. Instead, it has created a strong sense of urgency which is shared by both the Vietnamese Ministry of Education and the AID mission.

February 24, 1966

The program of educational assistance, which was conceived jointly by the representatives of Vietnam and the United States, has been characterized by two approaches. First, a long-range program was organized to develop a system of education which will produce the trained manpower required for social and economic progress. This system is planned not only to facilitate the transfer of knowledge and the training of skills, but also to assist in creating a society which will initiate and successfully absorb social and economic change.

A second major thrust has been the development of a special-impact program which offers the benefits of education to rural people. This program has limited, immediately attainable goals and will offer tangible evidence to the Vietnamese villagers that their government is interested in their welfare and is utilizing its resources and personnel to meet their needs.

With these two approaches in mind, AID's educational assistance to the Republic of Vietnam has been largely concentrated in four principal projects: First, hamlet schools; second, instructional materials; third, vocational education; and fourth, teacher training.

The hamlet school program was initiated in 1963 to expand elementary educational opportunities as rapidly as possible. This grassroots project has resulted in 3,203 classrooms in addition to 1,600 self-help classrooms that were constructed by the villagers themselves. More than 5,000 teachers have been trained through special 90-day courses. Programs for 1966, 1967, and 1968 call for annual goals of 2,500 classrooms and 4,000 teachers. At the ratio of 60 children per classroom—the typical class size in Vietnam—this program has provided schooling for 320,000 Vietnamese boys and girls. In the future, thanks to the AID program, many thousands more will have their first opportunity to attend school.

In a typical Vietnamese classroom, the children do not have books. To correct this situation, an instructional materials project was organized to provide textbooks and other educational aids such as maps and charts. Committees composed of Vietnamese teachers, artists, and editors, with an American adviser, have produced manuscripts at a phenomenal rate in fields such as arithmetic, health, history, and geography. These books were printed in Manila, Hong Kong, and Saigon. The Republic of China has printed 500,000. Australia will print and deliver 1,200,000 this spring. All together, more than 7 million books have been printed and shipped to Vietnam. In 1966, an additional 5 million will be printed and delivered. For an average of 22 cents per copy, more than 1,600,000 Vietnamese children will carry these books into hamlets and homes throughout the 43 provinces of Vietnam, offering visible proof to their inhabitants that the Government of Vietnam and the people of the United States share a deep concern for their future.

Within the framework of vocational education, the Republic of Vietnam has been assisted in four major divisions of training. In the trade-technical pro-

gram, AID has constructed, equipped, and developed four polytechnic schools which will each accommodate 800 students. These schools offer courses in fields such as forging and welding, machine shop, auto mechanics, electricity, woodworking, drafting, and diesel mechanics. More than 3,000 students are enrolled in these schools.

At the Phu Tho Polytechnic School in Saigon, 4-year and 2-year college-level teacher training courses have been established, under the competent advisory assistance of the Southern Illinois University contract team, which will make Vietnam largely self-sufficient in the training of vocational teachers and eliminate the need for an extensive program of study in the United States.

More than 6,635 Vietnamese students are enrolled in all types of secondary level trade and technical schools. With continued support of the existing programs, and the development of short-term trade training programs, over 10,000 students will be provided with an opportunity to acquire useful skills.

In the field of agriculture, 3 secondary schools—with an enrollment of 1,300 students—have been established with AID assistance. In Saigon, a college of agriculture, with an enrollment of 320 students, offers a 4-year curriculum which includes courses in the general fields of animal husbandry, horticulture, agronomy and agricultural engineering. These schools will be expanded and improved in future years.

Presently under construction are 20 2-year rural trade schools which will offer courses to elementary school graduates as well as short-term courses for adults and out-of-school youths in carpentry, metalworking, bricklaying, masonry, engine mechanics, and handicrafts. The basic purpose of these schools will be to meet local community needs rather than to follow a stereotyped national curriculum. Provision is made, however, for students to follow an educational program leading to secondary and higher education.

The Ban Me Thuot technical school, which is part of this program, offers a 4-year trade training program to elementary school graduates from the mountain Provinces of Kontum, Pleiku, Phu Bon, and Darlac. These courses are patterned to meet the unique needs of the Montagnards. Seventeen schools are now under construction with one, the Long Xuyen rural trade school, completed and in operation. Each school will have an enrollment capacity of 300 to 400 students.

At present, there is only one engineer training institution in Vietnam, located at the National Technical Center at Phu Tho, Saigon. A 4-year curriculum is offered in electrical, civil, and mechanical engineering as well as a 3-year technician training program in these same areas. A 4-year marine navigation course is also offered. A new 3-year technician training course in chemical technology was opened in fiscal year 1964. Currently, there are 792 students enrolled in the entire college. A survey of engineering has been completed, and a program to improve the quality and

quantity of the courses is now being considered.

Vietnam has received substantial assistance from AID in the field of teacher training. Four normal schools, which are capable of enrolling 2,100 prospective elementary teachers, have been built and equipped. A laboratory elementary school enrolling 450 children and an in-service center designed to upgrade teachers and administrators have also been completed. The teacher training program has been improved and expanded from a 1- to a 2-year program.

In the area of secondary education, improvements include the construction of new colleges of education, for training teachers, and attached model demonstration high schools at the Universities of Hue and Saigon. Now in full operation, these facilities will graduate over 500 new teachers annually. They will also provide comprehensive secondary school opportunities for more than 1,800 high school students in an environment featuring better methods of teaching, new approaches to curriculum, and innovations in administrative practices. Currently, 190 teaching candidates are enrolled in a special 1-year training program at the University of Saigon in an effort to expand educational opportunities in the first year of the secondary school program.

Despite the ravages of war, considerable progress has been made through the AID program in expanding and improving the educational opportunities of Vietnamese youth. It is obvious that additional efforts will be required if we are to fulfill the task of providing the human foundations to support the survival and growth of the courageous Vietnamese nation. I believe every American will welcome the opportunity to share in this task.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the supplemental economic aid appropriation for Vietnam. In our efforts to combat the so-called "wars of national liberation," those thinly disguised but effective tools of the international Communist conspiracy to take over developing countries, we have come to realize that economic and social measures are equally, if not more important than military measures. This means that a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the civilian programs of counterinsurgency. The Agency for International Development has the largest share of this civilian responsibility. It deals with the very roots of insurgency in working to alleviate the grievances of the people on which the Communists capitalize in seeking and gaining support of the population in these "wars of national liberation."

In preventing, as well as in stopping, these Communist-operated political wars, the efforts of the AID are indispensable. In Vietnam, the AID has a specially designed and unique program for reinforcing our political and military efforts. Not only does it alleviate the suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees, but it has programs for assisting the Government to be more responsive to the needs of its people and thereby demonstrate that our way of life in

the free world offers a better alternative than communism.

Such things as self-help projects and medical care in the rural areas, in the districts and in the provinces, constitute an orderly social revolution and a reinforcement of the essential political development which is required to sustain military victory. Indeed, if we attain military victories, as we expect to continue to do, they are in danger of going for naught, after blood and suffering on the part of our noble U.S. servicemen and the valiant armed forces of the Government of Vietnam, unless economic and social progress, such as that which is supported by the AID, is not only continued but accelerated. That would be made possible by our affirmative action on this supplemental appropriation for Vietnam.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I was elected to Congress I am going to support a foreign aid authorization bill.

When a nation is at war then it becomes mandatory we make every effort to win that war. I consider this bill an integral part of our effort to achieve peace in Vietnam.

In my mind these funds are essential to the success of our operations in Vietnam. I am convinced that to withhold such funds would mean a lessening of our chances of success. These funds are for import financing, for rural construction, for port expansion, for refugee relief, and for development. They have equal importance with our military effort itself.

The casting of this vote does not mean I have changed my view concerning many aspects of foreign aid. To the contrary, most of the criticisms I have made in the past years are still valid.

This vote is cast to support an extraordinary effort which our country is making and reflects extraordinary support of that effort.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "\$369,200,000" and substitute "\$684,200,000".

(b) In the first sentence, after "President" insert ", without regard to section 649."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following:

"Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275,000,000

shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his amendment.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing whatever complicated about this amendment. It neither takes from nor adds to the dollar amounts. It simply earmarks the bulk of the funds contained in this bill for spending in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and not somewhere else in the world.

I call your attention again to the fact that in this bill there is not one word which designates the purpose for which these funds should be spent—the purpose that I am sure we in the House of Representatives intend that they should be spent.

It has been said it would be unrealistic to designate where these funds ought to be expended. Well, nothing could be more realistic than to designate where they are to be expended. I would say to the gentleman who made that remark only a few moments ago that he serves on a committee which authorizes the expenditure of a good deal of money. I have heard him quite often criticize the flexibility and castigate those on the majority side for failing to write into legislation restrictions on the expenditure of funds. I am surprised that here today that he would say it is unrealistic to specify where these funds are to be spent.

One of the purposes of this bill and one of the purposes of all bills authorizing the expenditure of funds is to direct how and where the money shall be spent. That is all my amendment does. Anything less than that is an abdication of control on the part of the House of Representatives.

So I offer my amendment in the hope that the chairman will accept it and then we can go on from here.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish the gentleman would examine very carefully what is involved here. I am sure he did not when he drew up his amendment consider the borrowed money, \$63 million and some hundred thousand that has already been borrowed in this program, \$27,700,000 from the International organizations and \$36 million from supporting assistance funds in other countries in southeast Asia. Now with the limitation imposed by the gentleman's amendment, you are going to bar absolutely the repayment of these borrowed funds amounting to almost \$64 million.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment makes available exactly the same amount of money as is made available in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, but you put a limitation on it.

Mr. GROSS. All it does is to prohibit transferability, and put it to the use for which it is intended.

Mr. MORGAN. The way I read the gentleman's amendment, you provide not to exceed \$275 million solely for use in Vietnam, \$7.5 million for Laos and \$7.5 million in Thailand and not to exceed \$25 million to be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic. You have it tied down tight.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. MORGAN. What are you going to do about the repayment of borrowed money?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Iowa knows my position generally on the question of mutual security legislation throughout the years. He and I have had some differences in this regard. I am going to support this legislation, but I think the gentleman's amendment is sound and proper.

If I could make a suggestion to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the question that he raises—how would the AID agency repay to the one or more of the other programs from which funds have been borrowed to support the effort in Vietnam, I would suggest that the AID agency over the years has been very prolific in deobligating funds and reobligating them for other programs. This is not an uncommon thing. This has been done many, many times. So I am certain that in this instance here, they could deobligate and they could reobligate from the funds that are then made available. This is done a hundred times a year or more by AID. I think it can be done here in these circumstances. I think in all honesty the gentleman from Iowa's amendment is a good one. It would more clearly identify specifically and spotlight where we are putting the money. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman—how can you borrow from an account when in the beginning it is appropriated in a lump sum and not earmarked for any project anywhere on the face of the earth? It is a lump sum appropriation and the administration could borrow from one fund to transfer from one fund. In reality under this appropriation they could justify the funds for a project in Vietnam and yet take it and build a summer resort in Morocco. Where are they borrowing from inasmuch as the funds are not earmarked to start with? What are you borrowing from? I think that is a question that should be answered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Far be it from me to try to answer when there are Members here who are more expert than I am, but I believe the gentleman from Louisiana knows better than anybody that the \$3.2 billion—whatever the exact amount was that was made available for fiscal year 1966—was not all in one account. It was in several accounts and they do have the right to transfer from one to another. Perhaps that is what the chairman of the committee was referring to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I will agree to the request for the additional time, but if there are any further requests for extension of time, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. We do know that these funds are appropriated in lump-sum amounts. They are appropriated on an illustrative basis. The agency says, "We believe we need the money for these particular projects and these particular countries, but we have the right to spend the money anywhere we want to." I am making that as a statement of fact. Inasmuch as you do not allocate the funds, from what account are you going to borrow? I want that question answered, if I can get an answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the chairman of the committee will want to answer the question.

Mr. PASSMAN. It does not appear that he does.

Mr. GROSS. If the expenditure is not nailed down here and now they may well be borrowing this money for other purposes. As the gentleman has suggested, they may be borrowing it for the purpose of building summer resorts in Morocco.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think we would be establishing a very bad precedent here if we agreed to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, because down through the years in the foreign aid bill we have never specifically authorized x number of dollars for this country and y number of dollars for another and z number of dollars for another country.

If we start this, I promise you that there will be lobbyists around here lobbying for amounts of money for their countries the like of which we have never seen.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure that the gentleman recalls that a few

years ago we did earmark money for Spain.

Mr. HAYS. That is correct, but I think it was a mistake. I think I voted for it at the time. Experience taught me that we ought not to do it, because the next year—I do not want to mention the countries by name—ambassadors from a half dozen other countries came to see me in an effort to earmark an amount of money for their countries. If we do so again, we will have lobbyists around here the like of which we have not seen before.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you not think it would be better to have the lobbyists here than over in the State Department?

Mr. HAYS. No; and I will tell you why. First, I do not think they are over there. Second, I am even more interested in another point about the gentleman's amendment.

I was out there, and I am very much worried about what is going to happen in Thailand, because that is the next target. In fact, they are moving in there right now. They are moving in from the north and from the south. I do not know whether \$7.5 million is enough for Thailand or whether it is not. But I do not want to tie the hands of the administration so that if they decide they have to meet this threat and they have to meet it fast, they cannot do it.

We might very well want to take some of this \$275 million that the gentleman wants to earmark for South Vietnam and use it in Thailand.

I give the Thais pretty high marks because they have stood up against the Communists. They have really stood up against China.

There was a cartoon not long ago in a magazine that showed Chou En Lai and Mao Tse-tung looking at each other. One of them said, "I don't trust these Russians. They are too oriental."

I give the Thais high marks on that, too, because when the Chinese Ambassador—or at least I read this in the newspaper—called on the Prime Minister of Thailand to protest the use of the bases in Thailand for our Air Force, the Prime Minister looked at him straight in the eye and said, "You had better get some new spies. They are giving you wrong information. There are no American planes in this country."

In other words, he gave them back some of their own propaganda medicine, and I think it was good for them.

Of all the places I visited out there I was impressed about as much by the attitude of the Thais, who are a little country, who are close to the common frontier with the Chinese Communists, and who have not hesitated to stand up and be counted on our side. I do not want any amendments that will hamstring us if we in an emergency have to give them more than this amendment would earmark for them.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Is it not true that as far

as the borrowing is concerned, this money was borrowed from projects already programed and not expended?

Mr. HAYS. That is exactly correct.

Mrs. KELLY. Following that up, is it not possible that if agreed to, the amendment would limit any further appropriation or authorization under this basic law for the rest of this year?

Mr. HAYS. It would certainly limit it, and it might put more money than the gentleman from Iowa wants in the one place and less in another, depending on how much they have borrowed from these obligated funds and already obligated somewhere else. I do not think this is a very complicated situation.

Mr. ADAIR. There has been concern expressed here earlier today lest this money which is to go to southeast Asia should be diverted elsewhere. It is not the intent of the gentleman from Ohio that this money is in fact to be used in southeast Asia in furtherance of our effort?

Mr. HAYS. Certainly it is my intent that it is to be used in southeast Asia. I do not go so far on any appropriation as to say that, if the Chinese Communists attack in India, which is in southeast Asia, we could not use some of it there. It is not mentioned here, but we might. But I am sure it is the intent of all of us that it be used in southeast Asia, and in the Dominican Republic, which has been mentioned. But certainly I do not think that we ought to tie it down country by country and say "You are going to get so much" and "You are going to get so much."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—an AID supplemental request for \$415 million—involves economic assistance funds. Because of the saddening death of Admiral Nimitz, we are not now considering the Department of Defense supplemental request.

Most of the funds requested—\$275 million in supporting assistance—will be used in Vietnam. While this is a much smaller amount than the funds required to continue our military effort, it is every bit as important.

The challenge in Vietnam is not simply a military challenge; it is economic and political. The brave people of South Vietnam must know that their hard struggle will result in a better future—their future and their children's future.

The farmers, schoolteachers, merchants, workers, mothers, students and soldiers must see that the seductions of the Communists are illusory; they must see that a future in independence and freedom will secure the benefits of social justice and growing prosperity—more schools, better health facilities, thriving farms, rising incomes and opportunity to advance.

I regard the additional funds requested by AID for use in Vietnam as indispensable to the efforts by the South Vietnamese themselves to secure this future.

Secretary Rusk has already testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee:

Without our AID programs we could win the major military battles in Vietnam and still lose the war and the peace.

Secretary Rusk added:

For this reason I regard our economic assistance program, although not nearly so large in scale, as equal in importance with our military assistance. We fully intend to reinforce the economic and social progress that South Vietnam has been making during a brutal war and in spite of unremitting destructive efforts by the enemy.

One hundred million dollars of this request for additional economic assistance funds for Vietnam is for rural construction and counterinsurgency activities. More than two-thirds of the funds for these projects will be used for activities outside Saigon.

These funds will be used for a variety of provincial operations. They are administered under exceedingly dangerous circumstances by some very brave AID representatives.

These funds will be used for rural schools, to complete the construction of 15 rural trade schools, and about 830 hamlet school classrooms. They will be used to repair many other schools which have been either destroyed or damaged by the Vietcong. AID expects that during the next 3 years, it will be possible to build 3,700 new classrooms and train 12,000 teachers. I cannot imagine a better way to demonstrate to the Vietnamese the benefits of a free and secure future.

About \$9 million is needed for the expansion of rural health facilities in Vietnam. Most hospitals in the provinces are simply inadequate. They are old, outmoded or deficient in essential requirements. Through AID programs, new hospitals are built. Additional funds are needed to support surgical teams on detail to AID to assist provincial hospital operations.

Expanded assistance for agricultural improvements is also required. Our efforts in this area is one of the key tools in the campaign to win the support of the people. Agriculture and agricultural programs have suffered terribly from the savagery of the war. The Vietnamese farmers' land is often the battle scene; the agricultural technicians' access to the farmer is often limited by Vietcong activities. In spite of these great obstacles, some remarkable successes are being achieved through AID programs; progress must continue.

The list of AID efforts to improve the lives of the Vietnamese and support the war effort is long. Funds are needed for basic improvements in several municipal centers of South Vietnam, such as low-cost housing and sewerage and drainage requirements. Relief for refugees must be expanded. Warehouses must be built and ships leased for coastal and ocean supply operations; war-damaged rail facilities must be repaired; it is necessary to install temporary and permanent electric power services and construct workers' housing and training centers. Public safety and police improvement activities must be accelerated to help establish adequate levels of physical security for the Vietnamese people.

The \$175 million is also needed by AID in this fiscal year to help finance commodity imports to combat inflation. To cope with the severe inflationary

pressures which threaten economic and political stability, the United States must expand the financing of commercial imports. For example, \$21 million is needed for rice imports; \$9 million for medicines and pharmaceuticals; \$12 million for petroleum products; \$50 million for iron and steel, and \$4.5 million for fertilizer imports. Over half of these commodities will be utilized in areas outside Saigon. Without this vital assistance, destructive inflation would overcome our efforts to maintain a sound economy in Vietnam in the midst of the war.

It cannot be denied that all of these requirements are expensive. It likewise cannot be denied that they are necessary if we are faithfully to support the aspirations of the Vietnamese people for a better life and support the valiant efforts of our own fighting men in Vietnam to win this future. There is no alternative—except defeat and surrender in this beleaguered land—to meeting this situation by providing the President the funds which are needed to do the job now.

The bill before you also contains requests for supporting assistance funds for three other troubled lands: Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic—\$7.5 million are needed for Laos and Thailand each. In these countries, the peoples are faced with increasingly menacing Communist pressures. Funds are needed now to meet these threats by increasing non-military security activities financed by AID and intensifying rural development projects in vulnerable areas. In Thailand additional funds are required now to assist the Government of Thailand in its major expansion of the civil police program. To improve the effectiveness of the border patrol and provincial police in combating Communist infiltration, additional helicopter, radio communications and weapons support is needed. Steps are also being taken to meet increasingly the needs of the rural populace, especially in the threatened northeast area of Thailand, by, for example, bringing potable water facilities to the villages there. This surely is the way to build the foundations of resistance to Communist intrusions.

In Laos new moneys are needed to attend to a variety of unanticipated needs. Refugee relief must be accelerated, airlift operations stepped up, and airport facilities improved. Additional funds for this year are needed to help the Government of Laos stabilize its influence and control in contested areas, especially through work with rural peoples.

In the Dominican Republic the United States has a vital interest in the realization of the elections which are now planned for June. The United States has provided large amounts of assistance to prevent the aggravation of the economic and political instability which followed last year's revolution. We must continue to provide budget support if we are to help the provisional government avoid the kind of chaos which would destroy the possibility of meaningful elections—\$25 million are needed in the next 4 months to foster a stable environment in the Dominican Republic.

The President has also requested Congress to provide AID with \$100 million in contingency funds to replenish funds already exhausted through use in emergency and trouble spots around the world. I heard Secretary Rusk when he testified:

It is absolutely essential that a sufficient amount of contingency funds be on hand for the remainder of this fiscal year to permit us to respond immediately and effectively to emergency situations or unforeseen requirements which engage the interests of the United States.

It is impossible to predict precisely if all these funds will be used or where they will be used. The point is that we must be prepared to deal decisively with unforeseen crises in southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, or wherever.

I would like to comment briefly on some of the supplemental views expressed by five minority members of the committee.

These gentlemen express concern about "graft, corruption and black market activities." These are real problems in the wartime situation of Vietnam. But the impression should not remain that the Vietnamese leadership is corrupt or indifferent to crime or that the management of U.S. military or AID efforts in Vietnam is lax. There are two distinct types of problems which occur in a large-scale war effort such as now exists in Vietnam. First is diversion or corruption involving our assistance programs. AID's auditors and end-use inspectors are in Vietnam working to keep such diversion to a minimum. Their record is good. As a matter of fact, the Controller of the Agency is in Vietnam right now reviewing and improving audit and inspection procedures.

The second type of problem is profiteering, black market operations and corruption in the economy itself. Many of the charges and reports concern this type of problem. Vietnamese civil authorities are being assisted by American police advisers in a major campaign to deal with such corruption. It is occurring—but it being vigorously attacked.

The supplemental views question the need for additional funds for the contingency fund. They point out that none of the original \$50 million has been used in Vietnam. They do not mention the \$89 million special fiscal year 1966 contingency fund for southeast Asia—which has been needed and used in Vietnam—and which has been exhausted. I am sure that criticism would not be slow to come if the United States were not to deal effectively and promptly with emergencies and crises which might arise during the remainder of the year. As the supplemental views admit, contingency funds are not always fully used. As a matter of fact, AID has a good record since 1961 of not using contingency funds if they are not needed. If funds are left over, it is up to the Congress to reappropriate or not—and I am sure we can make that choice when the time comes.

The supplemental views complain of manipulation of funds by AID's borrowings from other programs to meet needs

February 24, 1966

in Vietnam. They suggest that borrowing is evidence of over-funding of other programs. This is simply not the case.

What AID has done is "borrow" from programs where funds were not needed until the last part of the year. These borrowed funds will need to be replenished—some of them by the end of March.

The borrowing that has been done is in full compliance with the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act—provisions enacted by the Congress. Each of these has required a determination by the President that the transfer is necessary. And who can dispute the necessity of meeting urgent requirements in Vietnam.

I am pleased to note—at least from their statement that they are "in agreement with the majority of our colleagues"—that these gentlemen do intend to vote in favor of a foreign aid authorization. I commend them for it.

Mr. Chairman, the world we inhabit is precarious and fragile. Most all of us recognize the world responsibility as a world climate of stability and security, of progress and hope. We also recognize that the price for bearing these responsibilities is not cheap, and the best evidence of this recognition would be a vote in favor of the supplemental request at hand. Those funds for economic assistance support in the truest sense our own best aspirations for the world in which we live.

The cruel dilemma of Vietnam hangs heavy over our Nation. It hangs heavily over the head of President Johnson. Everyone can criticize or offer suggestions as to what should or can be done. However in the end the burden is his. The people of this country elected him our President and our Commander in Chief. His judgment has never proven unworthy of the trust which the people of this country placed in him.

Some ask how did we get to Vietnam and this is a fair question that should be answered. Perhaps it is a time to trace the course which lead to Vietnam and place it in its proper perspective.

The Eisenhower administration on numerous occasions stated unequivocally that southeast Asia was of prime strategic meaning to the United States and that a threat to that region or to any one of the component countries, would also represent a threat to the security of the United States. In that period, when the Korean experience was quite fresh, aggressions against south-east Asia or Indochina were equated with the aggression against Korea in terms of significance to the United States and the free world.

In September of 1953 Secretary Dulles declared that the outcome of the struggle in Indochina "affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific." In a speech 6 months later, Dulles referred first to the resources of southeast Asia and then stated:

The area has great strategic value. Southeast Asia is astride the most direct and best developed sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia. It has major naval and air bases. Communist control of southeast Asia would carry a grave threat to the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, with whom we have treaties of mutual assistance.

The entire Western Pacific area, including the so-called offshore island chain, would be strategically endangered.

President Eisenhower appraised the situation last Wednesday (March 24) when he said that the area is of "transcendent importance."

A little later, Dulles stated that Communist conquest of southeast Asia "would seriously imperil the free world position in the Western Pacific" and he then explained the importance of Vietnam to southeast Asia as a whole:

We realized that if Vietnam fell into hostile hands, and if the neighboring countries remained weak and divided, then the Communists could move on into all of southeast Asia. For these reasons, the Eisenhower administration from the outset gave particular attention to the problem of southeast Asia.

Secretary Dulles in subsequent speeches put his position even more clearly when he said on one occasion that Chinese Communist aggression in relation to the Pacific or southeast Asia area "would be a deliberate threat to the United States itself," and on another occasion:

Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would in fact endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Somewhat later, toward the end of 1954 the Secretary, speaking on the SEATO Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that it would be reasonable to conclude if the Communists turned to armed attack in that region they were "starting on a course of action which is directly aimed at the United States; that we are the target."

Once more in 1959, when evidence began to come to light that North Vietnam was renewing its efforts to take over the south, President Eisenhower said:

The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom * * *. Our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Vietnam the morale, the economic progress, and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom.

It was in an awareness of this real interrelation of the security of the United States with that of southeast Asia that the U.S. Government negotiated and concluded the Southeast Asia Collective Defense—Manila—Treaty in 1954. This treaty which established the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, with Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States as members, was undertaken as a contract to defend southeast Asia. The nature of this contract will be discussed below.

The signers of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty for the United States were John Foster Dulles, H. Alexander Smith, and MIKE J. MANSFIELD. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the treaty was ratified by the President on February 4, 1955, and entered into force on February 19, 1955.

Article IV of the treaty provides:

1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by

unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any party in the treaty area or of any other state or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any state designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

In a protocol entered into simultaneously the parties unanimously designated "for the purposes of article IV of the treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

The United States, in a special understanding set forth in the treaty, limited its obligation "to act" under article IV(1) to cases of Communist aggression, including armed attacks by "the regime of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam." The United States agreed in the event of other aggression or armed attack to consult under the provisions of article IV(2).

OBLIGATION TO ACT—INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

In the event of armed attack as in Vietnam, each party is bound under article IV(1) to act "to meet the common danger." Article IV(2) "applies primarily to the threat of overthrow by subversive measures, internal revolution which might, perhaps, be inspired from without, but which does not involve open interference from without." This obligation is individual, as well as collective, and does not depend on consultations or agreement. This interpretation of the treaty obligation, widely held by the SEATO parties, was given formal expression in a joint communique issued by Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman of Thailand on March 6, 1962:

The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes" leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

But each party is committed to act on its judgment that an armed attack has occurred:

The Secretary of State assured the Foreign Minister that in the event of such aggression, the United States intends to give full effect to its obligations under the treaty to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. The Secretary of State reaffirmed that this obligation of the United States does not depend on the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective.

Almost all the SEATO parties have endorsed this statement. None has registered objection.

In the current hostilities, the Republic of Vietnam has not requested formal collective action by the SEATO Council. However, at Vietnam's request, the United States has acted individually, and collectively with other countries, including several SEATO allies, to meet the common danger arising from the armed attack against "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam." These measures are not actions by the SEATO Council, but they are actions in discharge of parties' obligations under the treaty.

SOUTHEAST ASIA-U.S. PEACE AND SECURITY

The meaning of the treaty commitment was underscored by Secretary Dulles in his report to the President:

The purpose of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty is the creation of unity for security and peace in southeast Asia and the Southwestern Pacific. * * * Although the United States has no direct territorial interest in southeast Asia, we have much in common with the people and governments of this area and are united in the face of a common danger that stems from international communism.

A week after the treaty was signed, Secretary Dulles explained to the Nation:

Any significant expansion of the Communist world would, indeed, be a danger to the United States, because international communism thinks in terms of ultimately using its power position against the United States. Therefore, we could honestly say * * * that Communist armed aggression in southeast Asia would, in fact, endanger our peace and security and call for counteraction on our part.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Dulles said:

The language used here which has now become, I would say, almost conventional with reference to these treaties, makes perfectly clear the determination of our Nation to react to [Communist] armed attack.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported the treaty and protocol by a vote of 14 to 1. In its report, the committee made clear its understanding of the importance of the new commitment:

This treaty constitutes an important step in the evolution of U.S. policy to create a system of collective security in the West Pacific area. It is the latest addition to the protective network of the mutual defense treaties which have been concluded by the United States with Japan, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines and Korea.

Designed to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific, the treaty is intended to deter aggression in that area by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each of them as dangerous to its own peace and safety.

The principle underlying this treaty is that advance notice of our intentions and the intentions of the nations associated with us may serve to deter potential aggressors from reckless action that could plunge the Pacific into war. To that end, the treaty makes it clear that the United States will not remain indifferent to conduct threatening the peace of southeast Asia.

The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that acceptance of these obligations commits the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interests. There are greater hazards in not advising a potential enemy of what he can expect of us, and in failing to disabuse him of assumptions which might lead to a miscalculation of our intentions.

For these reasons, the Committee on Foreign Relations urges the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty.

On February 1, 1955, the U.S. Senate approved the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty by a vote of 82 to 1. Senator Langer cast the lone negative vote. Thirteen Senators were absent and not voting, but with respect to each it was announced that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." Among the 13, 2 Senators were absent for illness: Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy. The others were Barkley, BENNETT, Chavez, Daniel, DIRKSEN, Hennings, HRUSKA, McCarthy, MONRONEY, Potter, and Young.

The commitment to protect the Indochina states from Communist aggression was a central consideration emphasized by each of the four principal speakers in debate on the floor of the Senate supporting the treaty:

Senator GEORGE. The nations of the free world sustained a serious setback with the loss of northern Vietnam to the Communists. The peril to the southern area, the free territory of Vietnam, as well as to the remaining associated states, Laos and Cambodia, is serious, continuing, and unrelenting. It is important that our Government should act promptly to give approval to this treaty as an act of confidence in the determination of other governments in the area to defend their freedom, individual liberty, and independence.

Senator SMITH. The net effect of this provision is to serve notice now and for the future to the Chinese Communists—and, I may say, to any Communists in the area * * * that they shall not encroach further on this area of free nations. They are no longer free to isolate and absorb the countries of southeast Asia, one by one. Laos or Cambodia or South Vietnam or Thailand cease to be individual entities on their timetable of conquest. That was taken care of by the special protocol which was added to the treaty at the time it was signed.

Senator MANSFIELD. The Southeast Asian Treaty is another part in the total pattern of strength which we have been trying to create throughout the free world. The armistice agreements at Geneva did not end the need for a pact in the southeast Pacific area; rather it emphasized it.

The treaty area is defined in the treaty itself and also in a protocol to the treaty which brings in Laos, Cambodia, and the free portion of Vietnam as treaty territory which, if attacked, would be under the protection of the treaty * * * those states welcomed the fact that the mantle of protection of the treaty was thrown around this area.

Senator WILEY. We all know what the loss of that part of the globe would mean to our own security. And we must not weaken our own resolve at this critical moment. Recent information, in contrast with pessimistic advice received earlier, appears to offer greater hope for a favorable outcome in free Vietnam. Surely now is not the time to dampen the morale of its people and its leaders.

INDOCHINA

The Manila Pact was negotiated in the shadow of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Korea and Indochina. When the Geneva Agreements on Indochina were signed by the French military command and the Communist Vietminh, the threat was clear that the Communists might attempt to take over the whole of Vietnam by internal subversion or armed aggression. At the conclusion of the Geneva Conference President Eisenhower declared that the United States would "not use force to disturb the settlement," but he warned "that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern." The formal declaration by the U.S. Government at the 1954 Geneva Conference was worded more strongly. It stated we "would view any renewal of aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

At Manila, Secretary Dulles warned the conference of the insatiable ambition of international communism:

We know that wherever it makes gains, as in Indochina, these gains are looked on not as final solutions, but as bridgeheads for further gains.

It was to contain this bridgehead that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was negotiated.

Secretary Dulles acknowledged that President Eisenhower and he "had hoped that unity would be forged in time to strengthen the negotiating position of the free nations during the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference. However, this proved impracticable. The Geneva outcome did, however, confirm the need for unity." The Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was fashioned to meet this need.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE COMMITMENT

The U.S. commitment to the defense of South Vietnam derives from a basic conviction that the vital interests of the United States are engaged in the struggle of the peoples of southeast Asia to build societies in their own way free from aggression from the Communist powers. This commitment has been reaffirmed by three Presidents. With the support of Congress, each took the action that was necessary in his time to honor that commitment.

As early as October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower undertook to provide direct assistance to help make South Vietnam "capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." On May 11, 1957, President Eisenhower and Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Vietnam, issued a joint statement which noted "the large buildup of Vietnamese Communist military forces in North Vietnam" and stated, inter alia:

Noting that the Republic of Vietnam is covered by article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, President Eisenhower and President Ngo Dinh Diem agreed that aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Vietnam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

The two Presidents "looked forward to an end of the unhappy division of the Vietnamese people and confirmed the determination of the two Governments to work together to seek suitable means to bring about the peaceful unification of Vietnam in freedom in accordance with the purpose and principles of the United Nations Charter."

As North Vietnam's aggression mounted, President Kennedy declared, on August 2, 1961:

The United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render.

On December 7, 1961, President Diem appealed for additional support to meet North Vietnam's efforts to impose a Communist regime. In his reply of December 14, 1961 President Kennedy recalled the U.S. Declaration at the Geneva Conference of 1954 and reaffirmed that the United States was "prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence."

THE JOINT RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 7, 1964

President Johnson has reaffirmed these commitments many times, and, on August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by vote of 504 to 2, a joint resolution which stated the commitments as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

During the floor debate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked by Senator COOPER whether the joint resolution fulfilled the requirement of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty that the United States act by constitutional processes:

In other words, are we now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT answered directly:

I think that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided it was necessary to use

such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.

This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that * * *. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

The joint resolution of August 1964 decided that the United States is prepared "as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom." South Vietnam has asked for that assistance, and the President has taken the necessary steps in consultation with the Congress.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AGREEMENTS IN THE PACIFIC

The Manila Pact is only one of a number of bilateral and multilateral arrangements made to facilitate the exercise of the inherent right of collective self-defense acknowledged in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The United States has entered into bilateral mutual defense treaties in the Pacific with Japan—most recently in 1960—Korea, 1953; the Philippines, 1954; and China, 1954; and it is a member of the tripartite Anzus pact with Australia and New Zealand, 1952.

Everyone of these treaties obligates the United States to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes—the formula used in the Manila Pact. This U.S. commitment, given in advance, to act in accordance with its constitutional processes in the event of Communist armed attack, is the linch-pin of the free world collective security system.

Thus U.S. commitment in South Vietnam, growing out of the Manila treaty and its protocol, must be met, in view of the aggression which is being mounted from North Vietnam, if the Manila treaty is to be regarded as a credible commitment. Were we not to help South Vietnam to defend itself, each one of the other SEATO nations which is under threat would most probably conclude that it could not count on American support, and we could expect to see accommodations being made to an aggressive communism which no one of the countries of southeast Asia could resist standing alone. Since our understandings with other allied countries in East and southeast Asia are stated in terms which are virtually identical to those in the Manila treaty, it is reasonable to assume that those countries too would feel obliged to reappraise their basic policies on the basis of a much more doubtful assumption of U.S. help in case they come under attack.

Under these circumstances we would have to assume that with the passage of time the bases in the Western Pacific to which we now have access would be shut off from us and that much terri-

tory and many resources now in friendly hands would no longer be so. Not only in that region but around the world the firm basis for the free world's system of collective security would have been badly if not irreparably shaken.

I think the vote today will demonstrate while we all seek peace we also possess an awareness of the commitment of this country. We have also a commitment to those young men who are doing the fighting that validates this commitment. They are entitled to our support.

The very risk that makes a treaty necessary in the first place carries with it the possibility that some day it may become operative. So too our responsibility becomes greater when our troops are committed to battle. Let us continue to discuss, let us continue to seek honorable negotiations but let us recognize that the answer to this challenge by communism like all its many challenges rests not with them. It rests with us.

Shall we continue to believe in ourselves? Shall we retain the faith of our convictions possessed of the knowledge that our ideals are more meaningful than our armies? Shall we retain our courage? For if we do then there is hope that Vietnam may be the dawn of a lasting peace in a world where men shall only fight their real enemies, misery, poverty, disease, and ignorance. I think we do.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the allotted time. I merely want to say, and I would like to add a footnote, that I have not studied this bill in detail. I do not know the fine points of it. I am not a member of the committee. But as I came in the door I heard the gentleman from Ohio make some remarks about the junior Senator from New York, and I might say that I am a good friend of the Senator from New York—

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman did not hear me correctly. I said the junior Senator from my own State. I do not bear any responsibility for the junior Senator from New York. I am a good friend of his, too.

Mr. DOW. Then I apologize.

Mr. HAYS. It is the junior Senator from Ohio that I was talking about.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I question the wisdom of my getting into this debate. I have profound respect for the distinguished chairman of this committee and every member of the subcommittee. It is his responsibility to get the authorization bill approved. Subsequently the Committee on Appropriations will have to consider the authorization.

I would like to be corrected if I am wrong. There is actually no borrowing going on anywhere. We may use the term "borrowing," but the allocation that the President made out of the United Organization funds is money that was unobligated. Had these funds been obli-

gated, they could not have been retrieved. It was unobligated funds that the administration used, that is if they have been used. I am making a statement of fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course this money is already appropriated. The gentleman's bill appropriated it.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not the question. Had it been allocated to specific projects?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course it has not been allocated to specific projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you are not borrowing it, you are merely using funds that have not been obligated.

Mr. MORGAN. I am reading from the gentleman's own bill. International organization programs authorized by section 302, \$144,755,000. This is a program that they borrowed from.

I am reading now from the executive branch's section-by-section analysis that came up to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AID has already "borrowed" \$36 million of essential supporting assistance programs and programs financed by the special southeast Asian contingency fund. In addition, \$27,700,000 has been temporarily transferred to supporting assistance from funds appropriated for volunteer contributions for international organizations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, that is correct, but what you are actually doing is obligating funds for projects in South Vietnam from money that had not been obligated or turned over to international organizations. I repeat, if the funds had been turned over to these international organizations they could not have been recalled or deobligated and reobligated as is the case with a multitude of other funds that are allocated or obligated on a bilateral basis, by the AID agency through the country and projects.

I just had a look at the budget. In the budget there are 15 different requests for foreign assistance of some type for fiscal year 1967. The total amount is \$3,505 million. I can assure the gentleman that this does not include any part of the Defense budget other than mutual security military assistance. May I say the total of unexpended funds from these 15 bills, to be dispersed in the future may exceed \$20 billion. The authorization request before you will merely enable the administration to increase the pipeline and I dare say not a dime authorized by this bill would actually be expended until 1968, if then.

The President laid the foundation for this supplemental when he came before the Congress last year. Read his message. He said that at some subsequent date, if we need the funds, we are going to ask Congress to appropriate them. I predicted at that time that there would be a supplemental in excess of \$1 billion, which would make it the largest foreign aid bill in the history of America if you picked up the international organizations and the other facets of foreign aid.

If the gentleman will accept this amendment and earmark these funds specifically for South Vietnam, for the first time since I have been a Member

of Congress I will vote loud and clear for this particular authorization, but you have struck it out of the bill somewhere along the way. Some of you had the idea that you should earmark the funds in reading your own bill before the committee, but it has been stricken and again you are asking for an open end appropriation whereby you could or could not allocate and spend these funds in South Vietnam. Again it is on an illustrative basis. We may spend it there, but again we may not. So, if the gentleman will accept this amendment, inasmuch as he has made his case on the basis that the money was needed for South Vietnam, you will give some of us an opportunity to use the propaganda that is being used downtown that we are doing this on account of the war in South Vietnam. If that be true, then let us allocate it and let us put in the supplemental in the other body when it goes over sufficient money to pay back the pittance of \$64 million which you said we had borrowed. You have not borrowed it but have spent it.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to bring this argument back into focus. This amendment was never considered in committee. No one introduced it, including anyone in the minority. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is inaccurate in that particular statement.

Now let me say this: The programs had been scheduled on a 12-month basis. We still have 4 months to go. Ninety-six million dollars has already been borrowed from programs that have been scheduled. Twenty-seven million dollars has been scheduled for the 12-month program of the international organizations. This includes a multitude of organizations that would be unfunded for the balance of the 4 months if this amendment were adopted. Second, \$60 million has been borrowed from the Korean funds.

Now, it makes no sense to talk about fighting communism in South Vietnam if we allow programs in Korea to go unfunded. The rigidity of this amendment would preclude the transferability of the funds that we have here and have borrowed under previously allotted sums of money for programs of supporting assistance that would be used in Korea. Further, barring unforeseen circumstances, these funds will be used for the purpose stated by the administration; that is, the United Nations, Laos, Thailand, the Dominican Republic, and to reimburse funds previously borrowed, as I have stated.

This is a tremendously rigid amendment which has never been passed by any previous Congress that has considered the foreign aid bill. It is possible emergency situations in Laos or Thailand might require some transfer of funds. If we adopted this particular amendment, we would be unable to shift funds from Thailand to Laos or from Vietnam to Laos or Thailand. We would be unable to shift funds to the Domini-

can Republic or, if we had no further need for funds in the Dominican Republic and had a greater need in South Vietnam for them, we would be unable to do that. So, to reimburse the \$96 million we have already borrowed and which the committee of the gentleman from Louisiana has appropriated, it seems to me we cannot adopt this amendment. Even if we were thinking about it, what we would be doing is starting down an entirely new path and setting rigid precedents that have never been imposed on any President in any previous administration. So this has not been a well thought out amendment. I am sure the purposes are sincere. We are voting to support our effort in South Vietnam, but let it not be so rigid that we cannot fight communism wherever the emergency arises. By adopting this amendment what we would be doing is putting some programs on an 8-month basis when they have been scheduled and programed on a 12-month basis.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I state again, and I am not quarreling with the gentleman, but the facts should be made known: You are not borrowing; you are merely allocating funds from previously appropriated, unobligated funds. You have nothing to pay back. I shall set forth that at the proper time.

If the gentleman will yield further, I want to ask one question: Using it in the extreme—I would not want to get into the hearings that are yet to be published—under the bill that is being considered, the authorization bill, if approved, funds out of this authorization could be allocated to Egypt, Indonesia, or any other of the 98 nations where foreign aid is being or could be dispersed in fiscal 1966, if the administration should so desire.

Is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to answer the gentleman to the effect that the gentleman from Louisiana is quite aware of the program. But what we have done, in effect, is that while we might not have obligated these funds—and we are getting involved in semantics here—the fact of the matter is we have projected our program in Korea on a 12-month basis. We have borrowed \$60 million from that program. If we adopt this amendment, the rigidity of this amendment would preclude our paying back the supporting assistance fund in Korea the funds that we have already taken out of that fund to support our effort in South Vietnam. That is just how simple it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman did not answer my question, which is this:

Could these funds be allocated to Egypt and to Indonesia?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The question is that they could be allocated to Korea.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has made my point.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I came over to the floor of the House this afternoon with the intention of voting for H.R. 12169. But I find, without the amendment, it will be impossible for me to vote for the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that this money was earmarked for South Vietnam or at least for southeast Asia. But instead of earmarking the authorization, the Committee has merely amended section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by raising supporting assistance from \$369,200,000 to \$684,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has raised a very valid objection. I have heard the gentleman from Louisiana say that the AID, the State Department, can obligate, reobligate, and deobligate all in the same day. If we pass this measure without earmarking the \$315 million for use in southeast Asia, the war in South Vietnam could end tomorrow and the State Department could spend all of the funds in Timbuktu the following week.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the authorization next week coming out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I serve on the House Committee on Armed Services. I raised a similar objection to the authorization in that committee. I feel that this is one of the valid objections to the operations of the foreign aid program. The Congress just does not exercise control over the operations of the foreign aid program. If this money is for use in southeast Asia, why should there be any objection to earmarking.

In my opinion—and I have been watching this for 6 years now in the House of Representatives—it is an absolute exercise in futility for us to go through the procedure of authorizing and appropriating, when the State Department can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate all in the same day.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have the same problem with reference to the defense appropriation, because the Pentagon and the Defense Department is doing the same thing through the process of reprogramming.

Now I did vote for the authorization in the Committee on Armed Services. That will be before the committee next week, but the problems are completely different. You can buy a bomb in the United States but you do not know whether it will be dropped in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Laos. But here we can exercise control at least to the extent of having it spent in Laos and Thailand and South Vietnam, which is the reason why the President has asked for this authorization.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to have one more clarification of this bill. I respect this great committee but as I understand the situation, no money has been "borrowed." I am familiar with

this procedure. Actually what has happened and what does happen is that they allocated money or funded programs for South Vietnam that would have normally been allocated to other projects, programs, or countries. It is just a question now of whether you are going to get more money to allocate funds to Korea and to other programs that have been temporarily underfunded. Had the money been obligated then, of course, they could not have allocated it to another program or country. In reality the AID Agency has not borrowed money. It makes a good case of argument but it is not factual. The AID Agency is merely allocating funds that normally would have gone to some other country. If this authorization bill is approved, they will merely fund these programs at a subsequent date.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say during the gentleman's discussion of this amendment that he is going to favor the same kind of amendment to the bill, H.R. 12335, when it comes on the floor Tuesday?

Mr. ICHORD. No. I do not think you could possibly limit the effort in fighting a war. I do think we should try to exercise more control even in the Committee on Armed Services. But when you are spending money for construction of airfields and for the purchase of numerous weapons and many new weapons that we are going to have come into play in South Vietnam, I do not think we can possibly earmark our authorization. We have made some progress, I will say to the gentleman, in the Committee on Armed Services. We did extend last year the authorization for line items to include track vehicles. Previously we only authorized specifically for missiles, aircraft, ships, and other large items of hardware.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for 12 years I was a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Each year we had to consider the necessary appropriations for the funding of the total mutual security and/or AID program. In the process of considering this program, every year you ran into these kinds of terms. The executive branch of the Government would come before the committee and say, "On an illustrative basis we are asking for this much money."

They could not be specific in pointing out the precise dollars for a precise project. The presentation was always illustrative. Each would also tell us that after the money was made available or the obligational authority was forthcoming, then they would program something—the precise dollar against a precise program.

Then they would eventually obligate the precise obligational authority against the project in a country. This was normal procedure. Then, of course, it

was just as normal to deobligate if a project fell through or if its justification was not warranted after further consideration. Then that obligational authority would be made available for another project in another country and there would be a reobligation.

Now when comments are made that money is borrowed from one program or project from one country or another, I suspect—and I would like to see the books—that they had gone no further than programming at this stage of the fiscal year. Even if they had, knowing full well they will get this authorization and this appropriation—and I am for them—they can deobligate and they can reobligate. The net result will be purely a bookkeeping transaction.

It would be very interesting if the books were up here and we had people to look at them. I suspect the facts are they have gone no further than the programming. Even though they have they can deobligate and if they can deobligate, they can reobligate.

Let me just conclude with this observation, Mr. Chairman. It has been pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that this is an unusual circumstance. I agree. Maybe the fact that it is an unusual circumstance is the reason why we should earmark. It would justify earmarking here when we have not done so in the past. We are seeking on this occasion to indicate our full support for our program in Vietnam and in these associated areas in southeast Asia.

There is no better way in my judgment than to be specific with the earmarking as long as we are convinced that the earmarking will in no way interfere with the operation of the program.

I am confident if the books were laid right out on the table in the well of the House, the facts would be—yes the facts would be—that they have not gone any further than the programming. If they had, they can deobligate and reobligate to take care of any borrowing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all as far as the semantics are concerned with respect to resupplying existing programs. We have authorized and appropriated funds on an illustrative basis for programs for the present fiscal year under the regular program. If it becomes necessary, even as a contingency, that it may be required to use some of these funds to finish out the present fiscal year, it would be my purpose in supporting this authorization to be sure that those funds previously authorized and appropriated would not be disturbed or that we would have to modify existing previously approved programs.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I rise only for the purpose of trying to clarify the general situation here. I have not worked with these figures as many Members have. But it

is my understanding that this so-called loan or deobligation or whatever it is was made from the Fund for International Organizations and Programs, and that the sum total of that Fund, if I read the correct figure, is \$144 million plus. I also understand that in that Fund involves obligations of the U.S. Government in connection with our contributions to various agencies and that these obligations are fixed.

If that is true—and I am merely rising for information—we would want to put the money back as contemplated in this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To a degree I am asking for information, too. It is my best recollection that the appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the international organizations were—and this was a separate amount—100 million plus—and that that money could not be transferred out of that to help fund to the extent of the full amount.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand that that \$27.6 million was taken from that specific fund, the entire amount of which is an obligation to the United States. That is my understanding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey because I promised him I would do so, but I would like to proceed with what I started to say on my own time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The debate today indicates what I said earlier, and that is we are being unrealistic if we are suggesting that there is any necessity right now to earmark these particular funds in the way that is being proposed by this amendment. I think we might have less reason to hesitate about earmarking them than we have had. But there is no need for it in this case. We are talking about a 4-month program. That means surely there will be a dislocation of existing programs if we do not have the flexibility which so-called open-ended authorization would provide in this 4-month period. Had we had discussion like this in the committee, we might have come up with a different conclusion. More difficulty would arise if we should now say that these funds can only be allocated in certain amounts as to certain countries.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to complete what I intended to say, and if there is any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield to those desiring me to do so. I understood the statement to be made on the floor that the committee had earmarked funds for a particular country in this bill for the general program and that subsequently we struck that out. I cannot find that language anywhere in this bill. It was not brought up in committee, and there

was no amendment to that effect. We did have a country earmarking with respect to administrative expenses and the transferability for that purpose. We put a ceiling and a limitation on those funds, but not on the others. In my judgment, this is no time to talk about changing the whole concept of authorization and appropriation, at a time when it is clear we do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 52, noes 71.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gross and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Of the funds appropriated under the amendment made by the first section of this act not to exceed \$25 million shall be available for use in the Dominican Republic on a loan basis."

And remember the following sections accordingly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is not to change the amount but simply to see that the amount listed in the report and hearings for the Dominican Republic should be certain to be on a loan basis. By that I mean the adoption by Congress of a loan rather than a grant policy for capital expenditures on U.S. foreign aid. The question comes up as to how much has the Dominican Republic received from the United States in grants and loans from the time of the revolution. Since the date of the revolution, on April 24, 1965, the United States has made available to the Dominican Republic \$86.3 million until January 10 of 1966.

There is now in the current President's contingency fund \$54.1 million of unobligated funds. As of now, \$37,322,000 of this current contingency fund has been allocated to the Dominican Republic, most of which is for their budget use for the Government. I am not allowed to give you the specific amounts as distributed in the Dominican Republic, although I can hardly see why the information is confidential when the Vietnam listing by category is given and the United States is at war there.

This makes a total already of \$123,622,000 U.S. credits made available to the Dominican Republic since April 24, 1965. That is pretty good financing for a revolution in these short months.

The President now requests for the Dominican Republic another authorization of \$25 million. The question is

should Congress make this a grant or a loan by specific designation, or just leave the question open? My position is that these funds should be a loan. The reasons for that position are these: First, they have a low rate of savings and investments in the Dominican Republic. The people are not seriously helping themselves, and we U.S. taxpayers should insist on their doing so.

The second point is that the Dominican Republic has not yet changed their agricultural program to meet present realities and market conditions, so that they vary their Dominican exports. They are still emphasizing sugar heavily and cocoa, which is in excess and overabundant supply at world market prices that are low.

The third point is that the U.S. taxpayers should insist that the Government of the Dominican Republic emphasize the free enterprise system and get out of its many businesses. There are too many businesses in the Dominican Republic that are owned and operated by the Dominican Republic. Too large a part of the businesses are government-owned or operated. My position is: Congress should definitely state the U.S. policy that this \$25 million is a loan. We can make it on a 40-year basis from the U.S. Treasury, the first 10 years at 1 percent interest and the remaining 30 years at 2½ percent interest. The U.S. statutes already authorize that procedure generally.

As to the current Dominican budget and their loans, of June 30, 1965, the Government owes \$30 million to foreign commercial banks on terms of 1 year or less. On a 1-to-8-year basis of maturities, the Dominican Government owes approximately \$153.5 million. If Congress or the administration puts the \$25 million in cash as a grant to the Dominican Republic, all the U.S. taxpayers are doing is picking up the tab for \$25 million of the \$30 million of the loans of the foreign banks which are due on the current under 1-year basis.

How about Dominican foreign loans that have maturities over 1 to 8 years? On those loans there is money owed to the U.S. Treasury, the International Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. On Dominican loans with over 8 years maturity, there is money owing, but that is to U.S. AID, the Inter-American Bank, U.S. Treasury under Public Law 480, section 4, and also the Export-Import Bank. So actually U.S. institutions are owed most of the long-term Dominican obligations. My object is to serve notice to the Dominican people and their Government to get their economic and budget houses in order. Revolutions are expensive.

My question is, Why, when it is stated that this \$25 million is for capital funds in large part, capital budget expenditures, does Congress not specifically label and treat it then as capital investment? Mr. Bell, Director of U.S. AID, stated on page 20 of the hearings, regarding Dominican aid:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development, to technical assistance, etc.

Under those circumstances, as this is capital investment, then Congress should

specifically treat the \$25 million as a capital loan and lend it on a long-term, 40-year basis.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I wonder what is the reason for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am reading from page 100 of the hearings and from the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and Mr. Sternfeld, who came up to testify before us:

Mr. FULTON. The question comes whether Congress should not now, at this time, make U.S. supporting assistance on a loan, rather than a grant base, rather than adopt the policy to have loans in the future after these grants.

Mr. STERNFELD. That is our proposition, Mr. FULTON. It is our intention that the \$25 million we are requesting here will be provided to the Government on a loan basis, at this time.

Mr. FULTON. So that there is no more aid going to the Dominican Republic on a grant basis?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORGAN. I just cannot understand why the gentleman himself, since he raised this at the hearings, would appear on the floor and offer an amendment to this effect.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Well, the answer to it is this: Unless we in Congress specifically say that this loan policy is the intent of the Congress, I think they will change it and move it around and make it on a grant basis. So I am simply tying this commitment down based upon what the administration said in answer to me, that it will be a loan, and that we in Congress adopt a policy right now of having loans for the Dominican Republic for capital expenditures, and that we say it directly.

So, I am really just outlining the intention of Congress and really outlining the intent of what Mr. Ball says on page 20 when he says:

Our money has been going to an increasing extent to capital development.

When it is capital development, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you that it should then be on a loan basis.

If this is the specific legislative intent as you state, then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield further to my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. During the hearings it was definitely and specifically stated on three occasions by Mr. Sternfeld, the witness, that this aid to the Dominican Republic would be on a loan basis.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That makes the legislative intent complete.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out "\$50,000,000" and substituting "\$150,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will note that by the bill there is added \$100 million as an addition to the President's contingency fund for the current year, that is, the fiscal year expiring on June 30. There are 3 months remaining after the enactment of this bill authorizing this money. So such authorization for the President's contingency fund will be at a rate, if we calculate it annually, of \$400 million, because this present \$100 million increase is only for 90 days. Therefore we are increasing the President's contingency fund at a rate of \$400 million a year. This is too much undesignated funds by blanket authorization of Congress.

That is too much of a rate of expenditure, without designation or request by the President for Congress approval; my amendment would say to the President, "We will give you \$50 million more in the current fiscal year to spend until June 30, in addition to the \$54 million you already have in your contingency fund."

Mr. Chairman, the President right now has a contingency fund of \$54.1 million; \$4.1 million is the carryover from fiscal year 1965; \$50 million is authorized and allocated already in the 1966 fiscal year in which we are now operating, and which expires on June 30. That has been allocated, I might say, but not obligated. That means it has only been tentatively programed, and can be changed by a bookkeeping entry, alone.

Now, the question comes up: Will Congress increase the contingency fund by \$100 million more? My answer to that question is this: "Mr. President, I think if we give you a contingency fund whereby you can spend \$50 million in the next 90 days after you get this money, until June 30, 1966, that is a very good rate, because it is equivalent to giving you \$200 million for your fund for a year. That is quite a rate of spending by one Government source, without designation or authorization by Congress.

In the 1965 fiscal year the appropriation for the contingency fund was \$99.2 million, and the amount obligated or used was only \$57.2 million. In this fiscal year the authorization is \$50 million and the amount appropriated is \$50

million. But I do believe if the President has contingency funds to the extent that he will have \$100 million that is not obligated between now and June 30 in his special contingency fund to spend as he wants, that is sufficient.

You might say, was this contingency fund in any respect for the military? No; no part of it is for the military.

Second, is any part of it designated? No; no part of it is designated.

Third, are there enough funds for southeast Asia? Yes; the amount presently programed by this bill is \$415 million, of which \$350 million is for southeast Asia, and only \$25 million for the Dominican Republic. We must remember also that this Congress gave the President an extra and special contingency fund of \$89 million specifically for southeast Asia last year for use until the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1966.

So what Congress will be doing is this. My amendment will be adding \$50 million more to the President's present contingency fund of \$54.1 million. So he will have in his pocket unspent as of this time, to spend between now and June 30, 1966, \$104.1 million. I think if there develops anywhere in the world, a new, unforeseen, and a bigger emergency than that, the administration should come back to the Congress and with a specific request for authorization and then Congress would promptly give them the money. My point is that Congress should be consulted.

This contingency fund can be used any place. So if the Congress wants to keep its authority and wants to keep its hand on the till and wants to be told what these emergencies and contingencies are, then I think we have to make the administration come back here for authorization and study of policies by the committees of Congress who have jurisdiction.

So I recommend that my amendment be adopted giving the President \$50 million for his contingency fund for the 90 days after enactment, to June 30, 1966. My amendment carries the figure of \$100 million because there is \$50 million there now and I increase it \$50 million more so it makes it \$100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute amendment and if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield so that I may offer my substitute amendment, he can then speak to both amendments.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the floor.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On the first page, strike out line 10 and all that follows down through line 3 on page 2.

And renumber the following section accordingly.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this. I try always to offer amendments that are easily understood.

This amendment would simply strike out anything for the contingency fund. I offer the amendment for the reason, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said in part, that there was \$50 million for the contingency fund in the regular appropriation bill for this year but not one dime was expended in Vietnam. This bill deals with Vietnam. Moreover, under the terms of this bill the contingency fund, if you vote \$100 million more, can be spent anywhere in the world for anything at any time and at any place. There is nothing in this bill that would prohibit it. It can be used to pay the accounts of the deadbeats in the United Nations, for instance. Why I can think of 100 similar examples of how the money could be used. There is no limit.

There is no reason in the world why we should vote \$100 million to beef up the contingency fund for a period of only 120 days, or until the end of the fiscal year.

How foolish could we possibly be, to vote a \$100 million contingency fund here today in view of the fact that only \$50 million was approved for this entire fiscal year and it was not necessary to spend a dime or a dollar of that amount in Vietnam.

Let reason prevail. I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, the reason no money was expended on Vietnam under the contingency this year was that we had a special contingency fund provided under section 451 of \$89 million specifically obligated for Vietnam last year. That has all been used and all of it has been used in Vietnam. The additional \$54 million which was in the contingency fund has already been programmed. There is no money remaining in that fund whatsoever.

If we adopt this amendment, it would be the first time a President of the United States did not have a contingency fund.

In 1956 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1957 we had a \$100 million contingency fund.

In 1959 there was a \$200 million contingency fund.

In 1960 there was a \$155 million contingency fund.

In 1961 there was a \$250 million contingency fund.

In 1962 there was a \$300 million contingency fund.

These were the authorizations. I might say too that the Congress has language in the act now which states that if the President does not use the money for the purposes outlined or de-

lined as a contingency, it must be returned to the Treasury.

In 1963 when the contingency fund was not completely used, \$127 million was returned to the Treasury.

The fact of the matter is if we adopt this amendment, the President would be without any funds whatsoever to take care of any contingency that might arise in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam or in any of the dozen flash points throughout the world. This would be the first time that the President of the United States would not be provided with a contingency fund by the Congress. I think that is not the intent of this body. We have never done it before to any President regardless of party, and I do not think we should start now. There is no money in the contingency fund now and I do think we owe it to the President and to ourselves to put this amount in the bill so that the President will have the money to provide for the security of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Funds appropriated under this subsection after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in Vietnam.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is for the purpose of taking care of Vietnam, then let us take care of Vietnam. Let us not have any shilly-shallying around here. Unless you limit this, the money can be used to pay the dues, as I have said before of the deadbeats in the United Nations. It could be used to underwrite, so far as I know, the million dollars that the U.N. is extracting from American taxpayers to support the Technical College in Havana which is training Communists to carry out subversion and guerrilla warfare in Latin America.

This contingency fund, I say to you again, is wide open to be used in any part of the world at any time. If you mean what you say and say what you mean, adopt this amendment and at least see that the money is used in Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This again is a limiting amendment which would tie the President's hands.

The definition of "contingency fund" since 1956, when Eisenhower was President, has limited the contingency fund to unforeseen emergencies. It has never been limited to any country any place in the world. The contingency fund has been available wherever the emergency occurred.

There has never been any limitation on the use of the contingency fund—never. If you are going to handcuff the President we might as well not even vote for this bill.

We are in a war. This money is needed. Let us trust our President with this money. Let us get ahead with our job so that the boys over there can go on with the job of winning this war.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with everything that our Chairman has said. I would like to point out this situation. Suppose North Vietnam decided to send a division of troops into Thailand tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We might then want some of this contingency fund in order to rush some reinforcement there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall give you another example of how the contingency fund today is being used, and that is to finance the boycott of Rhodesia. I cannot help but wonder if we put \$100 million into this fund, if the British decided to use military force in Rhodesia, whether the contingency fund would not be tapped either to finance them in that enterprise or to send American troops over there.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not investigated the situation of Rhodesia. This measure has nothing to do with Rhodesia. The contingency fund might be used to help the neighbors around Rhodesia, but it has nothing to do with the boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GROSS. It could be used to support the British in their boycott of Rhodesia.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In addition to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] pointed out, if there was no money in this contingency fund, we would not have it available to support troops if we had to send them into Thailand.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question has come up as to whether at any time the contingency fund was specifically designated. I would point out that last year in chapter 5, contingency fund, section 451, the following statement appears:

In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in southeast Asia such sums not to exceed \$89

million as may be necessary in the fiscal year 1966 for programs authorized for parts I and II of this act.

So there has been a designation of a contingency fund by section on the \$89 million bill be passed last year. So why the objection this year?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly the section I read to the gentleman when I opposed his amendment.

That was an additional sum. If he wants to earmark an additional sum for Vietnam, let us do it. All of that has been explained.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is not the point.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I read that to the gentleman before. This was an additional amount.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The Chairman had said that there was no special designation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would like to read it again. I have read it twice already. But if the gentleman wants to earmark a sum for Vietnam, let us do it, but let us not limit the President's authority to meet emergencies in other parts of the world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not participated in this debate, and in the pleasant climate of unanimity that seemed to prevail it had been my intention to remain silent, contenting myself with voting for the bill after the shouting was over.

But when my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, brought Rhodesia into the framework of the discussion, implying that there was something evil in our insistence upon equality among the people of that unhappy country, I could not in good conscience, continue to maintain my silence. Virtue, Mr. Chairman, is not something that is up for barter. Morality is not among the wares in the marketplace. Our position as regards Rhodesia is based upon our national morality and our sense of virtue, and it is certainly not a stance we have taken to please England or anyone else. It is the position that conforms to the still voice of conscience within our own people.

Our virtues and our moralities do not change with the scenery of different parts of the world. What we stand for, and fight for, and for which we give to the utmost in Vietnam, is that for which we stand and fight and give in Rhodesia.

It is the right of self-determination of peoples everywhere, their right themselves to determine by the will of the majority the kind of government under which they will live and the kind of lives they will make for themselves and their children.

I cannot make it too clear that the issue in Rhodesia is essentially the same as the issue in Vietnam. The brutal fact is that in Rhodesia the great majority of the men, women and children, the Africans by race and ancestry, are not permitted the right of suffrage and are denied equality of opportunity. That is a condition we as Americans cannot condone. It has no part in the world of freedom to which we belong and for

which we are risking so much in Vietnam and elsewhere.

We are happy that the Government of Great Britain is similarly minded as to Rhodesia, and the right of the majority of the people of that country to control their own destiny. But we are not beholden to Britain, nor Britain to the United States, because our two countries think alike and act with similar response when the virtues and the moralities are in issue.

The United States stands for the right of self-determination in Vietnam and in Rhodesia, and all the world around.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. I give back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No part of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be used to provide assistance to any country which permits any ship or aircraft under its registry to transport any equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress.'"

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is one which eliminates a glaring loophole in existing legislation. It is my hope that Members of both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort to make clear, beyond doubt, the intent of the Congress to use the economic power of our Nation in support of the servicemen whom the Nation has sent to the south Asian theater.

This amendment is comprehensive in scope. It denies assistance from the United States to any nation that permits its vessels or aircraft to transport any goods of any kind to North Vietnam. It means simply that the U.S. taxpayer will not be providing support to any nation that is involved in the business of transporting goods to our enemies in this bitter struggle.

Under existing law, foreign aid provided by our taxpayers is withheld from nations whose ships transport strategic goods or items of economic assistance to North Vietnam. The present law is thus restricted to certain types of commodities. It does not prohibit the grant of assistance by the United States to a nation whose ships transport to North Vietnam nonstrategic articles which are sold on ordinary commercial terms.

I think it important that the intent of Congress be made clear by the adoption of this amendment. By its adoption the Congress issues a warning to the other nations of the world that they can expect no further help from the United

States unless they cease carrying goods to North Vietnam.

The amendment which I am offering leaves an escape hatch for the President if he cares to use it. The amendment, following the provisions of existing legislation permits the President to waive its prohibition if he determines that withholding of assistance to any country affected by the amendment would be contrary to the national interest of the United States and reports such determination to the Congress. To avoid controversy at this time on the question of the latitude which the President should enjoy in the conduct of foreign relations, and after discussions with the distinguished chairman, I include this clause in the text of the amendment.

I recognize that attaching this amendment to this particular bill is in a sense a symbolic act since this measure provides assistance to only a few nations. None of the nations specified in the bill would, to my knowledge, be affected by the prohibition contained in my amendment. The measure, however, does provide a contingency fund, and my amendment could operate to prevent the grant of aid to some nations from this fund. Though the adoption of this amendment may be symbolic, it is important. It is important above all for the Congress to let Americans who are fighting in Vietnam know that they are supported by the full economic power of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential that we make the whole world aware of this country's unrelenting determination to bring an end to free world trade with Hanoi. The most recent report of the State Department, all but claiming elimination of this trade, is unfortunately premature. During last month, for instance, the unclassified report I received from the Department of Defense acknowledges that there were seven free world vessels in North Vietnam. But let no one take comfort in this figure for the truth is more than double that. We are, it would appear, returning to the level of traffic that existed 6 months ago.

We, especially here in Congress, must not let a single opportunity pass that offers the prospect of creating a roadblock for those who would profiteer while others die to safeguard freedom.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, because H.R. 12169 is described as a supplemental foreign assistance authorization, it is most necessary for some of us who have over the years opposed foreign aid to express our views on this bill for the record.

If this were just another broad program of foreign aid I would have no recourse but to oppose such an authorization. The question must be put bluntly, is this only another worldwide foreign aid program? The report accompanying this bill written by the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs makes it very clear and plain that what is involved here are additional funds primarily for Vietnam, closely related to our war effort there.

As we read the provisions of the bill itself it becomes apparent that to reach the objective stated in the report it must be amended to certain sections of the

1961 act. For the reason that there are no limitations spelled out in the bill earmarking these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand it would seem that the purpose contained in the report should be included with equal particularity in the bill itself. It is for such reason that I have supported the amendment which circumscribes the great bulk of these funds for Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand and I am hopeful that through some parliamentary procedure, perhaps by a motion to recommit, there may be a record vote that would leave no doubt that these funds are not simply more foreign aid funds but instead special purpose funding for use in the war in southeast Asia.

This morning it was my privilege as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to hear a report from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY who had returned only last evening from an extended trip to Vietnam, Australia, India, and the Philippines. The Vice President emphasized that the recent Honolulu conference was a turning point because there a determination was reached that we should not only continue to wage the military struggle against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese but at Honolulu we committed ourselves to carry on another war against misery, hunger, illiteracy, poverty and disease throughout South Vietnam. I came away from this briefing convinced that we have an aggravated problem to deal with in South Vietnam that ranks almost equal in importance to our military effort to stop the Communist aggression.

The funds authorized by this bill are for such worthwhile projects as port expansion, refugee relief and rural reconstruction. Who can say these activities are anything but just another face of the war. Along with many others I have opposed foreign aid consistently and repeatedly over the past several years. It is my intention to oppose indiscriminate handouts in the future. It should be clear enough that there is a sharp difference between peacetime economic assistance to the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, on the one hand and special wartime help to Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand.

One of the differences which immediately rises to the surface of any discussion is the fact that frequently in the past we have left behind a package of aid without adequate administrative personnel to direct or maintain an oversight of its use. On the contrary, in Vietnam and the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand this present aid will be completely geared or meshed to the military effort. Much of the opposition to foreign aid in so many parts of the world has been based on its maladministration, for many long years. Opposition has been outspoken because military assistance has been contained in the same package with economic aid. It has never made very good sense to me for military assistance to be administered by the State Department rather than by qualified, experienced military personnel. It was good news to learn the President has recommended that in the future no military operations be

financed by the Foreign Assistance Act. Notwithstanding this pronouncement for the future, it seems to me we have some good assurance because of the presence of our topflight military commanders in southeast Asia that this special or particular allocation of foreign assistance will in fact be just as much military assistance as if so titled or labeled.

We must remind ourselves anew that it is the presence of our military forces that have created some of the problems of the Vietnamese people. Their government is completely helpless to expand its revenues by taxation, yet they are faced with vital work of repairing war damage to their bridges and highways. They have a huge refugee bill that must be met.

Equally as important as the repair of damage is the counterinsurgency measures such as restoring of farms, and combating disease, in order that the rural population may be given a renewed will to carry on their resistance against the Vietcong.

In Laos there are areas that are now being contested by the Communists and some must be supplied by air. In portions of northeast Thailand the civilian population is being subjected to virtually the same terrorist tactics of murder and assassination as in South Vietnam. Who can argue that funds to strengthen the police units patrolling these besieged northeast Thailand communities is anything but a military effort?

In a word, under the circumstances of the present moment the real justification for H.R. 12169 is embodied in the proposition that if we don't send this \$275 million to Vietnam and the additional \$15 million to Laos and Thailand, then the remaining alternative is that we are going to have to send more American troops. The choice between our alternatives is made easy.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that I have followed the gentleman's work on this amendment since early last year. I know he has devoted a great deal of time and study to the ships going to North Vietnam. I have read with interest the last several insertions and speeches he has put in the Record on this subject.

I have examined the amendment very carefully, and it conforms with the so-called Castro-Cuban amendment. I think it is a good amendment and, speaking for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we will accept it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Funds made available pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be available for

transfer for expenses authorized by section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. Section 610(b) of such Act, which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Not to exceed \$1,400,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637 (a) of this Act for such fiscal year, subject to the limitations of subsection (a) of this section and subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in the Republic of Vietnam."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 742, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12169) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On the first page, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

"(c) Immediately after the first sentence, insert the following: 'Funds appropriated under this section after January 1, 1966, for the fiscal year 1966, shall be available solely for use in the following countries and within the following dollar limitations: Not to exceed \$275,000,000 shall be available solely for use in Vietnam, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Laos, not to exceed \$7,500,000 shall be available solely for use in Thailand, and not to exceed \$25,000,000 shall be available solely for use in the Dominican Republic.'"

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 213, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]
YEAS—169

Abbott	Erlenborn	O'Konski
Abernethy	Everett	O'Neal, Ga.
Adair	Findley	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Fino	Pelly
Andrews	Ford, Gerald R.	Pike
George W.	Fulton, Pa.	Plinie
Andrews	Fuqua	Polf
Glenn	Gettys	Pool
Andrews	Goodell	Quie
N. Dak.	Gross	Quillen
Arends	Gurney	Randall
Ashmore	Hagen, Calif.	Reid, Ill.
Ayres	Haley	Reifel
Baring	Hall	Reinecke
Bates	Hansen, Idaho	Rhodes, Ariz.
Battin	Harsha	Roberts
Belcher	Henderson	Robison
Bennett	Herlong	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Horton	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Hosmer	Rumsfeld
Bolton	Hull	Satterfield
Bow	Hutchinson	Schneebell
Bray	Ichord	Schweiker
Brock	Jarman	Secrest
Broomfield	Jennings	Shipley
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Shriver
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Broyhill, Va.	Jonas	Skubitz
Buchanan	Jones, Mo.	Smith Calif.
Burton, Utah	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Smith, Va.
Callaway	Kunkel	Springer
Carter	Laird	Staford
Chamberlain	Langen	Stanton
Clancy	Latta	Stephens
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Talcott
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Taylor
Collier	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	McClary	Thomson, Wis.
Conable	McCulloch	Tuck
Conte	McDade	Utt
Corbett	McEwen	Waggonner
Cramer	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Cunningham	MacGregor	Walker, N. Mex.
Curtis	Marsh	Watkins
Davis, Ga.	Martin Ala.	Watson
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Derwinski	Martin, Nebr.	Whitener
Devine	Moy	Whitten
Dickinson	Michel	Widnall
Dole	Minshall	Williams
Downing	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	Moeller	Wolff
Duncan, Tenn.	Moore	Wyatt
Dwyer	Morton	Wydler
Edwards, Ala.	Mosher	Younger
Ellsworth	Murray	
	Nelsen	

NAYS—213

Adams	Cameron	Evins, Tenn.
Addabbo	Carey	Fallon
Albert	Celler	Farbstein
Anderson, Tenn.	Clark	Farnum
Annunzio	Clevenger	Fasell
Ashley	Conyers	Feighan
Aspinall	Cooley	Flood
Barrett	Corman	Flynt
Beckworth	Craley	Fogarty
Bell	Culver	Foley
Bingham	Daddario	Ford,
Blatnik	Daniels	William D.
Boggs	de la Garza	Fountain
Boland	Delaney	Fraser
Brademas	Dent	Frelinghuysen
Brooks	Denton	Friedel
Brown, Calif.	Diggs	Fulton, Tenn.
Burke	Dingell	Gallagher
Burton, Calif.	Donohue	Garmatz
Byrnes, Pa.	Dow	Gathings
Cabell	Duncan, Oreg.	Gialmo
Cahill	Edmondson	Gibbons
Callan	Edwards, Calif.	Gilbert
	Evans, Colo.	Gilligan

Gonzalez	McGrath	Reuss
Grabowski	McVicker	Rhodes, Pa.
Gray	Macdonald	Rivers, Alaska
Green, Oreg.	Machen	Rodino
Green, Pa.	Mackie	Rogers, Colo.
Greigg	Madden	Ronan
Griffin	Mahon	Itconallo
Griffiths	Mailliard	Rooney, N. Y.
Grover	Mathias	Rooney, Pa.
Halpern	Matsunaga	Rosenthal
Hamilton	Meeds	Roush
Hanley	Mills	Roybal
Hanna	Minish	Ryan
Hardy	Mink	St Germain
Harvey, Mich.	Monagan	St. Onge
Hathaway	Morgan	Scheuer
Hawkins	Morris	Schisler
Hays	Morrison	Schmidhauser
Hechler	Morse	Selden
Helstoski	Moss	Sickles
Hicks	Murphy, Ill.	Siek
Holifield	Murphy, N. Y.	Slack
Holland	Natcher	Staggers
Howard	Nedzi	Stalbaum
Hungate	Nix	Steed
Huot	O'Brien	Stratton
Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.	Stubblefield
Jacobs	O'Hara, Mich.	Sullivan
Jocelson	Olsen, Mont.	Sweeney
Johnson, Calif.	Olsen, Minn.	Tenzer
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill, Mass.	Thompson, N. J.
Karsten	Ottinger	Thompson, Tex.
Kath	Patman	Todd
Kastenmeier	Patten	Trimble
Kelly	Pepper	Tunney
Keogh	Perkins	Tupper
King, Calif.	Philbin	Tuten
King, Utah	Pickle	Udall
Kirwan	Poage	Ullman
Kluczynski	Powell	Van Derlin
Krebs	Price	Vanik
Kupferman	Pucinski	Vivian
Leggett	Purcell	Waltner
Long, Md.	Race	White, Tex.
Love	Redlin	Wright
McCarthy	Rees	Yates
McDowell	Reid, N. Y.	Young
McFall	Resnick	

NOT VOTING—50

Ashbrook	Fisher	Rivers, S.C.
Baldwin	Grider	Rostenkowski
Bandstra	Gubser	Roudebush
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Saylor
Burleson	Halleck	Scott
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Senner
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Smith, Iowa
Chelf	Harvey, Ind.	Teague, Tex.
Clausen,	Hébert	Toll
Don H.	Kee	Vigorito
Cohelan	King, N. Y.	Watts
Dague	Kornegay	White, Idaho
Dawson	Landrum	Willis
Dorn	Mackay	Wilson,
Dowdy	Matthews	Charles H.
Dyal	Miller	Zablocki
Edwards, La.	Moorhead	
Farnsley	Multer	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Grider against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Hansen of Iowa against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Mackay against.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Miller against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Multer with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Watts.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Farnsley.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dyal.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 350, nays 27, answered "present" 3, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]
YEAS—350

Abernethy	Davis, Wis.	Helstoski
Adair	de la Garza	Henderson
Adams	Delaney	Herlong
Addabbo	Dent	Hicks
Albert	Denton	Holifield
Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Holland
Anderson, Tenn.	Dingell	Horton
Andrews	Dole	Hosmer
George W.	Donohue	Howard
Andrews	Dow	Hull
Glenn	Downing	Hungate
Andrews	Dulski	Huot
N. Dak.	Duncan, Oreg.	Hutchinson
Annunzio	Duncan, Tenn.	Irwin
Arends	Dwyer	Jacobs
Ashley	Edmondson	Jarman
Aspinall	Edwards, Ala.	Jennings
Ayres	Edwards, Calif.	Jocelson
Barling	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Erlenborn	Johnson, Okla.
Bates	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Pa.
Battin	Everett	Jonas
Beckworth	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.
Belcher	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Bell	Farbstein	Jones, N.C.
Bennett	Farnum	Karsten
Berry	Fasell	Kath
Betts	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Bingham	Findley	Keith
Blatnik	Fino	Kelly
Boggs	Flood	Keogh
Boland	Flynt	King, Calif.
Bolton	Fogarty	King, Utah
Bow	Foley	Kirwan
Brademas	Ford, Gerald R.	Kluczynski
Bray	Ford,	Krebs
Brock	William D.	Kunkel
Brooks	Fountain	Kupferman
Broomfield	Fraser	Laird
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Langen
Broyhill, N.C.	Friedel	Latta
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Pa.	Leggett
Buchanan	Fulton, Tenn.	Lipscomb
Burke	Gallagher	Long, La.
Burton, Calif.	Garmatz	Long, Md.
Burton, Utah	Gathings	Love
Byrnes, Pa.	Gettys	McCarthy
Byrnes, Wis.	Gialmo	McClary
Cabell	Gibbons	McCulloch
Cahill	Gilbert	McDade
Callan	Gilligan	McDowell
Callaway	Gonzalez	McEwen
Cameron	Goodell	McFall
Celler	Grabowski	McGrath
Chamberlain	Gray	McMillan
Clark	Green, Oreg.	McVicker
Clawson, Del.	Greigg	Macdonald
Cleveland	Griffin	MacGregor
Clevenger	Griffiths	Machen
Collier	Grover	Madden
Conable	Hagen, Calif.	Mahon
Conable	Halpern	Mailliard
Conte	Hamilton	Marsh
Cooley	Hanley	Martin, Ala.
Corbett	Hanna	Martin, Mass.
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Martin, Nebr.
Craley	Hardy	Mathias
Cramer	Harsha	Matsunaga
Culver	Harvey, Mich.	May
Cunningham	Hathaway	Meeds
Curtin	Hawkins	Michel
Daddario	Hays	Mills
Daniels	Hechler	Minish

Mink	Randall	Stafford
Minshall	Redlin	Stagers
Moeller	Rees	Stalbaum
Monagan	Reid, Ill.	Stanton
Moore	Reid, N.Y.	Steed
Morgan	Reifel	Stratton
Morris	Reinecke	Stubblefield
Morrison	Resnick	Sullivan
Morse	Reuss	Sweeney
Morton	Rhodes, Ariz.	Talcott
Moshier	Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor
Moss	Rivers, Alaska	Teague, Calif.
Multer	Rivers, S.C.	Tenzer
Murphy, Ill.	Roberts	Thompson, N.J.
Murphy, N.Y.	Robison	Thompson, Tex.
Murray	Rodino	Thomson, Wis.
Natcher	Rogers, Colo.	Todd
Nedzi	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
Nelsen	Ronan	Tunney
Nix	Roncalio	Tupper
O'Brien	Rooney, N.Y.	Tuten
O'Hara, Ill.	Rooney, Pa.	Udall
O'Hara, Mich.	Rosenthal	Ullman
O'Konski	Roush	Utt
Olsen, Mont.	Roybal	Van Deerlin
Olson, Minn.	Rumsfeld	Vanik
O'Neill, Mass.	Ryan	Vivian
Ottinger	St Germain	Waggoner
Fatman	St. Onge	Watson
Patten	Scheuer	Weltmer
Pelly	Schisler	Whalley
Pepper	Schmidhauser	White, Tex.
Perkins	Schneebell	Whitener
Philbin	Schweiker	Whitten
Pickle	Secrest	Widnall
Pike	Selden	Wilson, Bob
Pirnie	Shriver	Wolf
Poage	Sickles	Wright
Poff	Sikes	Wyatt
Price	Sisk	Wylder
Pucinski	Skubitz	Yates
Purcell	Slack	Young
Quie	Smith, Calif.	Younger
Quillen	Smith, N.Y.	
Race	Springer	

NAYS—27

Abbt	Gurney	Satterfield
Ashmore	Haley	Shipley
Brown, Calif.	Hall	Smith, Va.
Curtis	Ichord	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Tuck
Derwinski	O'Neal, Ga.	Walker, Miss.
Dickinson	Passman	Walker, N. Mex.
Fuqua	Pool	Watkins
Gross	Rogers, Tex.	Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Conyers	Diggs	Powell
---------	-------	--------

NOT VOTING—52

Ashbrook	Dyal	Miller
Baldwin	Edwards, La.	Mize
Bandstra	Farnsley	Moorhead
Bolling	Fisher	Rostenkowski
Burleson	Grider	Roudebush
Carey	Gubser	Saylor
Carter	Hagan, Ga.	Scott
Casey	Halleck	Senner
Cederberg	Hansen, Iowa	Smith, Iowa
Chelf	Hansen, Wash.	Teague, Tex.
Clausen	Harvey, Ind.	Toil
Don H.	Hébert	Vigorito
Colman	Kee	Watts
Colmer	King, N.Y.	White, Idaho
Dague	Kornegay	Willis
Dawson	Landrum	Wilson
Dorn	Mackay	Charles H.
Dowdy	Matthews	Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fisher against.
 Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
 Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Dyal for, with Mr. Colmer against.
 Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Roudebush against.
 Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Saylor against.
 Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.
 Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Baldwin.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Colman with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Teague of Texas.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Chelf.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Matthews.
 Mr. Grider with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Vigorito.
 Mr. Hansen of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to the address by the President of the United States last night on the occasion of receiving the National Freedom Award in New York City. The President delivered one of his greatest speeches, a speech which manifested not only strength but also the resolution of the President of the United States, which is shared by this House and by the people of this country, to the cause of human freedom.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the majority leader for calling to the attention of the House the magnificent address made by the President of the United States last evening in New York. It spells out with great clarity why we are in Vietnam and what our objectives are.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle for the responsible attitude that they have taken as Americans and not as Republicans or Democrats in supporting our Nation's determination to resist naked Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Louisiana has said, and I associate myself with his remarks. I do not know whether it is as well known as it should be around the country, but I can assert with complete confidence that the House of Representatives and its Members in overwhelming numbers support the policy of

the United States in South Vietnam. We have whatever will, whatever determination is required to see the job through to a victorious conclusion. We will not falter. We will not fail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert with my remarks the text of the President's message in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1968]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the Four Freedoms of mankind:

Freedom of speech and expression.
 Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.
 Freedom from want.
 Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Willkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now—however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt—the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

February 24, 1966

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

"This liberation from want—for which we thank God—is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children—by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity—by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life—by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflinching determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to "freedom"—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room—men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word—that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad—where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

That climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn—men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettos of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our vision and our compassion—against that violence here at home. And we shall end it—in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came south before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have al-

ready performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the southeast Asia treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner—making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at two score or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND
 PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION,
 FISCAL 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, lying on the desk is my amendment No. 481, cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the pending bill, S. 2791.

This amendment relates to the need for congressional approval for the sending of draftees to southeast Asia involuntarily. The consent of Congress would be required in order to have draftees sent to southeast Asia.

My amendment reads as follows:

On page 3, after line 8, add the following new section:

"Sec. 302. During any period that any armed force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that armed force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such armed forces."

At the appropriate time, I shall call up my amendment and ask for the yeas and nays on it so that the American people can have—as they deserve to have—a clear expression of congressional intent on the use of draftees in the present undeclared war in Vietnam.

I appreciate the fact that this subject came up for discussion during the hearings, on the pending measure, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. On this point the hearing record of this joint committee is most interesting in that it discloses that while the question was repeatedly raised as to why draftees are being sent to Vietnam while the reserves remain untouched and while we maintain a force of over 350,000 trained men in Europe, the answers supplied by the Department of Defense are

completely unsatisfactory as will be seen when I analyze them presently.

It seems to me that this is a question on which the parents of draftees and potential draftees—and the draftees and potential draftees themselves—have a right to have the fullest possible debate in Congress and which Congress itself should decide.

Before I proceed to the analysis, I shall review briefly the facts with respect to the proposed legislation. I have stated them on the floor of the Senate before, but I believe they deserve a review now.

I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, then pending in the Senate, some 6 months ago, almost to the day, on August 20, 1965. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military involvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half.

I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position; namely, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased. Of course, I would be free in any event, without his permission; but under those circumstances, and in accordance with the President's urgent request that I not offer the amendment at that time, and his hopeful expectation that our troops would be out of Vietnam by January, I naturally refrained from submitting the amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President, by special messenger, a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of it on that afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, my letter of August 20, 1965, to the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 6 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into

a third world war, and the price of which in any event, in lives and other costs, would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our military involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces—the so-called Regulars—have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. As in the case of the 600 gallant men who took part in the Charge of the Light Brigade:

Theirs not to reason why:
 Theirs but to do and die.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

Mr. President, I now analyze the testimony which took place in the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations on this subject matter.

As I said, the answers were rather unsatisfactory. I shall read portions of the testimony. It states:

Senator STENNIS.—

There is then the word "deleted" in brackets. There are some 900 deletions in the testimony presented at this hearing which lasted 5 days. That makes it rather difficult for those who were not present at the hearings to find out what the specific answers to definite questions posed by committee members were.

AUGMENTATION OF FORCES

Senator STENNIS. [Deleted.] On personnel, you are calling in 300,000 extra men, that is, augmenting our Regular Forces by that many. Let me put it this way. We have around 2 million reserves in all, do we not, in round numbers?

Secretary McNAMARA. About 1 million on paid status.

Senator STENNIS. And we are having to augment these other forces by an increased draft.

CALL-UP OF RESERVE FORCES

Why don't we call up some of these Reserve units? Many of them are trained, and we have spent money on them.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes, I think that is a very fundamental question, Senator STENNIS, and we have considered it and decided not to for two reasons: One, we think it is more equitable under present circumstances to use the draft, and to use men who have not fulfilled their obligated service. About 70 percent of the officers of the Reserve and Guard Forces, for example, if I recall correctly, have completed obligated service and if they were to be called back would be fulfilling military service for terms in excess of those that others in our society have completed. Therefore, from a point of view of equity, it seemed wise to avoid use of the Reserves if we could.

I shall presently introduce an article from this morning's New York Times concerning this statement. It appears that in the short interval since Secretary McNamara testified 3 weeks ago, he may

have changed his mind and is now thinking about calling up the Armed Reserves.

I continue to read:

Two, the Reserves, under the conditions under which we would be allowed to call them up, would probably be a perishable commodity. You may remember that in 1961 when the Reserves were called up, they were called for a term of 1 year under the provisions of the law. In this instance, if they were called for 1 year, it would be necessary, simultaneously, to activate new units in the Regular Forces so that we could replace the Reserves at the end of the year, and for that reason it seemed undesirable to call the Reserves.

Senator STENNIS. You have no plans to call any of them now, not even specialist units?

Secretary McNAMARA. Not unless the requirements exceed the levels that we are now planning upon. But in anticipation that they might exceed those levels and, therefore, that it might be necessary to call Reserves, we have, as you know, undertaken to increase the strength of certain units known as "Selected Forces" so as to raise their combat readiness and have them prepared for duty if that becomes necessary in the future. But at present we have no plans to call them.

Senator STENNIS. Well, to consider the equities of the situation, it is not particularly pleasant under any circumstances for anybody to be called, but these men you are talking about, 70 percent of them at least, went into this voluntarily beyond their ordinary military service, did they not?

Secretary McNAMARA. Oh, yes; you are quite right. They have volunteered for it.

FUNCTION OF RESERVE FORCES

Senator STENNIS. I thought that is what Reserves were for. It is part of our military strength, what we provide for every year.

Secretary McNAMARA. I think it was felt the primary purpose of the Reserve was to fulfill a need that we couldn't fulfill by the draft or by volunteers. We think that we can accomplish our present force goals and deployments without recalling Reserves, by relying on the draft and volunteers.

USE OF RESERVES IN NONACTIVE STATUS

Senator STENNIS. What about the hundred thousand men who have volunteered for the Reserve program in lieu of being inducted? They are inductees to a degree. They are put in the Reserve and they are now in a nonactive status. You say you have no facilities to train them.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. You have about a hundred thousand; isn't that right?

Secretary McNAMARA. Let me check it.

Senator STENNIS. Around that number.

What are your plans for them?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, the number as of the end of fiscal year 1966, a few months from now, we think will be about 135,000.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Secretary McNAMARA. At the end of last fiscal year it was about 32,000. Our plan is to train them as rapidly as our training system can accept them. The untrained backlog was 46,000 at the end of fiscal 1964 and at the end of 1967 it is anticipated it could grow perhaps 11,000 over the 135,000 now anticipated for end fiscal year 1966, depending upon the training system capacity in 1967. Currently we plan on training 52,000 of these men in fiscal year 1966 and 135,000 in fiscal year 1967.

Senator STENNIS. Isn't there some way to reach those men and put them in active service? They have not served a day's active duty; have they?

Secretary McNAMARA. That is right.

Senator STENNIS. Or even training?

Secretary McNAMARA. The point is that we don't need them in the Active Force now. We are taking all the men we can absorb in our

training system for the Active Force at the present time. These are men that have a right to volunteer so long as we have a requirement for them, and under the terms of the present legislation, we are required to raise the force level of the Reserve and Guard and, therefore, we have to accept their enlistments. But—

Senator STENNIS. You have to accept their enlistment?

Secretary McNAMARA. In order to fill our present prescribed totals of 270,000 and 330,000 men for the Army Reserve and Guard, respectively. Moreover, we don't wish to push them into the Active Force at this time for training because to do so would mean we would have to set up more cadres. To set up these training cadres, we would have to tear down the combat units of the Active Force. That is why our training capacity is limited at the present time and that is why these men will be trained in 1967 rather than in 1966.

RESERVE ACTIVATION

Senator MUNDT. Have you been asked to answer—it may have happened when I was out of the room—questions about any plans you have for the possible activation of the Reserve?

Secretary McNAMARA. I was asked if we planned to call Reserves at any time in the near future and I answered, no. We have no intentions of calling them at any time in the near future but we recognize that circumstances may change and may make such a call desirable. In anticipation of that, we ask authority of the Congress to expend funds to increase the combat readiness of selected Reserve Force units and additional funds for that purpose are provided in this supplemental.

Senator MUNDT. I ask it only because I have heard from a couple of reservists who think, should they sell their business or do something, there is no reason they should change their economic lives—

Secretary McNAMARA. No, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Because of the imminence of that?

Secretary McNAMARA. No, sir; there is not, with the qualification that circumstances may change and we may have to call them.

ARMY AND MARINE POSITION ON DRAFT VERSUS RESERVE CALLUP

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Secretary, does the Army agree with you it is most desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft enlistments rather than by calling up the Reserves?

Secretary McNAMARA. In the first place, let me say that up to the present time we have met all of General Westmoreland's requirements, on time, with the exception of about [deleted] men [deleted].

I think the Army leaders might have preferred to call up certain selected personnel, but not including major combat units.

The Marines, in particular, opposed the call-up of the Marine Reserve division unless it were to be sent into combat in Vietnam. Were that to be done, of course, and assuming it were called up under legislation similar to that passed in 1961 it would be a perishable asset because the reserves were called for only a 1-year period. And neither I nor the Chiefs would want to send a division to Vietnam if we could anticipate only 12 months of service from the time it was called up to the time it had to be returned to reserve status. So generally speaking, I think that up to the present time we are better off having relied upon the draft and volunteers than we would have been had we called the Reserves.

Senator THURMOND. Does the Army agree with you that it is more desirable to increase the manpower by using the draft and enlistments rather than calling up the Reserves?

Secretary McNAMARA. Without question, I think they agree on the major combat units.

With respect to some specialists I think they might have preferred to call Reserves.

Mr. President, I submit that that is an unsatisfactory and inadequate explanation of why we have called in draftees.

In Parade magazine for January 30, 1966, distributed with the Washington Post, there appeared a brief description of draft practices in a number of other countries. I ask unanimous consent that this description be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with respect to sending draftees to Vietnam, the following is indeed significant:

In South Vietnam all men, 18-35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Vietcong. We support the South Vietnamese economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Mr. President, of course we pay for the mercenaries.

In connection with these mercenaries, we read in this morning's New York Times an article headed "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned." The article is dated Saigon, February 23. It is written by Neil Sheehan, in a special dispatch to the New York Times. The article begins:

About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

So while we are reaching into every American home, taking our young men as draftees and sending them to the slaughter in southeast Asia, 96,000 of the South Vietnamese forces have deserted in the last year. This is the kind of war we are asked to fight with the blood of our young men, when the people in the armed forces there are unwilling to defend their own country, and are leaving the ranks and deserting by the tens of thousands. Of course, no punishment is meted out to them, and we Americans continue to pay those who remain in the service. This is a shocking situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. I likewise ask unanimous consent, in connection with Secretary McNAMARA's positive statements at the recent hearings on S. 2791 that there was no intention of calling up the Reserves at this time, that an article published likewise in today's New York Times, Thursday, February 24, headed "McNamara Hints Call-Up of Reservists for Vietnam"—indicating that there is little stability or assurance that the assurances and the promises made in one week are not going to be reversed in the

next—be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. It is, of course, obvious, since Vietnam is receiving budget support in large amounts from the United States, that the United States is footing the bill for such of these mercenaries as have not deserted. It is a sad commentary indeed that Vietnamese must be paid to defend the so-called freedoms of their own country while we are conscripting draftees here in the United States to send to Vietnam to fight side by side with these mercenaries, and to take the places of those who are deserting the Army presumably fighting the cause of their own country.

It should be noted that when France was fighting in Vietnam to recolonize that country, it used no draftees. By an amendment to the French budget law of 1950, draftees raised under the French military draft were not permitted to be used outside of the Territory of the French Republic except under a situation of declared war. No draftees were used in Indochina at all after 1949.

The United States with respect to waging an undeclared war in Vietnam is in the same position as France until the fifties and, absent a declaration of war or a clear expression of congressional intent in lieu thereof, draftees should not be sent to Vietnam involuntarily.

Mr. President, I have received a tremendous amount of correspondence on this subject since it was first known that I was planning to offer my proposed amendment. I have received hundreds of letters which reveal great alarm and distress. They come from every part of the country.

I do not intend to put all of them in the RECORD, but I shall read from a few of them, to give Congress and the people of the United States an idea of the deep concern and worry that exists in the hearts of the American people concerning the proposal to conscript draftees and send them to South Vietnam.

It is my hope that Congress, under my amendment, will have a chance to register its views, and let the people of the United States know just where each Member stands.

Here is a letter from Fordham University, New York. It says:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have just read a corrected description in the Times on your proposed amendment to the supplemental defense appropriations bill, and want you to know I wholeheartedly support the measure. Legalized involuntary servitude is perhaps the greatest offense against civil liberty possible in a free society such as ours; and for the Government to coerce a man into fighting a war he does not support is clearly a violation of the 13th amendment to the Constitution prohibiting involuntary servitude. The complexity and seeming hopelessness of the Vietnam situation only aggravate such infringements of personal liberty.

Thank you for proposing the amendment; I hope your proposal gets the widespread Senate approval which it certainly deserves.

I would appreciate your informing me of the progress of your amendment in the days to come.

Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from a housewife in Vancouver, Wash.:

DEAR SENATOR: As a lifelong Democrat, I am fast becoming an admirer of yours and always have been of Senator MORSE, and I wondered if you were aware—I bet you are—of the high wages paid civilian employers in Vietnam.

A member of my family who has a prison record, and won't be drafted, is a second-rate welder.

He has signed up to go to Vietnam for 3 years with some contractor banking \$55,000 for him. The Government can turn around and draft my son, 20, who has worked his way through 2 years of college (still going) and has never been in trouble in his life. He has also never lived as he hasn't been able to afford to date a girl since his senior year in high school. He hasn't been able to find a part-time job that doesn't interfere with his classes, and if he did, he probably couldn't keep his grades up.

His ambition has always been to be a history teacher—which he has always done "A" work in. Now I read that the Army will take the history and English majors before mathematics and science majors. He and I both feel Vietnam is sure suicide. It isn't something to die for. We would both fight for our country, but we feel this war is wrong. I have three sons, no education, work hard to just give my kids room and board.

It's one thing to die for a cause you believe in, another to throw away all your dreams for a better life for nothing.

I can't get a decent job because of my education (ninth grade). I'm 36 years old and I can't afford to go to school nights because it takes all my husband makes just to feed six people. Yet we need two paychecks to make ends meet and then to read about a civilian employee's wife in Vietnam sending home \$36,000 in money orders in 6 months is too much.

Here is a letter from Arlington Heights, Ill.:

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I am a liberal, a Democrat and an ardent supporter of the President, but I applaud your stand to bar the use of draftees in Vietnam.

I believe our involvement there is a diplomatic disaster and a moral tragedy as well. And, as everyone knows, we have failed militarily, which is not surprising since we can't possibly win (or even survive) a land war in Asia. Therefore, I urge you to do everything within your power to influence the administration to withdraw our forces.

These days one has to listen closely to hear the voices of reason amid the clamor for bombs. But men like you and Senators CLARK, MORSE, and FULBRIGHT have more support than you may realize. What the administration fondly interprets as support of the Vietnam war is not that at all. It is merely a quiet tolerance sustained by a booming economy.

I work for a large corporation and live in a suburban, middle-class neighborhood. I have a college education, a wife and three children, so I hardly represent the long-haired, "ban the bomb" crowd. And I have yet to meet a single person among my friends who supports our policy in Vietnam.

My best wishes to you in the difficult days ahead.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Orlando, Fla.:

Senator GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for joining your small group of erudite, clear-thinking Senators who are unafraid to express their views in the face of all the jingoistic hoopla of the hawks and "me tooers." It takes courage to leave political expediency

and stick to one's honest convictions. Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, CHURCH, MCGOVERN, and you, and a few more of your colleagues are truly outstanding men, and to be congratulated for your honesty and logical minds.

Eisenhower naively spoke the truth when he spoke at the Governors' Conference in November 1954: "Whoever maintains the sphere of influence in southeast Asia controls the tin, tungsten, rubber, oil, etc." Therein lies the *raison d'être*—freedom? Humanitarianism? Commitments to whom or to what?

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Kansas City, Kans.:

DEAR SENATOR: I am certainly in favor of your bill not to send draftees to Vietnam or any foreign wars. Being the mother of five sons, two of whom are already in the service—one just 19 in January—I do not wish to see them sacrificed after 16 weeks training. Boys sent to fight a man's war, when we have men in Reserve units who are well trained for these wars.

We have a unit of brokenhearted mothers ready to wage war.

Here is a letter from Villanova, Pa., from a physician:

DEAR SENATOR: In these dark days with our Nation committed to an illegal, immoral, and militarily psychotic war, it is most encouraging to see that some true Americans in public life will stand up and be counted. Your stand on dragging this issue out into the open and in regard to draftees being sent to southeast Asia are most commendable. Most of all I admire you for standing up and being counted in these days when powerful people think that consensus is more important than truth. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for all that you are doing.

Very truly yours,

Here is a letter from Fort Wayne, Ind.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The recent legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam is without a doubt the most intelligent action to be taken in this disgraceful mess.

I have personally conducted a survey and have talked to hundreds of people in all walks of life in this area, and the response has been 100 percent in opposition to the administration's present policy in Vietnam and especially the drafting of our young men for this service.

Considering this as a basis I feel that the people of America as a whole will support you in your noble effort.

The most regrettable situation existing in our State, is the fact that our representatives evidently favor this warmongering giveaway program of human life against the will of the people.

I feel certain that I speak for the people of America in commending you and Senator WAYNE MORSE for your effort. May God be with you.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif.:

SENATOR GRUENING: This is a note of support for legislation you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam.

As a Korean war veteran, I can testify to the fact that a rudimentary knowledge of the army game and a sprinkling of luck is usually sufficient to keep a person out of a combat zone. Most draftees neither have the sophistication nor the opportunity to play the army game due to the rapidity at which they are assigned to combat divisions.

February 24, 1966

Regular Army men are quick to defend military action and to define themselves as soldiers in every sense of the word. They should be given the opportunity to practice their chosen profession. It is incongruous to have civilian conscripts in the Infantry in Vietnam and soldiers in quartermaster depots in the States. With proper training the draftee is capable of supplying the soldier's needs in the field. In a war of the nature of Vietnam, where there is considerable question as to the extent to which American soil and institutions are threatened, this is certainly all the draftee should be compelled to do.

It might be mentioned in passing that if military service in the lower grades could be made more palatable it is possible fewer draftees would be needed.

Your speeches and comments concerning Vietnam are one of the few lights of reason shining through the present fog of World War II clichés.

Here is a letter from a soldier on active service. His name and unit have been deleted, for obvious reasons. I do not wish to get him into trouble.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Recently I read of your efforts to introduce legislation designed to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam, supplemented by your three logical and intelligent amendments. This letter in support of your legislative efforts, which I consider to be of the highest order in the protection of individual freedom and which keeps a man from being reduced to the role of a mere pawn in the hands of statesmen, may have the insignificance in determining the successful outcome of your bill as my vote in determining the President in a national election, yet I offer you my support because symbolically it means as much in its little way in the tradition of American democracy as, on the other hand, the actual importance of your proposal does in defending and propagating that tradition.

Men I have known and served with in units during my one and three-quarter years in the military have volunteered and gone to fight in Vietnam, some for patriotic reasons, some for personal reasons. I admire their courage and their convictions; but for those whose values and political opinions do not lead them to this action your legislation is the means whereby they may express their choice and exercise their liberty.

Here is another letter from a soldier in uniform, likewise, whose name and unit are likewise deleted:

SENATOR GRUENING: Today it was announced on the radio that you and Senator Morse are sponsoring a bill before the present session of Congress which advocates congressional approval of any Presidential action committing draftees abroad. If this is the case I would like to express my unconditional support.

For the past year or so I have followed with great interest the course of our Vietnam involvement. I have also read some excerpts from speeches by you and Senator Morse, among others, on this involvement and I think that I am in complete agreement with you and Senator Morse.

In summary I am dissatisfied with the present involvement as I think that: firstly, the United States became involved there under a President and Secretary of State who were overcome with their own anti-Communist involvements and acted not on what was there but what they thought was there; secondly, because our involvement seems to be a violation of the U.N. Charter and the 1954 Geneva agreements, and thirdly, because we are supporting there a regime (or regimes) that in effect is a dictatorship and seemingly unrepresentative of the Vietnamese people. Thus the same points that we

accuse the NLF and North Vietnam of violating are exactly the ones that we and our allies there have and are violating.

I have not up onto this time expressed my opinion to any of our elected representatives mainly because I felt that it would do no good. I must at this time, at least, attempt to clear my own conscience.

Please let me express my support again for your course on the Vietnam question and wish you luck in this course you have elected to follow.

Here is a letter from Chicago, Ill.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your proposed amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, and 2793 which would provide that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval. It will certainly let the Senators stand up and be counted and let the people know how their representatives feel about this highly controversial issue of Vietnam, especially the parents of the young men who are being drafted or shortly face the draft. Senator Morse and yourself have the appreciation and gratitude of many thousands who feel their representatives have somehow forgotten or ignored their constituents in this matter.

It is also urged that there be an open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted every single legal avenue in our search for peace.

Again I say, thank God the American people have a few courageous spokesman who seek a policy that is just.

Here is a letter from Milwaukee, Wis.:

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to express my enthusiasm for your draft legislation concerning making service in Vietnam voluntary.

I was chief of the communications, media division of the ICA mission in Cambodia for 2½ years, leaving in late 1961. Ten of the people who worked under me in the division were Vietnamese and I went fairly often to Saigon. My opposite number in Saigon was through his duties well acquainted with the internal situation.

Here I have talked recently to young people and church groups in sort of general discussions resembling a little teach in. There is real doubt regarding the morality of this war. People are not cocksure in either supporting or opposing it but there is a real moral crisis. Young men sincerely hold—some of them—that we are more or less the aggressor.

It is not a case of they not wanting to sacrifice their lives or health or eyesight or hearing and so on in what they doubt is really a just cause. It is that they do not believe one should kill when one's own country is only in a theoretical and possibly farfetched sense in danger. The history of this war is getting somewhat better known. I think many young men feel as they hear about the history of the war or read about it that they would have had to be fighting against the French if they were Vietnamese. Therefore they feel they would probably continue to fight against the successor to the French if they were Vietnamese.

The moral issue is very serious. We cannot just put it off on the State. We are responsible before God, each of us. To kill in the conviction that it is unjust to do so is murder. Nationality is only an incident in time in any case. Our moral responsibility is related to things eternal.

It my lifetime, and I am 60, I have never known this Nation to be so sharply and openly divided. I am glad it is divided.

The circumstance is proof that we are not morally bankrupt.

Man does not live by victory alone.

Most sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Bridgeport, Conn.—they come from all parts of the country:

DEAR SIR: Thank you for upholding the ideals of peace, integrity, good judgment, and democracy. While we are supposedly fighting communism thousands of miles from home our own people are beginning to wonder what has happened to our democratic processes here at home. The American people don't want war but we have it; the American people abhor this war and want a negotiated peace right away but our President speaks out continually for more men to die in Vietnam, for more billions to be delegated to destruction and horror. The American people are being pushed into a war that they do not want, billions of dollars are being spent on war while millions of our own people are in want, thousands upon thousands of young men are being dragged from school to fight a war in which they do not believe. I love America and have always felt proud of my Nation but I am aghast and terrified by the evidence of dictatorial power that seems to be overriding the will and moral questioning of the good people of this country.

Something must be done to turn this tide before the United States involves the entire world in nuclear destruction.

You and a few other thinking legislators seem to be the only men with courage enough to speak for what is right. Please keep it up. Peace has to be our only aim if we and the world are to survive. Think of what could be accomplished in Asia with \$12 billion in food and medical help as opposed to bombs.

I hope you will press for your amendment to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will. In the light of all the mixed, moral feelings of the people in regard to this ill-advised and horrendous mess, it seems the only just thing to do.

I hope you will press further for a recall of unlimited powers such as President Johnson seems to think he should possess. Vietnam could be repeated throughout the world. Dictators have this prerogative; presidents of a democracy should not.

Here is a letter from Power, Mont.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We support, respect, and thank you for the stand you have taken on peace at a time when people are not fully aware of the truth or the consequences. The Senate hearings must go on and must be televised and reported to the American people. The first day the debate on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room was on television we were so glued to our sets that we were unable to do any work except the bare essentials.

We support wholeheartedly your bill to amend the draft law so as to prohibit draftees be sent to Vietnam against their wish unless Congress approves. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Eugene, Oreg.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have just learned, by mere chance, this morning that you have proposed an amendment or resolution in connection with the military assistance bill that would give draftees the opportunity to volunteer to fight in Vietnam rather than to be sent there under orders. It seems to me to be an inspired way to indicate opposition to the present policy of open-ended escalation of the war in Vietnam, as well as humane.

It is very odd that one has to depend on word of mouth for important news such as this. I have followed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on television almost in their entirety and have paid particular attention to reports on related matters in the press. Not one word have I seen of your proposal with regard to the draft,

February 24, 1966

It is only because, in a reply to a letter to you written by an acquaintance you enclosed a copy of your amendment, and that I chanced to speak to her today, that I learned of it. No doubt you regret even more strongly than we do the seemingly total silence that has greeted your proposal.

My husband and I thank you deeply for this effort, as well as for your many others, to force reassessment of our policy in Vietnam. We have long admired you for your attempts, along with Senator Monse's, to inject reason into our foreign policy. We hope you will continue.

Sincerely yours,

Here is one from New York City:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: While you are not "my" [New York] Senator, your efforts on behalf of peace and rational behavior are really universal.

It is in this context that we write you to thank you and tell you we feel encouraged by leaders of your ilk—attempting to hold the future for us—and our children.

Please accept our warm thanks and appreciation for all that you do on behalf of an adult and mature society.

Cordially,

Here is one from Oakland, Calif.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I compliment you on your suggested amendment to the military pay bill—concerning the assignment of draftees to Vietnam without congressional consent.

According to the newspaper accounts which I found the reasoning which you've advanced is very sound and I hope that others in the Senate will join with you in support of this proposed amendment.

I do hope that we will be hearing more of this amendment and I must tell you that I always find your statements concerning foreign and internal policy extremely incisive and thought provoking. Will continue to look for them with great interest.

Sincerely,

Here is one from neighboring Virginia; McLean, Va.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have read about your proposed bill which would make it necessary for men who have enlisted in the U.S. services to make this their career, or way to earn a living or way of life, to go to Vietnam before sending fresh, new draftees who have no choice but to do as told.

May I say that this makes sense to me, and as a U.S. citizen, I support this bill whole heartedly, and will write to support such a bill to anyone that you would feel would be of influence in its passage.

Here is one from Seven Valleys, Pa.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to applaud your proposal that only volunteers and not draftees be sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am also writing as a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom who attended the legislative seminar this past week and the legislative luncheon Wednesday and greatly appreciated your statements there.

Your record of opposition to this horrifying war is so outstanding that repetitive applause seems redundant, yet I feel it is important that you know that you have the support of many—and I believe of many you have not heard from. I have been doing a considerable amount of traveling by bus lately and wearing peace buttons, and myself conversing with strangers about the war. These conversations seem invariably to be with people who don't write to the Govern-

ment, but who are extremely distressed at the war and anxious for a rapid peaceful settlement.

I might add that I do what I can to broaden the knowledge of the war of as many people as I can and any reprints of your speeches you could send me would be put to use and greatly appreciated.

In any case, thanks again from a grateful citizen.

Sincerely,

Here is one from Chicago:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to thank you and encourage you in your attempts to bring a little sense into our Vietnam policy. Your bill which prohibits sending unwilling draftees without the approval of Congress into this conflict is an admirable measure.

There are young men who see some point in this war and can risk their lives in it without risking the moral foundations of their lives. There are others, however, who, for very good reasons, are convinced that the campaign in Vietnam is wholly destructive to the Vietnamese people, and therefore unjust and detrimental to our proper goals as a nation. Forcing these young men to die in Vietnam amounts to forcing them to give up the usefulness and meaning of their promising lives, and to see themselves as marked for a stupid, useless, and meaningless death. No government should be permitted to do such violence to the moral fiber of those it represents.

Thank you and thank you again, for realizing this, and good luck in your efforts to make others accept it.

Sincerely,

Here is one from Rocky River, Ohio:

DEAR SIR: I hereby wish to express complete approval of your proposal to bar the sending of draftees to southeast Asia without congressional consent.

Respectfully yours,

Here is one from Madison, Wis.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For the last year or so I have been following your statements about the war in Vietnam and have been very much encouraged by what you have said. Your recent proposal which is coming up before the Senate soon to keep any draftees from being sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress again gave me hope that perhaps there can be found a peaceful settlement for the war in the immediate future.

I only wish that more Senators and Congressmen for that matter, would have the courage to speak against the policy of our Government in southeast Asia, which can only lead to more bloodshed and to further slighting of much more important world and domestic problems.

Here is one from Denison University, in Granville, Ohio:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: You are to be very highly commended for introducing legislation that would prevent the sending of draftees to Vietnam against their wills without congressional approval. I should also like more generally to commend you for your outspokenness against our country's position in Vietnam.

My own position is that our military intervention in the affairs of Vietnam is cruel and totally unjustifiable in moral terms and that we should withdraw our troops and military commitment unilaterally and immediately. I am not for withdrawal in the sense of noncommitment, however, for I believe our country should offer nonmilitary aid to all of Vietnam and to all Vietnamese, whether their allegiance be with Saigon, Hanoi, or the Vietcong.

I'm glad there are people like you in the Senate; I only wish there were more of you. Keep up the good (nonviolent) fight.

Sincerely yours,

Here is one from Tillamook, Oreg.:

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am addressing this letter to you because of the hope you have stirred in my heart when I read in our daily newspaper you would oppose sending our boys to Vietnam as draftees.

There has not been much hope in my heart for a good many months. We mothers of boys endangered by the draft don't really live. We just exist. During the last war my brothers (dedicated, purposeful, scholarly young men) served long and faithfully. I watched my wonderful mother fail before our very eyes as the war years took their toll. I have since then shelved these hellish memories in the deepest, darkest recesses of my mind wishing that such a world of sorrowing could somehow serve some useful purpose. We can't live in the past. But that is exactly what our President and certain others have condemned us to. To broadcast a message of peace and then refuse to discuss peace with the enemy. To send out our boys to fight and die when the President will not meet and amicably discuss peaceable settlement of our problems. We as a nation may be leaders in industry, commerce, or military might but we are not a truly great nation until we clothe ourselves in the raiment of humility and lead all nations in the quest for peace—that priceless goal worthy of all men's hearts.

As a mother and a hardworking officer in the Democratic Party I beg your every effort be directed toward removing ourselves from Vietnam where we stand despised by all our fellowmen. We have erred and greatness lies in how we face our problems now. History will record those who stand steadfast and courageously in the great battle for peace not military victory.

God bless you.

Very truly yours,

I think that is a very wonderful letter from a constituent of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], written from the heart.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Alaska, but just listen. However, the comment he has made about the letter from a constituent of mine from Tillamook, Oreg., and one from Eugene, Oreg.—and there are many similar letters in my files—cause me to take only a moment to tell the Senator and to tell the people of the country, through this Record, why I was proud to join in cosponsoring his amendment. Many people do not understand that the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon take the position that a line of demarcation is justifiably drawn between enlisted men and drafted men. I think it is most unfortunate that we have any enlisted men at all over there, for reasons I shall set forth in just a moment.

But the Senator from Alaska this morning has made the Record crystal clear. We are drafting men also. Drafted men are not volunteering. These men are being taken in by conscription under a draft law. They are being sent into a war zone where we have no right to be, and never have had any right to

be. We are sending boys to their death without a declaration of war in open violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

The Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon have urged that at least sending men to war ought to be regularized. Congress ought to make up its mind whether we are going to declare war or not declare war. The President should make up his mind whether or not he is going to send us a war message, as Woodrow Wilson did on April 2, 1917, when he sent one to a joint session of Congress recommending war against Germany. At the beginning of the message Woodrow Wilson said he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

This is an elementary principle of constitutional law.

Then, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, following Pearl Harbor, sent Congress a war message asking for a declaration of war.

That is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon, and I know it is the position of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who really has been my leader and teacher in this historic debate that has been going on now well over 2 years. He and I, now joined by a few others, have stood on this floor week after week and protested the course of action that our Government is following in American foreign policy.

We are saying by this amendment: If you are going to draft these boys and send them into war, then declare war. I believe the American people are entitled to have this administration take that course of action.

But, then, I point out also that this war has greatly divided this country, in spite of the apologists for this administration in and out of the Senate. This war is causing a great rift among our people at the grassroots of America.

I wish to say again to my President, as I have said so many times, I love him, but I love my country more.

In my judgment, my President needs to clarify this situation by making perfectly clear to our country what his objectives are. He completely failed to make those objectives clear in New York City last night. He spoke in terms of semantic emotional sanctions but not in terms of specific proposals for ending the war.

As I will say tomorrow when I make my speech in opposition to the pending legislation, the very terms of the pending bill authorizes an escalated war. The American people need to be told that the administration has in that bill—but they are not boasting or talking about it—the funds for escalating the war at any time the President decides to escalate it. I do not propose to vote to give my President that power.

In my judgment, that kind of arbitrary discretion should not be vested in any President at any time.

Then, what needs to be asked, of course, in talking about supporting a government in South Vietnam, is how did it happen that we decided to support a puppet government in South Vietnam? The government that we, the United

States, created in open opposition and in violation of the Geneva accords of 1954 is the government which we seek to entrench in South Vietnam. We did not have the slightest right to set up a puppet government in South Vietnam and we now say to the world that we are going to support that government.

South Vietnam does not belong to the United States. South Vietnam does not belong to this little puppet that we are supporting by the name of Ky, either. South Vietnam and North Vietnam belong to all of the Vietnamese people both north and south.

Do not forget that the Geneva accords proposed that there be a 2-year period after the line of military demarcation was drawn separating the military forces of Vietnam and the military forces of the French in bringing about a reunification of Vietnam both north and south into one country.

They were to take 2 years to work out a program for reunifying Vietnam. That is what was provided. Who stopped it? The United States. That is going to be the sad, sordid, black record of history that will be written against our country for future generations of American boys and girls to see.

The amendment of the Senator from Alaska goes to the very core of this matter. It goes to the issue and the right of our country to be there in the first place. We had no right. If we had none in the first place, we have none now. What are we going to do? Are we going to support this regime in South Vietnam and impose this regime on North Vietnam? Do the American people know the plan is for the Ky regime to take over all of Vietnam?

We are headed for one of the bloodiest holocausts in the history of mankind if other nations of the world do not stop the United States.

It makes me unhappy to have to say this.

The fact is that every noncombatant nation of the world that is a member of the United Nations has a great and historic obligation to say to the United States, "Stop your war, for you are endangering the world."

The course of action that we are following in Vietnam makes our country the most dangerous threat to the peace of the world existing on the globe. We are following a completely improper course of action.

It is a sad thing that the other signatories to the United Nations are not following their commitment and obligation. What is needed is for them to stop talking behind the scenes in New York City and get the issue into the open before the Security Council and make up their minds whether they are going to assume their peacekeeping functions. If not, we should go to the General Assembly, where I am satisfied that 80 nations would proceed if it is put to them to do the peacekeeping.

What is needed is that the other nations of the world send whatever number of divisions of men are necessary to separate the United States and South Vietnam on the one side and North Vietnam and the Vietcong on the other.

South Vietnam should be turned into a checkerboard of buffer zones, with division after division of men from non-combatant nations being sent in, not to keep the war going, but to stop the fighting and to enforce a cease-fire imposed on the United States and the Vietcong.

Let me say to the world, "If you wish to avoid the great danger of an Asian holocaust you must make clear to my country that it must obey a cease-fire to be imposed upon us by the noncombatant nations of the world, in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter."

It may not work, but we better try; because one thing is certain if we follow our present course of action we will end up in a massive war in Asia. Yes, I listened to the Vice President this morning. I do not share the views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] at all. I listened to the Vice President. In my opinion he has lost all of his persuasive influence among thinking people who are willing to think about the great obligations of war and peace.

I never expected to hear my Vice President make this plea for war that he is making. Do not be fooled by his semantics. If we follow the course of action of the President of the United States and the Vice President as he is talking these hours, we are on the way to a major war in Asia.

That is why we say, in submitting the amendment, that we believe we had better come to grips with the question as to whether we shall send conscripted American boys to die in a war that has not been officially declared.

I well know that the speech I have just made, as well as others I have made, will bring down upon my head strong castigations and charges of disloyalty. In fact, last Sunday I was supposed to be boycotted by the American Legion at a speech I made at Harrisburg, Pa. Yet American legionnaire after legionnaire came to compliment me. One of them, introducing me to his 12-year-old and 14-year-old boys, said that when he heard on the radio that the American Legion was asking its members to boycott my speech, he drove 100 miles to be there, because, as he said:

They are not going to tell me in free America—and we hope it will remain free—whom I can hear and whom I can't hear.

Of course, the attempted boycott by the American Legion provided me with an audience much larger than I otherwise would have had, because at the grassroots of America the people are concerned about what is happening in Vietnam.

Last Saturday afternoon, at 1 o'clock, I spoke at a high school in Madison, Wis. The sponsors of the meeting said that more than 3,600 persons were in attendance and that it was necessary to use closed television circuits to enable the overflow audiences that could not enter the auditorium to hear my speech.

Yes, Mr. President, at the grassroots of America the people are disturbed because they know we are not marching down the road to peace but are marching down the road toward more war.

February 24, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3803

The Senate has before it a bill which some of our colleagues say involves no question of policy. They say it concerns merely the question whether we shall provide materiel for the boys in Vietnam. But I say again, as I said yesterday, that the boys are not suffering from a lack of materiel over there. That was admitted again this morning by spokesmen for the administration. There is not one of us who would want to deny a single bullet or a single safeguard that a single boy needs, because they are not in Vietnam because they wanted to go there, but because their Government sent them there.

In these historic hours of this debate, we ought to take a look at the policy that is involved in the bill. The bill contains a bad policy, a policy that permits the carrying on of a greatly enlarged war if the President decides to enlarge it. I do not believe our country should risk that exercise of arbitrary discretion. The people of the country are entitled to know whether we are going to war under article I, section 8, or not.

So again I ask my President: "Why don't you send up a war message, and then ask Congress to decide whether it wants to declare war?" Such a proposal would arouse a public debate that is sorely needed in this country at every community level.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I continue to read from this outpouring of expression from the American people. I read a letter from historic Charlottesville, Va.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your continued, articulate opposition to our "holy war" in Vietnam. Like the holy wars of history, barbarity of indescribable dimension accompanies its execution. Unlike those wars, its continued execution threatens the security of the entire world. It also creates the most brutal selection of national priorities. Nothing can be more important to the crusader than the growing ability to slaughter the Asians—to divert public moneys from the feeding of the starving, the medication of the dying, the protection of the oppressed—to the ever more relentless and ruthless destruction and violation of life and property in a most indiscriminate manner.

I applaud your amendment to the war bill to make the assignment of inductees to Vietnam subject to congressional approval a matter of option. I wish you every success in that matter.

Please exert your influence to bring Secretary of War Dean Rusk—

The writer has slightly confused the Secretary's title—

back to reality from the schizophrenically, moralistic hallucination which he takes to be the real world. In my own view, he is the most dangerous man to the progress of peace in the entire world. He appears determined to have his "war of attrition" with China which he so woodenly advocated when he sided with MacArthur in 1951.

Please continue to voice your opposition to the war.

Sincerely yours,

I read next from a letter I received from a minister in Mound City, Ill.:

My DEAR SIR: The Globe-Democrat says that you are back of a resolution that would give those who are to go to Vietnam, the right to express their opinions on this matter.

As I see it the overwhelming majority of the people who have not expressed themselves in public demonstrations, are a long way from being satisfied with our entanglement in Vietnam, that according to figures has already cost 1,700 of the promising blood of America.

If we are so much concerned with the freedom of people from Communist aggression, why did we turn a deaf ear to Cuba, when Castro took over lock, stock, and barrel?

Recalling past history, I am convinced that the time has come for the young men to have something to say about their destiny. Their's has been too long, "to do and die, and not to ask why." I am with you in your efforts.

I am,

Very truly yours,

The next letter is from Kirkwood, Mo.:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for all of your good work on the conflict in Vietnam, and for your forthcoming resolution with respect to draftees in that connection. We shall be watching the outcome of the debate with interest.

I read next a letter from Kirkland, Wash.:

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Thank you with all my heart for introducing the bill against requiring draftees to fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am a longtime admirer of your courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam.

I feel that draftees should not be required to fight in Vietnam. Many are as against what we are doing there as are those who have been classified conscientious objectors. One's conscience may allow him to fight in a defensive war but not in this situation where innocent men, women, and children are being killed. I cannot believe that our men are defending our country when it has not been attacked. Young men, whose parents never thought we would fight an aggressive war, were taught to value human life, and now they must go against their consciences.

Aside from objecting on moral grounds, they may also feel, as I do, that what we are doing in Vietnam is harmful to our country, that we are precipitating a world nuclear war that could devastate our country as well as most of the world.

The only hope I see for our country, and the world, is in you and the other few leaders who have the insight and courage to speak out for the right on this issue. We ordinary people are not being heard. Many are afraid to speak out because they are so misunderstood, called traitors or draft dodgers. The issue doesn't come to us to vote on. We thought we were voting against escalation when we voted against Senator Goldwater, only to learn now that President Johnson was planning similar escalation when he was campaigning, but didn't say so, so we really had no choice.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,

The next letter I shall read is from Bellingham, Wash.:

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It is noted that you have introduced legislation to prohibit this Government from committing draftees to the Vietnam situation without the consent of Congress. Once again, I wish to express my personal gratitude to you for your efforts to turn the tide from control of the "war at whim" people.

It is inconceivable to me that the sort of thinking which drives us into such errors as

Vietnam can have any ultimate effect other than to alienate decent people and drive them to the very extreme which we assert we are fighting to avoid. Overtaxation, degradation, and conscription of their children finally drove the Chinese to communism; the result will be the same here if our "leadership" refuses to come to terms with human decency.

Very truly yours,

The next letter, from Philadelphia, Pa., reads:

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our morning paper carries word of your having proposed legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam until Congress authorizes such assignments.

Short of a declaration of peace, this is the best news the concerned, thinking Americans could hope for. It is only regrettable that delaying tactics of the Administration held off the move for so long.

My husband joins me in extending congratulations to you on your wise and courageous move. May the bill very speedily become law.

Sincerely yours,

Here is a letter from Brooklyn, N.Y. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Too frequently I find myself writing to Government officials and Members of Congress because I disagree with them, and much too rarely do I take time out these busy days to thank them for something well said or done. Let me at least partly correct this for myself by thanking you for the foresight, statesmanship, and the courage you have shown as one of the lonely voices opposed to the madness that is taking place in Vietnam, and even more particularly for your recent proposal not to permit draftees to be sent to Vietnam unless this is their choice and Congress so votes.

Thank you for your wisdom and your courage.

Here is a letter from Bellingham, Wash. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was most pleased to read in tonight's Bellingham Herald the AP report of the amendments that you and Senator Morse have offered to the administration's defense appropriation bill. The prohibition of involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam will, I hope, receive the support that it deserves. I respect you for continuing your efforts in behalf of an unpopular cause.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Berkeley, Calif. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My entire family (two sons of voting age, two daughters almost voting age, my wife and myself) all strongly admire your brave and intelligent stand on the Vietnam issues. We have read from time to time the newspaper reports of your statements in Congress and just today the San Francisco Chronicle carried another story about the amendment you have proposed to the defense supplement bill for Vietnam. Please keep up your efforts in the name of sanity and morality.

The whole Nation owes you a debt of gratitude for your brave stand on Vietnam. I am sure that the war hawks are putting all sorts of pressure on the President and on the few brave Senators who speak out against intensification of the war. But I am equally sure that there are millions upon millions of us who ardently pray for a peaceful solution

to this seemingly impossible situation, and we all are grateful to you, Senator GRUENING.

I have thought that one possible solution would be to announce to the whole world and to the United Nations that we would accept any solution worked out by an impartial United Nations commission, with no strings or preconditions whatever. I believe this is the only way out for several reasons. One, the Vietcong and North Vietnamese could hardly refuse such an offer, and I am sure that world opinion would support such a move (while almost no opinion in other countries supports our present position). Second, I believe that no matter how or what the U.N. commission decided the issues, nothing—no matter what—would be so bad for us and the world as to continue to escalate the war. Any decision, however bad, would be less bad than a world war.

Again, may I tell you that you have our heartfelt admiration and highest esteem.

Here is a letter from Clovis, Calif. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We were very pleased to hear of the amendment you wish to offer that would prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam without prior consent of Congress. We wish you every success in getting it passed.

We also hope you are able to stage public hearings on U.S. policy in Vietnam. We were very glad, and heartened, to read of your attitudes on Vietnam, as we have been very distressed concerning this issue, and sincerely hope somehow it can begin to be righted.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Freeport, N.Y. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: What a wonderful world this would be if there were more Senator GRUENINGS. You have my unbounded admiration and every time I read of your views in the newspapers my faith in human nature is restored.

Your solution to the draft problem regarding Vietnam is something long overdue. Our neighbor Canada is a good example for us—Canadians can be drafted to protect the country if it is attacked but cannot be sent overseas. When you are asked to kill, this seems the solution to the problem—one shouldn't be made to kill against his beliefs.

Keep up your great work.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Danville, Pa. It reads:

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I saw in today's paper—the Philadelphia Inquirer—that you introduced legislation that the draftees should not be forced into going into Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Please, please do everything in your power to bring it about. You will gain the untiring gratitude of thousands of American parents if you do. Many sleepless nights are spent worrying about this very thing. These young boys are forced into the service and after only 8 to 12 weeks of training they are sent into the jungles and swamps of Vietnam and expected to defend themselves. This is inhuman and very unfair.

The older and more experienced men hold down the jobs back of the fighting areas.

I have a young son who will soon be called up for service (drafted) and it almost drives me out of my mind thinking he may be sent to Vietnam with so little preparation.

It seems to me the draftees are being penalized for not volunteering for the service, just as all the men in our country who do not go to college are penalized.

So please do whatever you can to help us in this matter.

Thank you.

Here is a letter from Bridgewater, Conn. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For the first time in my life I wished I lived in Alaska, so that I could be one of your constituents. Your proposal that only draftees who wish to serve in Vietnam be sent there, is the most sensible thing I have heard yet in connection with this war—if this war is to go on. I do not believe in this undeclared war. I think it is pointless, horrible and tragic. Yet if some wish to fight it let those be the ones to do it.

Blessings and luck in your amendment to the supplemental defense appropriation bill.

I have a telegram from Lothar Stewart, of Moorhead, Minn. It reads as follows:

MOORHEAD, MINN.,

January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

Support proposed draftee amendments to pending Vietnam defense bill. Urge immediate end to involvement.

I have a letter from Baraboo, Wis. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: May we commend you for your honest remarks concerning the voluntary service in the phony war in Vietnam. If we could get legislation passed to do that as well as conscript wealth and war profits, perhaps the military couldn't have the power it does and we could use the vast sums to make living better for some of our unfortunate citizens. We have watched your voting record and work in Washington and would we have more statesmen like you.

These are merely a few of the hundreds of letters which I have received. However, these letters illustrate the deep and heartfelt concern and worry among the American people. I believe that if their message or their pleas could be presented to our colleagues we would have an affirmative vote in favor of the amendment.

There are many other communications that I could read. However, I shall read only a few more of these letters.

It is rather striking—and this cannot be emphasized too strongly—that we are sending these young men to Vietnam and taking them away from their families while a South Vietnamese force equivalent to virtually one-half of the total U.S. force of 200,000 that we have sent there—96,000 of the South Vietnamese soldiers—has deserted in the past year. Yet we are sending our young boys to die and to take the place of those men who will not fight for their own country.

That to me is one of the most disgraceful situations imaginable. It should be unthinkable that in this body and elsewhere our colleagues will support the sending of our young men to die in a foreign land whose people will not fight for themselves. The evidence of this appears in today's New York Times in a story describing how there have been 96,000 desertions this year. Yet we have been hearing all the official propaganda that with our growing troop involve-

ment the morale of the South Vietnamese has vastly improved.

The evidence is overwhelming that we have gradually had to take over the entire conduct of this war. The situation has changed greatly since the time when President Kennedy, a few weeks before his death, said that:

This is their war. We can give them assistance, but they are the ones who have got to fight. They are the ones who have got to win it.

Since that time it has become evident that there is little will on the part of our South Vietnamese so-called "allies" to fight this war, certainly not among the leaders, the corrupt grafters whom we support.

The evidence of corruption which confirms what has long been known, is contained in an article from today's Washington Post which I am having printed in today's RECORD. The article describes how the entire government is corrupt. It indicates that one of the biggest jokes in South Vietnam is that we are telling the corruptors and grafters in charge to stop corruption. That must be one of the biggest laughs they have. We would all be laughing if it were not so tragic. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Stanley Karnow in today's Washington Post entitled "Mr. Nguyen, Saigon Employee, Chuckles Over Curbs on Graft" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

"MR. NGUYEN," SAIGON EMPLOYEE, CHUCKLES OVER CURBS ON GRAFT

(By Stanley Karnow)

SAIGON, February 23.—The official announcement here yesterday that the South Vietnamese Government is creating a special court to try profiteers and grafters drew a chuckle from Mr. Nguyen.

"If that court does its job properly," he observed, "it will have to put almost the entire administration behind bars."

Mr. Nguyen, whose real name cannot be revealed, would know. He is deputy director of a key Saigon ministry that deals with the personnel problems of South Vietnam's 120,000 civil servants. By his own admission, Mr. Nguyen himself is up to his elbows in influence peddling, bribery and several less larcenous forms of moneymaking. Nguyen believes that nearly every other state employee must be so engaged, too.

Profitable sideline activities are so widespread, in Mr. Nguyen's view, that most Vietnamese civil servants can find little time to handle their regular functions. This partly explains why many American officials here, designated to work with the local administration, lead lives of quiet desperation.

It is not uncommon for a Vietnamese clerk to devote 3 or 4 hours a day to his government job, then spend the rest of his time selling favors, speculating on imported commodities or arranging real estate deals. Mr. Nguyen, a true patriot, puts in a full official day and does his trafficking in the evening.

In large measure, this semblance of corruption stems from the fact that Vietnam is Asia, where public office has been traditionally used for private gain. More important, however, is the fact that the average civil servant here must resort to some kind of illegal operation if he wants to avoid starvation.

Except for an insignificant raise 2 years ago, civil service salaries have not changed since 1954, when South Vietnam attained its independence. In contrast, prices have spiraled astronomically over the past decade.

Thus a Government stenographer earns the equivalent of about \$20 a month—roughly what a couple of Americans here spend on an ordinary dinner. Mr. Nguyen, whose official walls are covered with diplomas from French universities, makes \$100 a month, the third highest salary in his ministry. He receives an additional \$18 a month in special allocations.

To make ends meet, state employees indulge in various tricks. Those of a higher order can obtain privileged purchasing rights permitting them to buy wholesale quantities of merchandise for resale.

Contractors often find civil servants handy and willing intermediaries for sealing deals with the Government, and they pay tidy commissions for the service. Manufacturers frequently offer certain Government employees lucrative opportunities to win their sympathy for the future. A current offer in one ministry is 2,500 sacks of cement, which can be turned over at a 35-percent profit.

Lowlier civil servants must rely on more pedestrian techniques. Internal revenue department employees speed up the delivery of tax clearances for an additional 200 plasters, and exit visas can be processed quickly for an extra 1,000 plasters. Office boys and other menials simply swipe Government pencils and stationery for sale on the black market.

For Mr. Nguyen, making ends meet is considerably more complex. In line with his upper bourgeois standing, he supports four children in private schools, occasionally endows his wife with jewelry, and wears a clean white shirt every day. His expenses run to the equivalent of \$350 a month, or more than triple his official salary.

One of his most successful sources of income is the used car trade. He buys automobiles from departing Americans and sells them to wealthy Vietnamese, and he can gross from 50- to 100-percent profit on each transaction.

This business tangentially leads Mr. Nguyen into somewhat shadier realms. To pay the Americans with meaningful money he must find dollars, which gets him into black market currency deals. Moreover, he has to legalize the sales of automobiles from foreigners to Vietnamese, which entails greasing the palms of customs officials.

From time to time, Mr. Nguyen has to repair or refurbish his used cars with rare spare parts, available only through smugglers. And while he is at it, he may, on an ad hoc basis, handle whatever other contraband items that promise to yield a fast plaster.

His commercial acumen is such that, just moonlighting, Mr. Nguyen may well be quadrupling of quintupling his wage as a civil servant. He has pondered the possibility of quitting his government job to engage in the used car trade full time.

His government position is a good fulcrum from which to operate commercially, however. So Mr. Nguyen is sticking to it: "Besides," he will insist, "I want to do something for my country."

Mr. GRUENING. I read further, here is a letter from Urbana, Ill. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Our evening paper reports that you and Senator Morse have introduced an amendment to the military appropriation bill prohibiting the drafting of men for service in Vietnam without the approval of Congress.

Thank you for that. Although I am far past the draft age, and am not myself affected by the bill, I feel it is morally repre-

hensible for a country to draft men to fight in a war that they believe is morally wrong, as is true of many men of draft age.

I hope that you feel free now to renew your opposition to the war in Vietnam. Opposition to the war is greatest among persons who know most about the situation. Very gratefully yours,

Here is a letter from Los Angeles, Calif. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR: While I am not one of your constituents, I do wish to congratulate you on your amendments designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam without the consent of Congress. Even if my own son were not being drafted next Tuesday, I would commend you for your stand, as I consider the involvement of the United States of America in Vietnam a disaster, stemming from a series of serious mistakes on the parts of all our Presidents since Roosevelt. While I do not blame President Johnson for the war, I do consider him responsible for the decision to bomb North Vietnam.

This mistake has apparently brought about the increased involvement of North Vietnam, increased determination of the majority of the Vietnamese people to rid their soil of the white man, increased dislike and distrust of us on the part of all the other nations of the world, Communist and non-Communist. I see our present path in Asia as national suicide.

I urge you to do all you possibly can to persuade the President and Congress to continue the efforts toward peaceful negotiations, even if they do not bear immediate fruit, and to bend all efforts toward convincing Ho Chi Minh of our sincerity in willingness to return to the Geneva accords of 1954. I also urge you to use your power to strengthen the United Nations so that it may shoulder the responsibilities which only a world organization can carry out—maintaining peace and settling disputes among nations, large and small.

Sincerely,

Here is a letter from Arlington, Va., just across the Potomac River. It reads:

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read yesterday evening in the Star of the excellent proposal by you and Senator Morse to make service in Vietnam by our boys voluntary and not compulsory. This is a fine and long-needed move. As of now, our sons, husbands, nephews, and others, are willy-nilly sent to the Vietnam blood bath.

It is unthinkable really, that our foreign policy in its essence means the lives of our finest young men. Also, strange is the policy that our youths must police and protect nations and peoples all over the world.

It is a pity that our citizens are not more articulate in protest against all this.

You might be interested to know what the voters are saying about the war in many sections of the country.

Here is a letter from Bridgeville, Pa. It reads:

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,

DEAR SIR: Keep up your good work against this unnecessary involvement in Vietnam and your proposal against involuntary service for draftees without congressional approval.

Sincerely,

BRIDGEVILLE, PA.

Here is a letter from Morehead, Minn. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: You seem to be one of the few Senators who has the courage to disagree with the President. Congratulations. Your proposal that draftees should not fight in Vietnam without the consent of Congress gets my wholehearted support, and I urge you to propose a few more things, such as bringing this problem to the United Nations for solution, and calling for a complete congressional investigation into our involvement in this war, the uses to which our foreign aid in South Vietnam has been put, the bombing of the villagers and peasants about whose right to vote we are so concerned, and many other matters about which there have been rumors and conjectures. Perhaps if enough Senators chorus together, they can be heard above the booming of the generals. Thank you.

Here is one from El Cerrito, Calif.:

I heartily commend you in your consistent opposition to the Vietnamese undeclared war. I consider it highly immoral in that we have broken the Geneva agreements about free elections and foreign soldiers in Vietnam while Johnson and the State Department lay unctuously the blame on North Vietnam for breaking the agreements. These are real totalitarian techniques, I feel.

I heartily concur in your proposal that no draftees should be sent to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

Here is one from Hoodsport, Wash.:

We wish to express our agreement and support of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

In addition, we wish to protest the excesses of pettiness and arbitrariness practiced by the Selective Service. An illustration of this is contained in the enclosed newspaper clipping.

It is our hope that current Selective Service procedures will be subjected to investigation and reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the contents of the clipping enclosed with that letter, entitled "Father Drafted Hours After Physical for Failing to Report New Address," be printed in the Record at this point.

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

FATHER DRAFTED HOURS AFTER PHYSICAL FOR FAILING TO REPORT NEW ADDRESS

A 25-year-old Madras man, married, and father of four children, was drafted into the Marines Wednesday, after failing to report change of address to the Selective Service. He was inducted and flown to San Diego within 24 hours of taking his Marine Corps physical.

Robert W. Swan said after his induction that he first registered for the draft 7 years ago in Milwaukee, while he was living in Gladstone. He got married the following year, and didn't hear from the draft board again until last November.

Meanwhile, he had moved from Gladstone to two different residences in Portland, then to Madras. He reported the Portland address to the draft board, but he told the Oregonian he forgot to report the second Portland address and Madras address.

In November, Swan got a letter asking him to take a physical from his family doctor and send the results promptly to the draft board.

Because the letter was delayed in being forwarded from Swan's old address in Portland to his current one in Madras, he was

February 24, 1966

unable to report the results of the physical on time. This is how the draft board learned Swan had been delinquent in reporting his changes of address, Swan said.

In January, the draft board sent his another order to take a physical—but this time, at the induction center on Southwest Taylor Street. Swan took the physical Wednesday, passed it, and found himself inducted into the Marine Corps in a matter of hours.

He left Portland Airport for San Diego at midnight, less than 24 hours after passing the physical. He left behind his wife Norma and four children, who will receive a \$145-a-month family allowance from the Marine Corps.

The Selective Service headquarters said that any delinquent registrant may be processed for induction despite his family status.

Mr. GRUENING. Here is one from Chicago:

I am writing to commend you for your strong opposition to President Johnson's war policy in Vietnam. I was glad to read of your proposed bill that would prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to serve in Vietnam without congressional approval.

I see that President Johnson is contending that the resolution passed by Congress in August, 1964, gives him authority to take whatever action he may choose in Vietnam. It seems to me that the time has come for Congress to reconsider this resolution. I know you voted against it at the time it was passed. I understand Senator Morse is introducing a resolution to rescind this resolution. I am sure you will give it your support.

Here is another one from Los Angeles:

According to a report in today's issue of the Los Angeles Times you are introducing legislation to prohibit the Armed Forces from assigning draftees to Vietnam against their will.

I wish to congratulate you on this measure. It is a step in the right direction.

Having lived for nearly 8 years in the Far East, I greatly deplore Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy. In fact, I consider it the greatest disaster for our beloved country.

May your efforts be successful.

Mr. President, I think these letters—a small sampling—demonstrate that the concern of the American people is deep-seated and overwhelming; and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of these letters be printed in the RECORD following the others I have read.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how many letters does the Senator wish to put in the RECORD?

Mr. GRUENING. I should say there are about 25 more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

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

KENTFIELD, CALIF.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We are very much in favor of your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam without the approval of Congress. Also not to resume bombing North Vietnam. Better yet get out of Vietnam.

Thank you.

SELAH, WASH.,
January 27, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to commend you for your action in offering the amendments to prevent young American men being drafted and sent to fight in Vietnam unless Congress affirms. It is good to know that there are still men who are not afraid to stand up and be counted, when they feel the country is being led down the wrong path.

I feel that our entry into the Vietnam situation was poorly justified, and wonder if we may not yet discover that the same Vietcong we are trying to drum up such a hatred for, will not turn out to be the true patriots of their country. These are the same people who fought for their freedom from an admittedly short-sighted colonialist government.

Why are we in Vietnam? Is it to protect a notoriously graft-ridden government that we are risking the very finest our country has produced? I pray that this is not the case, and that if we are wrong, we have leaders strong enough to admit it, and soon.

I am the mother of four sons, and have watched fearfully as our asinine foreign policy has been allowed, like Topsy, to "just grow."

I pray for your continued courage and wisdom.

Sincerely,

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express my deep and sincere appreciation for the legislation which you have introduced to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in Vietnam. I am sure there are millions of real Americans who agree with you even though you may not hear from them.

Something must be done to bring this war to an early end. The life of one of our fine young men is worth more than the entire enemy. Our leaders should take a lesson from the policies of nations such as Sweden (no war since 1814) and Switzerland.

We are taking in Cuban refugees. Why not move the friendly Vietnamese to other lands where they would be safe. Surely there are countries that would willingly absorb these people, including our own United States. The cost hardly could be as great as the billions now being wasted in carrying on this present conflict. And, precious lives would be saved. I assume that our objective is to protect the inhabitants (not the land) from the Communist enemy.

Sincerely yours,

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

P.S.—I am 79, have lived through three terrible wars. I am opposed to war except in defense of our country.

ITHACA, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST E. GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your amendment whereby draftees not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

CITRUS HEIGHTS, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the newspaper that you introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of

draftees to fight in South Vietnam. That makes me very, very happy. I cannot believe that our President legally has the right to send our men to another country to kill and be killed where there is no formal declaration of war. The President says we are fighting for freedom and our way of life. What freedom do our men have when they are forced to leave their wives and homes, forced into Army camps, then taken, against their will, to another country to be mistreated, and suffer, then perhaps killed? Where is there any freedom in that?

Right now I am not too proud of being an American citizen.

Please, please, do what you can to stop this sending our men to Vietnam. I am just a poor working mother but please tell me what I can do to help you.

Sincerely,

CHICAGO, ILL.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. GRUENING: We wish to commend you for introducing amendments to Senate bills 2791, 2792, 2793, bills now under consideration by the Senate Committee on the Armed Services and Foreign Relations, bills that would authorize additional military and AID programs for Vietnam.

For a long time you have shown much courage and a high sense of responsibility in your opposition to the undeclared war we are fighting in Vietnam.

For much too long our young men have been sent to Vietnam, by three presidents, for reasons that are highly ambiguous and whose legal right to do so is suspect.

When you do introduce your amendments we hope there are enough men in the Senate who will "stand up and be counted."

Sincerely,

HON. SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING:

I read an article in the January 26 Daily News of your proposal to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

I am definitely in favor of this proposal and I hope it will be passed.

Yours sincerely,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DECATUR, GA.,
January 31, 1966.

DEAR Mr. GRUENING: Let me thank you for proposing legislation for not sending draftees into southeast Asia. I thoroughly agree with your ideas as expressed in the January 26th CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like very much to see the draft replaced by alternative service, Peace Corps work, or meaningful employment. To many of our youth lose hope and desire to make of themselves anything worthwhile as they are pressured by so many people to go into military service. It seems to me an exploitation of youth and military conscription is for Communist countries, not a democracy. Has there been any desire for this kind of legislation by any individuals or groups?

I am very proud there are men like you and Mr. MORSE in Washington. It is too bad that there are not more who are as strong and morally right.

Sincerely,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We read of your proposed amendments to pending bills for additional appropriations for the war in Vietnam, to wit; that military service in Vietnam be on a voluntary basis, and we wish to express our full agreement with the proposed amendments.

We have written to our Congressman and to our Senator requesting them to give all possible support to these amendments.

We further wish to thank you for the good fight you are making to bring this illegal, immoral, and brutal war to an end. It has disgraced and dishonored our country long enough.

Respectfully,

DAVENPORT, WASH.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your decision to sponsor a bill to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam.

I hope that such courageous action by responsible leaders, such as yourself, will give our Government cause to reexamine our policy in that area.

Sincerely,

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It was good to learn that the President gave you permission to do as you thought best in 1966 in regard to making suggestions for the conduct of the Vietnamese war. As of now it seems inconceivable that he thought the war would be over by last December.

Your suggestion of not sending into jungle warfare the recent draftees (many of them very young) seems to me very sensible, not to say humane. Lacking training and experience, they could most quickly become casualties.

To my mind, our deep involvement in southeast Asia is deplorable—and very difficult to improve.

Respectfully yours,

Senator GRUENING,
 Alaska.

DEAR SIR: You have my warm approval for your proposal to cease sending of draftees to Vietnam. It looks like you men in Congress are the only ones capable of exercising the restraint we so vitally need in this dangerous situation.

Sincerely,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We wish to assure you of our support for your bill which would prohibit the drafting of young men for the war in Vietnam.

We hope there is a feeling strong enough in the Senate to pass the bill recently introduced by Senator MORSE, to take back the power which was given to the President to prosecute this war. It is our feeling that the Congress did not have the constitutional right to abrogate its own power to declare war.

We are certain that unless President Johnson's powers are curtailed he will push us further and further toward a nuclear holocaust.

Sincerely yours,

MADISON, WIS.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read with interest of your proposed bill to bar the Armed Forces from sending draftees to Vietnam without their consent unless Congress so orders. To force a man to fight a war which he believes is wrong is even more immoral than war itself. I support such a bill unequivocally.

As I write this the President has so far resisted the pressures to resume the bombing of North Vietnam. For the sake of the slim hopes which remain for peace, I hope he will continue to do so. I simply cannot understand how supposedly responsible public figures can advocate renewed bombing as the means to a cheap victory. It did not work in Korea, and it will not work in Vietnam. It will only unite the North Vietnamese in their determination to drive what they believe—rightly or wrongly—to be the foreign aggressors out of Vietnam, and will further dissipate what little the United States has retained of the world's respect.

I admire the courage and determination of the Senators and Congressmen such as yourself and Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT who are resisting the current war hysteria to oppose our unrealistic and ultimately self-defeating Vietnam policy. Please continue to represent all the people, from all over the country, who, like myself, oppose what our country—despite our claims of defending freedom—is actually doing in Vietnam.

Yours very sincerely,

AMERICA—LAND OF THE FREE?

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Your Senate speech, moving to keep draftees out of Vietnam, was summarized in the Chicago newspapers a few days ago.

While I have been a Republican for many years, I regret that I am not one of your constituents so I could vote for you. Being so logical on this point must mean that you also use sound commonsense on other Senate matters.

To me it is ironical that America, which is supposed to be the land of freedom, arbitrarily takes such freedom away from our young men, without recourse, and forces them (in some respects no different from a Russian slave labor camp) to fight 9,000 miles away with no hope for any permanent success.

I have in mind the case of a son of one of my neighbors—a Catholic family. The young man spent 2 years studying to enter the priesthood. When he decided not to continue, he was drafted last July and is now on his way to Vietnam. Here is just one instance of a boy of high character who, against his will and natural instincts, is being forced into the position of killing other humans whom he will never know. And may in turn sacrifice his life to no good purpose. The tragedy is that even though he makes the supreme sacrifice it is highly debatable whether he is actually defending America in Vietnam.

Our State Department and other do-gooders start out with the highly questionable premise that our national security is imperiled if Vietnam and all of southeast Asia goes communistic. Highly questionable because such countries are 9,000 miles away, whereas Cuba is only a short distance away. Yet the United States isn't seriously imperiled even though Cuba now is communistic. A nuisance but not a deadly threat.

It is said we are merely fulfilling our obligations as a member of SEATO. But where are all of the other SEATO countries who should be vitally interested if there is any real merit in our being in Vietnam? Aside from token forces from Australia, the Philippines, and Korea, the SEATO countries are not there. Primarily because they are oriental and don't care whether our boys live or die. In other words, fight to the last American. The Buddhists and the rest of the people won't work together for a stable government in Vietnam. The oppression of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the subsequent murders are incontrovertible evidence. So maybe a lot of their people don't care who rules their country.

Personally, I am of the firm opinion that all of southeast Asia could go communistic, and our national interests, if we stay clear, will be benefited rather than impaired. As someone recently wrote—socialism (i.e., communism) and famine go hand in hand. Recently U.S. News & World Report pointed out that in 1964 wheat sales from Australia, Canada, and the United States of America fed one out of nine Communists. This may be a completely erroneous ratio, but under any ratio our food supplies are vital to them. On this basis, within 10 or 15 years most of southeast Asia and China and India, whether communistic or not, will be sorely in need of our help to avoid starvation because of the continuing population explosion.

If we can only be sensible enough not to become involved in Asia, it seems inevitable that within the next 50 years Russia and China will be fighting. My own guess is that it will be much sooner because of the Chinese exploding population which already is overflowing into territory adjacent to Russia. As you know, there have been reports of numerous local border skirmishes between Russian and Chinese military forces. Just give them time.

So, Mr. Senator, this one citizen and voter salutes you. May you continue your efforts to keep our draftees—and the Regular Army—from ending up as cannon fodder in a large-scale land war across the world where we should not be involved under any circumstances. We talk about the reluctance of the Chinese and other orientals to lose "face." But our own war hawks insist that we must keep face and not pull out under any circumstances. Far better that we admit we made a stupid mistake in taking such unilateral action instead of asking the United Nations to handle the matter and save many American lives.

When we read about the student protests against involvement in Vietnam, many of us automatically think of beatniks and communistic leadership. This undoubtedly is true in some cases. But maybe there is a large undercurrent of student opinion resentful about being forced to kill and be killed where America's vital interests are actually not at stake. Someday these same students may be the nucleus of a youth party which will carry a swing vote that will be essential to the Democrats and the Republicans. Let's hope that more of your colleagues will begin to utilize your own good commonsense in this matter.

Yours very truly,

WILMETTE, ILL.

HOMINY, OKLA.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for introducing legislation which would permit the sending of volunteers only to Vietnam. Your actions and expressed attitudes on the

February 24, 1966

war in Vietnam makes the growing despair over the course the President has taken in Vietnam more bearable. I am writing to our representatives to plead for support for your bill.

I contend that American women have had no part in helping to shape foreign policy although they make up 51 percent of the electorate. According to a Harris poll in September, 1964, they were voting for Mr. Johnson on the issue of peace. The enclosed is a copy of a news item from Newsweek which I placed on the bulletin board in our Democratic headquarters during the presidential campaign. I helped organize our local Democratic women's club, and now serve as its reporter. I find no strong support here for our involvement in Vietnam, but mostly confusion and disappointment.

You have earned our praise and admiration for your actions on behalf of what we believe to be the true feeling of the American people. (According to Theodore White and other political experts war and peace was uppermost in their minds when they went to the polls in 1964.) The candidate who advocated doing what President Johnson has now adopted was repudiated by the American electorate.

Many of our young people are well aware that responsible members of our society, including the last three Presidents, have expressed the opinion that American boys should not be sent to fight as ground troops for the South Vietnamese Government. How cruel and inhumane are we in this Nation that we could force our young people to be sacrificed on the altar of national pride, because the measures undertaken by President Eisenhower in 1954 proved to be self-defeating?

As an American woman I feel betrayed by these policies which never had the American woman's hand in their making. The President and his advisers, some of whom never have had to go to the people for approval or disapproval, surely did not take into account the woman's point of view on war and peace. It was American women who first proposed voting rights for womanhood. I contend that they have come of age politically, and that a better foreign policy will emerge when their views become reflected in its making.

Yours very truly,

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator ERNEST H. GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to assure you of the gratitude of many of us who deplore the ugly war in Vietnam for your undaunted and principled opposition to the present Government policy.

I am sympathetic to the difficulties which political method opposes to uncompromised idealism; however, I feel, as you obviously do, that there are times when the immensity of a moral outrage overcomes the usual and various considerations which determine our actions.

Your proposed bill to send only volunteer draftees into Vietnam is welcome and forces the burden of decision on Congress in lieu of the declaration of war which President Johnson refuses to ask.

I believe that yours will be remembered as a voice of honor in a shameful period of American history.

Respectfully yours,

P.S.—No reply necessary or expected.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to thank you and pledge my wholehearted support for your resolution concerning the sending of draftees to Vietnam.

I think the entire issue of Vietnam should be taken to the United Nations. As long as the United States is in Vietnam with troops, planes, munitions, actively engaged in the struggle, it will be extremely difficult to work out any settlement.

If we have a commitment in Vietnam it is time that this commitment be reexamined in the light of world peace.

Sincerely,

SEATTLE, WASH.

Thank you again for your work for peace.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Greatness in a man is the trait which compels him to take what may be considered an unpopular stand because he has examined himself within and the issue from without. Such is yours on the issue of the draft as it relates to the Vietnam situation. I concur wholeheartedly with your analysis of the situation and will give you all the moral support possible. It is fortunate for the whole world that men such as you are willing to stand for what is right and are willing to be counted.

The demagogues may get you—but you are a man.

Sincerely yours,

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your stand regarding the Vietnam situation.

A recent article in the local newspaper tells of your three amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such services.

There is so little we at home can do, but to tell those of you working so valiantly to end this terrible war, that we are with you in thought and prayer.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.

WEST ORANGE, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to commend you not only for your petition to the President to extend the bombing pause but also for your proposal to stop draftees from being sent to southeast Asia. It is indeed refreshing to hear a voice raised against the "consensus." As I have stated in letters to the President, there are many of us in consensusland who believe the United States is waging an unholy war against the Vietnamese. The tragedy of this war is that many innocents are losing their lives, both Vietnamese and American, because of decisions which are, at best, debatable. At least you have given me some hope that even if the war is to continue, there is a possibility that some lives can be spared.

Sincerely,

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for proposing an amendment to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service.

Best wishes and heartfelt thanks for your work toward, as Walter Lippmann said (January 25, 1966), "liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tom-toms."

Godspeed.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The January 28 edition of the Cleveland Press stated that you and Senator WAYNE MORSE introduced legislation to forbid sending draftees to South Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval. May we express our heartfelt endorsement of such a measure.

The same edition carried the letter signed by 15 Senators including our conscientious Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, asking the President not to resume bombing at this time, and a column by Henry J. Taylor stating that McNamara should resign "on his record in the big questions that really count most." The article was titled "McNamara Computers Missed on Ships." It is no wonder ordinary citizens are confused if those in the inner circle of the Government are not agreed on the issues involved let alone the solution.

Why should our finest youths just starting to live die for such a muddled cause? How can we contemplate an all-out war with Red China if we are unable to get supplies and men to even one spot as Vietnam?

Please do all in your power to continue pressing for peace negotiations. You have the support and well wishes of many people who love their country and their sons and do not want either destroyed in a senseless war which will not solve any problems that cannot be solved more effectively and efficiently at the conference table.

Respectfully yours,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Tonight I heard that you and Senator MORSE are proposing a method of preventing the sending to Vietnam of men drafted into our Armed Forces. I support that proposal. I should like to see the defeat of all appropriations bills for the support of that illegal war.

I have informed my Representative that I shall not vote for anyone in the 1966 election who supports this monstrous war.

I hope Mr. Johnson's proposal to extend the term of office of Representatives will fail. I consider it a typical Johnsonian trick to upset the present balance of power which makes it necessary for Representatives to lend an ear to their constituencies at least once in 2 years if at no other time.

Yours truly,

ALBANY, CALIF.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I express my concurrence with the amendment which has been submitted prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam. It appears to me that since this is a war not legally declared by the Senate and House of Representatives then each draftee should have the moral right to decide whether his services should be in Vietnam. If such a decision were possible I think it would surprise the administration as to the number of young men who are not convinced that the Vietnam conflict is necessary to the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

In my discussions with parents of boys of draftable age I have found none who feel that sending their sons to Vietnam is either necessary to the security of the United States nor the most desirable way to preserve the peace. This is a war into which we never should have gotten and to allow its escalation by sending hundreds of thousands of

unwilling American boys to fight in Vietnam can only lead to a greater disaster.

A final and interesting comment concerning the publicity given your proposed amendment. It appeared, even in the liberal San Francisco Chronicle, on a back page while the testimony of Secretary Robert S. McNamara before the House Armed Services Committee was given front-page headlines. He reported that we had a missile force powerful enough to destroy both the Soviet Union and Communist China simultaneously. What a happy thought.

Sincerely yours,

ELK MOUND, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support amendment limiting conscription without war declaration. Grateful for all your work toward negotiation.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING:

I read in January 26 newspapers of your proposed legislation to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will, unless Congress specifically approves.

I am very much in favor of this legislation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR: This clipping appeared in our paper last night and I just want to say that I really admire you for your stand on draftees. Our son (being married and an expectant father), has received his notice for his physical. This has been his second time that he has been called for a physical. He has a good position and is a good son and husband so you can see why we are in full accord on your stand. We hope and pray that you and others like you will be able to get this proposal through. Good luck and may God bless you.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

BAN ON ORDERING DRAFTEES TO VIETNAM PROPOSED

Asserting that he was free of a Presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING said that President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

Senator GRUENING offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteered for such service or Congress later authorizes "the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted" into the Armed Forces.

He was joined by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon.

The proposals were offered as amendments to the pending \$12.8 billion defense supplemental bill for Vietnam.

Senator GRUENING said that he told Mr. Johnson at the August 26 meeting that United States involvement in the Vietnam fighting was "folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster."

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment," Senator GRUENING said. "He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read, with the first faint ray of hope, this article enclosed, in yesterday's Lawrence Eagle-Tribune. As this horrible war in Vietnam escalates and our boys die in ever-increasing thousands, you seem to be one of the few in Washington who cares about that. We realize with horror that Washington does not want to end the war; it only wants to talk about ending it. If there were no money, there would be no war, yet Congress is forcing taxpayers to see their money spent to slaughter their sons—all that makes life worth living for them.

In November 1964 the people voted for what we thought was peace; the vote was overwhelming. It was the only issue. This secret and most accurate poll of all said that 61 percent of the voters, Republicans and Democrats alike, did not want a war in Vietnam. Yet Washington turned a deaf ear to this voice of the people. Why?

In less than 25 years we have had three wars. Our losses in World War II are still open wounds. Then came the fiasco that was Korea which produced 160,000 casualties and left things just where they started. Now Vietnam, the cruelest war of all—one that cannot be won by fighting and dying—a civil war. And our boys are being sent to senseless slaughter by the hundreds of thousands to die in rice paddies of a people who does not want us there, helpless pawns of a government which would not listen to the voice of the people. Perhaps Washington thinks it is fighting communism but with Cuba 90 miles off our shores and communism running rampant in South America and the Supreme Court ruling that Communists do not have to register in this country, it just doesn't make sense. At least the men in World War II believed in what they were fighting for but these helpless pawns do not have even that to sustain them.

Washington has its volunteers—the Reserves. They chose to join. Yet our boys are being forced (drafted) to die before they reach the age of 26—nothing but a foreign legion. They are yanked from college before the ink is dry on their diplomas (if they are lucky enough to be allowed to finish) and sent 9,000 miles from home to die for a cause in which neither they nor we have any belief. This slaughter is fomenting a volcano of anger and resentment among parents, black, white, and yellow all across the Nation. These boys are not machines which can be replaced. They are the dearest possessions of parents, their hope of any future.

A better life—medicare, jobs, money, housing, reduced taxes—we do want these things for our sons. Slaughter them and all our reason for living and working is gone. Only bitter resentment is left.

Sincerely,

BILL ALLOWS VIETNAM OBJECTORS

WASHINGTON.—Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, proposed legislation Tuesday to forbid sending draftees to Vietnam against their will without specific congressional approval.

The Alaska Democrat was joined by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in sponsoring the proposal. The ban was offered in the form of amendments to legislation to provide more money and more economic aid authority for South Vietnam.

GRUENING and MORSE are two of the leading critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam.

GRUENING said he had planned a similar amendment to the defense money bill last

August but held off at President Johnson's urging.

However, GRUENING said, the President "said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

He said "more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and others costs would be staggering."

GRUENING said enlistees had no recourse but to go where they are ordered.

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess," he said.

WAPPINGERS FALLS, N.Y.,
February 7, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am a retired country newspaperman, a Democrat who shares your views about the southeast Asia involvement. It was most gratifying to be able to hear you express your views on the television Saturday afternoon when you appeared on the "Youth Wants To Know" program.

It seems to me that the President by usurpation of power beyond that given him by constitutional authority has put our country in the position of a violator of international law, to say nothing of the obvious violation of our Federal Constitution. Unless the Congress moves rapidly to exercise the powers vested in it by the Constitution we will be well along the road to totalitarian government.

I am heartily in accord with the bill you propose to introduce to forbid the sending of conscripts to Vietnam. It has always puzzled me how the entire conscription machinery squares with the 13th amendment which forbids involuntary servitude in the United States for any reason except for punishment for crime. Since the Government is the only authority empowered to punish crime (private individuals cannot) it would seem to spell out the limit of Government to require such involuntary servitude.

It is my opinion that in contradiction to the contention of the administration it is a minority and not a majority of Americans who favor this Vietnam involvement. Witness the tremendous concern evident in the columns of the daily newspapers, the demonstrations taking place everywhere and the tone of letters written to editors of newspapers. Surely the election of 1964, if it had any significance, meant that the people did not want to disturb the peace of the world as they feared a Goldwater victory might result in.

President Johnson, speaking in Hawaii, said yesterday that we were in Vietnam to see that South Vietnam emerged a free country with a free government. Who appointed the United States to this role? The concerned peoples agreed at Geneva on free elections to determine this matter with such elections to facilitate the unification of the Vietnams. Whence is the authority for the United States to determine the future of South Vietnam in particular. Are we not here similar to Russia in preventing the reunification of Germany?

Please keep up the work you are doing which strengthens the integrity of the Congress. Congress can keep in check this reckless, irresponsible administration, if it will, by withholding the funds which it must have to operate.

Sincerely yours,

CANTON, MASS.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: Please continue the good fight as to the decision of draftees as to whether they will fight in Vietnam or serve their country in some other way. I am strongly opposed to this bloody, futile war, and hope you will oppose it in every way possible.

Yours very truly,

DUBLIN, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your courage in opposing this terrible reliance upon violence. God bless you and give you strength to continue your efforts toward peace.

We support you in your resolution to deprive the President of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia (see New York Times editorial, Jan. 31).

We must negotiate with the NLF and stop this evil war.

Sincerely,

LAFAYETTE, IND.,
February 3, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to express my strong support for your suggestion that the approval of the Congress be required before inducted servicemen be sent to Vietnam. It would seem to me that, in a situation where the Congress has not declared war, the public should, through its representatives, have the right of deciding whether or not large numbers of inductees are to be sent into battle. I would hope that you will press this point in the Senate.

In a war such as this to which a great many people are opposed, it would seem more just to use inducted men in support and supply positions rather than as combat troops. I am particularly opposed to sending married men to the frontlines. (Incidentally, I am not married myself.)

I also feel that any attempt on the part of the administration to expand the war must be strongly and loudly resisted. The arguments put forth in favor of our participation in this war are not very good, to say the least. Any enlargement of the present war can only result in an increase in the number of lives pointlessly sacrificed.

Very truly yours,

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
February 4, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We would like to support your efforts to force discussion of the Vietnam war through your amendment to prevent draftees from being sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval. We are shocked by President Johnson's arbitrary use of power and lack of candor in the conduct of the war, and by the absence of congressional debate.

You are one of the few Senators who have earned the respect of the voters who elected them.

Sincerely,

BAITIMORE, MD.,
February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to you because the Senators from my own State do not seem to be the least bit interested in their constituents opinions.

However, I have written to them asking that they give their support to your bill for keeping draftees in the United States.

You see my husband has been drafted, and I think I am pregnant, and I think that we deserve a future. If my husband is sent to Vietnam, the future doesn't look too good.

You and Senator MORSE seem to be a rare minority in that you care about the people in the United States. President Johnson seems to care only about people in other countries and the poor people here.

Well, now that Charles has been drafted, I'll be poor, because the allotment isn't anything to live off of, and I work for the SSA, and the Government doesn't pay well either.

Today we listened to your interview with Senator FELL. It seems to be the first time an attempt has been made to give the people even a hint of what is really going on in Vietnam, and even after all the talk on the program, it still isn't clear.

Please keep trying to get that bill through and keep up the fine job you've been doing. I wish there were more Senators like you.

Sincerely,

LONDON, ENGLAND,
February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As Americans temporarily living in England where U.S. prestige is low because of our involvement in the Vietnamese war, we are proud of your continuing efforts to stop escalation of this terrible conflict.

We especially wish you well with your amendment providing that no draftees be sent to southeast Asia without congressional approval.

Sincerely,

FALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I urge you to withhold your support for further war appropriations until open and complete hearings have been held.

I commend you for your continued and forthright opposition to this immoral and illegal war. Never in history has one nation been quite so wrong as are we, now.

Most sincerely,

RENTON, WASH.,
February 4, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We read about your amendment on not sending draftees to Vietnam.

We deeply appreciate your efforts in the behalf of our boys and also the poor people of Vietnam caught in a war that is not of their making and must be horrible beyond all imagination in this day of modern warfare.

We want to thank you again and also Senator MORSE in your fight to bring some kind of reason to the world today.

Will you please convey our thanks to Senator MORSE?

Sincerely,

JERICHO, N.Y.,
February 2, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I hope I spelled your name properly. Just want you to know that I am just one of the people out of many that are in favor of your bill which you sent to the legislature 2 weeks ago. Draftees should not be sent to Vietnam unless they volunteer.

We have not been a family who have shirked their duty to their country when it has been needed.

My father-in-law served in World War II. He had three Purple Hearts.

My husband was in the Battle of the Bulge. He has three Purple Hearts.

My 20-year-old brother was killed in World War II. He was an only son.

Both my brothers-in-law served in World

War II. One stayed in the Air Force for 20 years.

My son was drafted in October. He was working 40 hours a week at the time. This was to enable him to go to night college and when he had enough saved to matriculate to days. Since his country needed him. He had to put his plans aside. He made up his mind he would do the best he could for his country.

It is a heartbreak for every mother, father, grandfather and grandmother to see these young boys go. They might as well send us with them when they send them to Vietnam. We have been through so many years of war. If these young men were given a choice I don't think it would be quite so hard on the parents. I also think it might help to do away with some of the demonstrations we've been having especially with the college students. I know if my son was given the choice and it was his decision to go. I would feel better because I would know this is what he wanted and believed in. A lot of the boys with my son have had quite a bit of college. It seems so horrible to be making foot soldiers out of them and sending them to the slaughter like this without a choice. Now for the ones that don't want to go, there are many other jobs they can serve their country doing. There is no declared war in Vietnam. Most of the draftees are fine young boys with good educations. Who is going to run this country 20 years from now? The way they are going, all that is going to be left here is the morons that the service doesn't want. It takes a lot of educated men to run a country like this as well as soldiers to protect it. I hope these boys are given a chance to make a choice. I sincerely hope like many other people your bill goes through.

Respectfully yours,

P.S.—When a draftee is sent by choice he can do more for his country than 10 that are sent by force.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to express to you my sincere thanks for your amendments 481, 482, and 483 to Senate bills Nos. 2791, 2792, and 2793. I have written Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY from my State of California, urging them to support your amendments.

I have the firm conviction that it is dead wrong, grossly immoral, and diametrically opposed to the principle of constitutional, democratic government that our President should be allowed to send our soldiers into battle of the magnitude of that in Vietnam without specific authorization by the Congress. And it is high time that the terrible mistake of our deepening involvement in Vietnam be thoroughly examined, publicly, by the Senate, and all of Congress. The adoption of your amendments would force such an examination.

I also feel that it is high time that Congress and the President, and the administration, put a little less stress on the state of the economy and the stock market, and a little more on the sanctity of human life—even that of our alleged enemies.

Again, my sincere thanks to you, Senator GRUENING. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

BETHESDA, MD.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: For some time I have admired your forthright statements on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Now I

think you deserve commendation particularly for the introduction of legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to South Vietnam. This is undoubtedly the most democratic and American move that could be made to help solve our difficulties there. If your bill should become law, we would all very quickly see who sincerely believes the sacrifices of American men and money in Vietnam are worthwhile. I thank God that there is a person of your intelligence and courage in the U.S. Senate.

I am writing to the Senators and Representatives from my own State of Maryland asking them to support your bill, and if there is any other way in which I could help you in your work I would be only too glad to do anything within my ability.

Sincerely yours,

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator, State of Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was greatly cheered to learn in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 26, 1966, that you have offered three amendments to bar the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

While I realize that the chance of any amendment of this type to be adopted is extremely low, I am happy to know that at least two Senators, you and Senator MORSE, represent my view on this question.

Very recently, I attended a special meeting for parents at our church in which our minister explained the current draft law with regard to objectors. I came away deeply disturbed and angry after learning that, at present, the chances for an alternative to combat service are good if the boy is absolutely against war under all conditions; however, if he objects to the Vietnam war, but not to defensive war, he has only the choice of accepting military service or going to jail for 5 years with loss of certain civil rights following release.

I asked how this condition differed from that of a German boy's choice under Hitler or a Roman during the imperial period. Our minister felt that a 5-year prison sentence is a milder punishment than could be expected in Hitler's Germany or imperial Rome.

I am far from satisfied that the choice of surrender of conscience or surrender to prison is good enough for an American boy when our country is not at war, nor is being threatened in any way. To present to a boy at age 18 this requirement for corpse-like obedience is to deny freedom of thought and action that his teachers have trained him to consider his American heritage.

If a path consistent with justice and good conscience is not to be found, the result will be corrupting in some form. Passivity, resignation, cynicism, hostility, rebellion, outright disloyalty are examples of many negative attitudes that could develop from repressed conscientious dissent.

I think that a free America would not treat its sons this way because it is wrong to do so. I think that a strong America (able to destroy Russia and China simultaneously) should not destroy the spirit of its youth this way because it is unnecessary in view of these circumstances:

1. So far, President Johnson has not thought it necessary to ask Congress for a declaration of war.

2. The armed services have not considered that an emergency exists which requires calling up reserves.

3. Soldiers in Vietnam return to the United States when their enlistment is over (even just after arrival there according to reports) indicating that total exposure both to the Army indoctrination and to the Vietnamese situation has not convinced them that they

have any duty in Vietnam that conscience dictates. (The French would not support a heavier draft during their period of fighting there even though the alternative was the loss of all of Indochina.)

4. I have never felt that the armed services and Congress have fully exploited the possibility of maintaining peace time strength by voluntary enlistment. If we are to be a worldwide police force, our policemen should be recruited as are those in cities and States, by adequate inducements to compensate for risks and hardships involved.

Besides being both wrong and unnecessary to deny freedom of choice regarding service in Vietnam, this denial threatens the welfare of the United States. The alienation of a reluctant soldier, his family, friends, and sympathizers may harm the United States much more than the soldier could hurt the Vietnamese. Paul Potter has summarized the convictions of many less articulate when he declares that, "To live decently in this society, to do what you believe is right, is self-destructive." How much of this despair lies below the surface phenomena of drug use, sexual libertinism, alcoholism, the defiant style of dress and appearance which offend and bewilder conventional people?

My only hope is that courageous men such as you and Senator MORSE will gradually persuade more people at all levels to your point of view and we will halt our drift toward our version of Roman imperialism before either internal rot or external reprisal have destroyed us.

Very truly yours,

TRANQUILITY, N.J.,
February 12, 1966.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have delayed far too long in expressing my appreciation for your outspoken criticism of the administration's policy on Vietnam.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I am sending to the President. It is not necessary to rehearse any of the arguments which I have presented to him. Let me, simply, express my hope that you, together with some of your colleagues, will be able to find a way to convince the President that there is far more dissatisfaction with his policy than he seems willing to recognize; and, further, that the Senate will insist on reasserting the constitutional demand that Congress shall have a voice in determining whether or not this country shall carry on a war.

Let me, further, express my support for your amendment to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam except as volunteers without the consent of Congress. I am sure, furthermore, that you will oppose any measures which Mr. Johnson can interpret as endorsement of, or support for, his policy, or as a blank check for further action.

Respectfully yours,

FEBRUARY 12, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With millions of people in all parts of the world, I was encouraged by your action in taking the problem of Vietnam to the Security Council of the United Nations; and by your continued expressions of determination to seek for a negotiated end to the war. Inasmuch as American intervention has vastly exceeded in quantity and quality of troops and arms the intervention by North Vietnam, the United States may well take the initiative to set the example for radical deescalation of the conflict. I urge, therefore, that we de-

escalate the conflict and make clear our readiness to negotiate not only with Hanoi, but with the NLF as a principal party to any settlement, inasmuch as the war was originally, in essence, a civil war.

That there may well be risks in this, I recognize; but I am sure that they are not as dangerous as the certainties which are entailed by continued escalation of the conflict. For this reason, I deplore your order to resume the bombing in North Vietnam, as a threat to world peace. One thing has been demonstrated by this policy initiated a year ago: it has served, as nothing else has done, to solidify the Government of Hanoi and the people of North Vietnam in their determination to fight. That this could have been expected has been demonstrated again and again throughout history: e.g., in the response of England to the German bombing in World War II.

As our Government has repeatedly stated, throughout three administrations, in respect to various declarations by the U.S.S.R. concerning peaceful intentions, it must be actions, not words, that count. To declare that we seek peace while intensifying the war, can only result in our professions carrying no weight but being under suspicion. Declarations by the Secretaries of State and Defense, by the military, as well as your own statement, have interpreted our actions as being motivated, controlled, and made necessary only for the purpose of stopping the aggression and protecting the freedom of the South Vietnamese people. However, may I respectfully call your attention to the sequence of developments following 1954, which I am sure are quite familiar to you (although they have been frequently ignored or distorted in statements to the people) which do not substantiate our claims? Rather, aggressive military action by North Vietnam has been demonstrated (as in the facts of the white paper by the State Department last spring) to have been largely in response to our action.

Allow me, Mr. President, respectfully but most urgently to protest against the policy which our Government is pursuing in Vietnam, in spite of clear demonstration of mounting dissatisfaction with that policy, not only by the people at large but by many of the most competent leaders of your party in Congress. It is my conviction that to persist in our present course will not only lead to world war, but will earn for the United States the loss of respect of much of the world. It would be ironic, and unfair to you, with your demonstrated concern, and consistent efforts, for the kind of society which will make possible a better life for all men, if you should continue to be imprisoned by the kind of policy initiated by Mr. Dulles (and persisted in by Mr. Rusk). It was this policy which was a part of the total outlook which was repudiated by the people in 1960 and even more emphatically in 1964.

ORANGE, CALIF.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We fully support the legislation introduced by you last week and supported by Senator WAYNE MORSE, prohibiting the involuntary assignment of draftees to Vietnam. Let those who feel strongly about forcing American freedom on the Vietnamese people go forth and do the fighting. Those who feel it is an unjust war should not be forced to defend our freedoms on someone else's soil.

We feel the Geneva agreements should be lived up to and all foreign troops be withdrawn from Vietnam. Let them have their free elections as was proposed in the Geneva agreements, but let them be free of foreign intervention and domination. We are also in favor of foreign aid to Vietnam after our

February 24, 1966

3812

troops are withdrawn and some responsible person be in charge of administering the foreign aid so as to prevent the aid from getting into the hands of enemies of the people, so the people can rebuild their economy.

Yours truly,

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 10, 1966.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Allow me to congratulate you on your amendments to the Vietnam aid bill—that I understand would prohibit sending our fine young American boys into southeast Asia against their will, without the approval of Congress, inasmuch as the war there is not authorized by the U.S. Congress.

Sincerely,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1966.

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your amendment concerning the necessity of congressional approval for draftee shipment to Vietnam.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your proposal to make Vietnam service voluntary.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you, bless you for your efforts to change backward, shameful, Rusk Vietnam policy. Your draftee idea is great.

NEWINGTON, CONN.,
January 29, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I read in the paper on how you don't want the draftees to go fight in Vietnam unless Congress approves. I hope you keep up the fight as all the mothers are with you 100 percent.

As a mother I am in favor of it as my son just left for the Army. It was just 22 years ago I sent my husband and brothers off to war. I never thought I'd live to see the day my son would be in uniform to do the job. I thought his father and uncles had finished the job. Our joy was short lived.

I am an American and if I could see why we are there maybe I wouldn't feel this way. But I have never had a clear picture of why we are in Vietnam.

We should clean up our own country of Commies before we try to do it somewhere else.

Everyone I have talked to and that is many people are not in favor of this conflict. When you say war they disagree with you as its a police action like Korea, they tell me. I told them to ask a mother who lost a son and see what she'd tell them.

Something else I can't understand is why we are there and not the United Nations. I thought that was formed to try and keep peace. How come we are the only country there. I thought that was the whole idea of it being.

They take a boy 18 or 19 away from home. He can't vote and his parents are responsible for him. Yet the Army takes him, sends him where they want to and the parents don't even know where. Is this the country that we fought so hard for or is this just something I imagined. Where my son is right now, I don't know. My husband has a heart

condition and he is not to worry but he is as upset as I am only he don't want me to know.

You keep up with your good work and I hope God is on both our sides.

Yours truly,

YAKIMA, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your stand re: draftees. These men, my son included, are not unpatriotic, there are very few draft-card burners among them—they simply find themselves thrown into a so-called political war which somehow requires the presence of 400,000 men (projected) to enforce this political ideology.

My son, and dozens of others I know, go reluctantly, but with that indomitable spirit of indestructibility, that enviable assurance that come what may, each will come out all right. As you well know, this has not and will not be so—let the professional soldier, the volunteer—fight in Vietnam. Don't force our sons who have been drafted march involuntarily to their deaths in a land 12,000 miles away; a land they know and care little about.

As you know, our position in Vietnam is untenable, ill-advised and contrary to our democratic beliefs.

Please do all you can to enact legislation to keep our draftees home where they belong—with millions of trained men, we can then withstand, even overcome any overt acts of direct aggression.

Sincerely,

SENATOR ASKS DRAFTEE BAN IN VIETNAM

WASHINGTON.—Asserting he was free of a presidential restriction imposed last August, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, introduced legislation today to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

In a Senate speech, GRUENING said President Johnson told him at a White House conference August 26 that "if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased."

GRUENING offered three separate amendments, all designed to bar the sending of draftees to South Vietnam unless they volunteer for such service or Congress later authorizes the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into the Armed Forces.

He and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, offered the proposals as amendments to the pending \$12.3 billion defense supplemental bill for Vietnam.

GRUENING said he told Johnson at the August 26 meeting that U.S. involvement in the Vietnam fighting was folly; that it was a war we could not win; that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

"The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment," GRUENING said.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for your part in challenging the President's authority, assumed under the southeast Asia resolution, to wage an expanding undeclared war in southeast Asia. Thank you also for your proposal to make service in Vietnam on a voluntary basis. (This does not affect me, as I am above the draft age—60.)

I have been grieved and concerned for a long time about our Nation's policies and actions in Vietnam. Reading Senator EDWARD KENNEDY'S "Fresh Look at Vietnam" in the current issue of Look magazine has deepened my concern, and I hope it has that effect on his fellow Senators.

Respectfully yours,

MADISON, WIS.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As potential draftees, and as citizens of the United States who are opposed to the war in Vietnam, we would like to give our full support to your amendment that would bar the use of draftees in this unjust and unnecessary war. When 200,000-plus soldiers are fighting in a war that has never been declared as such, the absence of any substantial senatorial criticism is truly criminal. It is heartening to see that you and a few others have the courage to stand up against this war.

We hope that you continue in your position, and defend it as adamantly as you have in the past.

Sincerely,

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to encourage you in your fight for your legislation to prohibit the involuntary assignment of draftees to fight in South Vietnam.

I certainly hope you will succeed in getting this legislation through at once and will thus give those who wish to fight in Vietnam, along with the regular military personnel, an opportunity to do so. Yesterday's Oregonian suggested that soon the Korean war policy would begin to operate here. It means simply that the lower half of the freshman classes at various colleges would be removed for the draft, and it would continue on up to the lower quarter of the junior class. This seems very unjust to me, and a bit insane, too. If a student is serious in his pursuit of a degree in a vital profession, why not allow him to complete his education first? Then let him take his place among the ranks, too, or use him wherever his education can do the most good. But in the meantime, why not use the reservists first who are being trained and paid to fight when needed?

I do hope your sane and just proposal, as well as your good judgment, will prevail.

Sincerely yours,

SWITZERLAND,
February 4, 1966.

Senator E. GRUENING,
The Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I should like to express my deep approval of your resolution to deprive President Johnson of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia. As the mother of an all too soon to be draft age son I am most personally interested in the draft situation. As an American citizen I am exceedingly distressed by the war in Vietnam which I consider an outrage against the people of that country and against the very principles for which we say we stand—brought about without the consent of the citizens and slowly and dishonestly escalated into catastrophic proportions.

President Johnson has ignored the justified demand from Hanoi to include the Vietcong in discussions and his peace feelers have come to naught—as was to have been expected. With the resumption of bombardments by the United States we have entered once again into a state of Alice-in-Wonderland logic—a topsy-turvy reasoning that we can save a country and its people by smashing them to death.

I hope you, and such honest and outspoken critics of current U.S. foreign policy as Senator MORSE, will continue to act for the establishment of peace and for the protection of innocent victims of this cruel war—both American and Vietnamese.

Very sincerely,

MILLBRAE, CALIF.
 Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: A request. Will you please suggest a solution to the Vietnam problem that will appeal to American conscience.

I belong to a group called Concerned Citizens of San Mateo County. The group feels that if we had something that would really move the general run of Americans, we would go all out to contact people.

If I had something mimeographed on a card (about the size of a postcard)—it could be printed on both sides—I could carry 50 or so in my pocket and give them out each day. What do you think?

Sincerely,

P.S.—We could flood the country with a mail-in.

Mr. GRUENING. So, Mr. President, we are confronting perhaps the gravest crisis in the history of our Nation. I say "perhaps the gravest crisis" because, in times past, when our Nation went to war, there was a large degree of unity, there was widespread patriotic support, based on real and justified conviction that our safety, our lives, our way of life, and everything that America stood for and holds dear were in grave danger. Under those circumstances, our people willingly marched to war.

That is not the situation today in regard to southeast Asia. I repeat my view that our alleged commitment lacks reality, is not based on any sound foundation, is in violation of the Constitution. Now the myth that we were asked in there by a friendly government, and acceded to that request, that three Presidents have supported that commitment, and that it has become a solemn national pledge has been pretty well disposed of by elucidation of the true facts. These facts are that we asked ourselves in that President Eisenhower did not promise, but merely offered economic aid—and that with many conditions, none of which were ever fulfilled—and that President Kennedy merely added to our advisory role by sending some 15,000 to 20,000 advisers. But it is only in the last year or so that we have sent our men into combat, that we have made war without a declaration of war voted by the Congress. The latest justification, now being refurbished, stems back to the SEATO treaty, in which it is alleged we made a commitment to do what we are doing.

But when one examines the SEATO treaty one finds that in the first place, we are in violation of that treaty, because in article 1, the very first article, it says:

The parties undertake, as set forth in the charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and remain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Therefore, as we have gone to war, as we have used armed force, we are in violation of the very treaty which is now invoked as a justification for our actions.

It is pleaded by those who use this SEATO Treaty as a later justification for action that article 4 says:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

In other words, if we are to fulfill the obligations such as they are now alleged to be under the SEATO Treaty, we would have had to go to Congress and ask for a declaration of war, which we have not done, for that way, and only that way would we be acting "in accordance with" our "constitutional processes."

Consequently, this later argument, now dredged up, when the previous arguments are shown to be mythical, also falls to the ground.

It is a tragic situation for those of us who deeply love our country, who have been steeped in its ideals and traditions, to have to stand by and see the course we are following. That course can only lead to disaster. It is already disaster. It is time we confessed to error—the greatest, most tragic error we have made in our history—and use every decent means to get out at the earliest possible moment. Any withdrawal which will stop the useless slaughter of American boys and the killing of civilians would be preferable to continuation of the course in which we are now involved.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

AUGUST 20, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It was very good of you to see me yesterday and to give me the opportunity to present to you my views on the present situation in Vietnam.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I had on my desk when I spoke to you yesterday. This was prepared for delivery yesterday and in it I offered an amendment to the defense appropriation bill prohibiting the sending of draftees, without their consent, to southeast Asia. You will recall I spoke to you twice about this, and that at your earnest request I agreed not to introduce this amendment.

In compliance with your wish, I shall not introduce this amendment at this time, although I feel deeply that at the very least the Congress should pass on the sending of our draftees into the war in southeast Asia.

However, as I suggested to you at our meeting, I strongly urge you to announce publicly that—at least until there has been a review of the entire situation after the Congress returns in January or unless a grave national emergency develops—draftees will not be sent to southeast Asia unless they volunteer for such duty. Such a public announcement from you would do much to reassure the people of the United States.

I was pleased to hear from both you and Ambassador Goldberg of the strenuous efforts to secure peace in southeast Asia. As I told you, I was particularly gratified to notice your clarification of your position since your Johns Hopkins speech. Your announcement at your press conference on July 28, 1965, that there would be no particular problem in bringing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front to the conference table, as I had been urging for some time, was most reassuring.

I was also pleased to hear your changed stand on the reunification of Vietnam through internationally supervised elections as provided for in the Geneva Conventions of 1954. Of course, as I said, it is difficult to convince those with whom we are seeking to arrange a cessation of hostilities of our bona fides while we continue the bombing of North Vietnam.

With best wishes, I am,
 Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
 U.S. Senator.

EXHIBIT 2

[Parade, the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1966]

Universal draft. Young men the world over are facing the same problem: military conscription. Britain (alone of the great powers), India, and Pakistan are among the few large countries relying solely upon voluntary enlistment in this deeply divided world. Poverty is so rampant in India and Pakistan that there are more volunteers than military facilities to house, clothe, and feed them.

Elsewhere the rule is conscription. In the Soviet Union all youths 17 and 18 who have completed secondary school are inducted. Service ranges from 2 to 5 years with leave only for emergency or outstanding service. Pay is \$3.30 per month. Israel, surrounded by hostile Arab nations, requires military training of all men and unmarried women, 18 to 26. Reserve duties are obligatory for men until age 49, for childless women until age 34. In Red China which has a virtually bottomless pool of manpower, every man according to Maoist theory, is considered a soldier. In South Vietnam all men, 18 to 35, face 3 years of military service. A large percentage of South Vietnamese conscripts desert each year. South Vietnam hires mercenaries to fight against the Vietcong. We support the South Vietnamese economy. Without us that country would go broke. Whether indirectly we are paying the South Vietnamese mercenaries is a question Washington declines to answer.

Certainly we have fought side by side with mercenaries, employed their aid and information. France, Germany, and Italy all use conscription to supplement their regular forces. In West Germany every youth at 18 is liable for 18 months of service. In France boys are drafted at age 19 for 18 months active duty, 40 months availability, 12 years of reserve duty.

On the U.S. borders things are not so stringent. Canada has no conscription. In Mexico the young man chooses a white ball or a black ball. The white ball permits him to perform his military service by marching each Sunday for a year. The black ball puts him in the barracks and regular army duty for 1 year. Argentina uses a lottery system to select the unlucky few.

EXHIBIT 3

TOTAL IS PUT ABOVE 96,000—U.S. AID CONCERNED: 1965 DESERTIONS UP IN SAIGON FORCES

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

February 24, 1966

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular Armed Forces—Army, Navy, and Air Force—and 17,000 were from the Regional Forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,000 were from the Popular Forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assignments.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular Armed Forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular Armed Forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The Armed Forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 missing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods, and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular armed forces, for example, included 114,000 men during the year—77,000 volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. The Regional Forces and Popular Forces—two militia units heavily affected—are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular armed forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Government units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government armed forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOR STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Vietnamese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded, and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded, and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1966]
MCNAMARA HINTS CALL-UP OF RESERVISTS FOR VIETNAM

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told Congress today that partial mobilization and a Reserve call-up would be necessary if the enemy in South Vietnam widened the war. The thrust of his remarks indicated he thought these actions would be required.

The Secretary pointed out, in a 220-page "posture" statement on U.S. global defenses, that the administration had not wanted to call Reserves, preferring to rely on the draft.

But he also called attention to growing strength of Vietcong and North Vietnamese regular army forces in South Vietnam and to what he described as Communist China's increasing militancy.

Mr. McNamara emphasized evidence that the Peiping Government had undertaken serious insurgency in Thailand, similar to that in Vietnam.

HEARING IN SENATE

Appearing before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he said:

"In view of the continued buildup of Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam, we now believe we should be prepared to deploy promptly additional forces to that area if required.

"President Johnson has stated categorically that we will give our commanders in Vietnam all the resources they need to carry out their mission. The deployment of additional forces to southeast Asia would require some further increases in our force structure and military strength."

After outlining impending increases, most of which had been previously announced, Secretary McNamara went on:

"Although the President has repeatedly stated that the United States has no desire to widen the war in southeast Asia, we cannot preclude the possibility that our opponents will nevertheless choose to do so.

"Such a contingency would necessitate at least a partial mobilization including the callup of some or all our Reserve forces and the extension of active duty tours."

Mr. McNamara spoke to the Senate panels in closed session, but a censored transcript of his report was released. Annually it has constituted the most comprehensive review of U.S. foreign policies and military commitments and plans by any Government official.

As Mr. McNamara testified, the Pentagon announced a call to Selective Service headquarters for the drafting of 900 male nurses beginning in April.

The Defense Department said the conscription of male nurses was necessary because of additional medical services needed for the treatment of casualties from Vietnam and also because of the general increase in the size of the Armed Forces.

Selective Service headquarters announced that the first deadline for student registration for planned draft deferment tests would probably come in late April.

Selective Service said it expected to sign within a few days a contract with a testing agency to prepare qualification tests similar to those used during the Korean war.

In these tests students seeking deferment, who believe that their local draft board might regard their standing in class as too low to be considered "satisfactory" under the draft law and thus not warranting deferment, may take a test. Their grades on the test may be submitted as evidence of satisfactory educational progress.

DENIES TIMES REPORT

Secretary McNamara, who was accompanied to the Senate hearing by General Earle G.

Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, talked briefly to newsmen after a 2-hour morning session in the committee room.

He denied a report published in the New York Times on Monday that the United States had spread thin its trained military manpower because of the demands of the war in Vietnam and elsewhere. The defense Secretary, when questioned about the article, asked General Wheeler to comment first.

General Wheeler said he did not agree with the article but acknowledged that there had been what he called a "draw down" of some U.S. forces because of Vietnam.

Secretary McNamara then said: "It is absolutely false to say that we are overextended and that we cannot fulfill our military requirements.

"We have never been better prepared."

In his formal statement to the Senate committees, Mr. McNamara devoted a lengthy section to rebutting allegations of shortages of arms and other military equipment.

After reviewing his logistics policies and reporting on experiences in the Vietnam war, the Secretary went on:

"This is not to say that every one of the tens of thousands of Defense Department supply points is without a single inventory shortage. Anyone who has had experience with large supply systems knows that somewhere, sometime, something will be lacking."

The question of shortages "must be viewed in perspective," he said.

"The acid test of our logistics system is the ability of our forces to take the field and engage in combat," he asserted.

"Never before has this country been able to field and support in combat so large a force in so short a time over so great a distance, without calling up reserves and with out applying price, wage and material controls to our civilian economy."

In his assessment of the international situation, Secretary McNamara noted that "the focus of the U.S. defense problem has shifted perceptibly toward the Far East."

He emphasized time and again the administration's concern over Communist China. In his report he included an appendix containing excerpts of a policy statement by the Communist Chinese Minister of the Defense, Lin Piao, last September and quoted Secretary of State Dean Rusk's characterization of it as being "as candid as Hitler 'Mein Kampf.'"

The war in Vietnam is a test case in Communist Chinese "version of the so-called wars of national liberation, one of a series of conflicts the Chinese hope will sweep the world," the Secretary told the Senators.

Were the effort to bring about Communist takeover through "subversion, political assassination, and other forms of terrorism successful in Vietnam, Mr. McNamara said Peiping would "move forward with increased confidence and determination" elsewhere.

"Indeed," he said, "even without such success, Communist China already has named Thailand as its next victim."

The Secretary described the insurgent start in Thailand as follows:

"A Thailand Independence Movement and Thailand Patriotic Front have already been established. The first is, apparently, intended to be the equivalent of the Vietcong and the second of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. Large sums of Thai currency have been purchased by Peiping in Hong Kong, and the study of Thai language is now being emphasized by Communist China.

"In recent months a number of village officials and policemen have been assassinated in the northeastern areas of Thailand. Clashes have occurred with small bands of armed Communists, seemingly well equipped and trained; and a Voice of Free Thailand

radio station has apparently been established in Communist China. Obviously the apparatus for the war of liberation in Thailand is being created."

Mr. McNamara said that the Soviet Union's leaders "fully appreciate" the perils of local wars that might escalate to nuclear war and that he believed the Communist Chinese were "reluctant to challenge the full weight of our military power."

"But it is clear," he said, "that we have yet to convince the Chinese Communists that their new drive for world revolution, using what they euphemistically call people's wars, will not succeed. But convince them we must."

He repeated his conviction that if Peking's "challenge in southeast Asia" were not met the United States would be confronted with it later "under even more disadvantageous conditions."

He emphasized the administration's readiness to "cope with any further escalation of the conflict on their part" and at the same time its readiness "for a just settlement."

"But we have no intention of negotiating the surrender of South Vietnam," he said.

Mr. McNamara hinted that Communist China's aggressive attitude and her developing nuclear capability might compel the United States to develop and install an antimissile defense system geared to a nuclear attack threat from Asia.

The Defense Secretary has been doubtful in the past on proposals for establishing an antimissile defense system against a Soviet nuclear threat, on the ground that it would prove prohibitively expensive for the defense it would provide.

However, it has been indicated that he believes an antimissile system against Communist China might be feasible because of the more rudimentary nature of the Peiping government's nuclear arsenal.

Mr. McNamara in other portions of his military planning treatise indicated he was considering recommending three rather than one more nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. He also disclosed plans for purchases for the Air Force of the Navy's A-7 attack aircraft as a weapon in Vietnam.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I understand the burden of the Senator's argument to be that we should send the Reserves before this Nation sends any more draftees, or is his argument that we should not send anybody?

Mr. GRUENING. My argument is that we should not send the draftees without the consent of Congress. That is all my amendment does.

I think it is about time Congress took a little responsibility for involvement down there, and that is what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My feeling was that we gave the President the authority when we authorized him, in August of 1964, to take whatever steps he found necessary to resist aggression in that area of the world. That was certainly, in my judgment, broad enough to cover putting troops in there, when the North Vietnamese sent their troops in.

The Senator has dwelt at considerable length on the question of the Reserves, and I just wondered if he is advocating that the Reserves be sent; or is he advocating that neither Reserves nor draftees should be sent?

Mr. GRUENING. I am not advocating the method of fighting this war. Secretary McNamara, in the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, stated—and I have read extracts from the hear-

ings—that there was very little likelihood of their being sent.

That was only a few weeks ago, and yet today a leading front page story in the New York Times indicates that he has changed his mind.

I am not prepared to argue that this is desirable or undesirable. I am sticking to the fact which is the basis of my amendment, that I think that Congress should take a position on the matter. I think we should vote it up or down; and that Members of Congress should have a greater inclusion.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I was one of two Senators who voted against that resolution at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident. I have no criticism of my fellow Senators who did not agree with me, but I think there is no question but that a great many Senators—and I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me—who voted for that resolution did not realize at the time that it would involve such a large escalation and increase of activities.

There are many Senators who would like to have a reaffirmation of the power of the President, or some variation to bring that authorization up to date.

I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana anticipated such a large involvement as a result of his support of the resolution.

Maybe he did. Maybe he was more foresighted than others, but I think the issue now is that the draftees, at least in my judgment, are in a somewhat different category from those who entered the service voluntarily, have been paid for it, and are now part of what we might call the regular Military Establishment. If Congress decided it wishes the draftees to go, then it should vote accordingly. If Congress does not decide it wishes the draftees to go as volunteers, then it should vote accordingly. My amendment is an effort to get Congress to express itself and to participate in this great and vital, major undertaking that we have got into.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has stated that this is an illegal war. Is he familiar with article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which explicitly states that nothing in that charter denies any nation the right of collective self-defense until such time as the Security Council of the United Nations has acted and taken steps to relieve that necessity of collective self-defense?

Mr. GRUENING. Before we get to article 51, there are articles 1, 2, 33, and 38 which forbid the use of armed forces in situations of this kind. I also wonder whether the Senator means that this is a war of self-defense for the United States. I do not consider it so. I believe that we have intruded into another country which is taking part in a civil war and we are fighting their war in a civil war. The question of self-defense is not involved in the slightest degree, in my judgment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Article 4 of the SEATO Treaty and the protocol to the SEATO Treaty which refers to article 4 are definitely collective defense arrangements to which we are committed.

We are there in compliance not only with that treaty but also in compliance with a resolution which Congress passed last year. The Senator from Alaska voted against that resolution. That was his privilege. Since that time, he has made speeches against it about once a week. Sometimes he has done so once a day ever since he voted against it.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the Senator from Louisiana overestimates my capacities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The vote on the resolution was voted by 416 to 0 in the House, and 88 to 2 in the Senate. The Senator was one of the two who voted against it, and has since spoken against it. This vote represents 99 percent of Congress, yet at least approximately once a week and sometimes once a day, sometimes twice a day, the Senator from Alaska has spoken against it.

Mr. GRUENING. That is because there were 504 votes on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The overall vote exceeded 99 percent. Congress passed its resolution in both Houses and it was signed by the President. We said that we feel the SEATO Treaty applies here, that this is a collective defense treaty, and that we are obligated to help these people who are defending themselves. We also said that the President should take whatever steps he deems to be necessary to resist aggression in the area.

When we said that, we gave the President a mandate to do whatever would be necessary to resist aggression. When the North Vietnamese troops marched down, we felt—and I feel now and am ready and prepared to say so—that the overwhelming majority of Congress had exactly that kind of mandate for the President in mind that when the North Vietnamese marched in their troops, that the President has the power—indeed, the duty—to resist aggression and to send in our troops if he thought it to be necessary to meet that aggression.

The Senator from Alaska has declared that this war is illegal. Is he familiar with the fact that outstanding law professors of international law, at Harvard, Yale, and in schools all over the country, signed a resolution some time ago declaring that in their minds there is no doubt that not only is U.S. action in compliance with the United Nations Charter, but it is also in compliance with our obligations under the SEATO agreement, and in compliance with the resolution of Congress.

The President did not even really need the resolution. He had the power anyway as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. Presidents have done that more than 125 times in the history of the country—even in the absence of a congressional declaration, or a treaty requiring us to do so.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say, in response to the Senator's comments, that there are a great many lawyers in this country who regard it as unconstitutional and illegal. I placed a brief in the Record a few days ago, signed by a number of distinguished law school deans, to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana. But, let

us go back to the claim that the SEATO Treaty justifies what we are doing.

Article 4 states in part:

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

We are not meeting in accordance with the constitutional process. Our Constitution provides that only Congress can declare war. That we have not done. Another thing, this is supposed to be a collective defense treaty, but where are the cosigners? France is not there. They are violently opposed to it. Pakistan is not there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the other five countries? They are there.

Mr. GRUENING. They are there, feebly and belatedly, after much prodding on our part. They did not come in jointly with us at the beginning. We did not call any meeting of the seven nations saying, "Come on, boys, let us go in together." We knew they would not go along. It took us all these years to get those few nations to make token contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us discuss the legality of what we are doing in Vietnam. A few days ago the American Bar Association considered the question. A distinguished Member of this body suggested on television that our conduct was immoral, illegal, and that America was an international outlaw.

The American Bar Association is supposed to understand this sort of thing; and after studying the problem they voted 279 to 0, if I recall correctly that what we were doing in Vietnam was entirely legal, in line with precedents, in line with international law, and in line with the Charter of the United Nations. They specifically referred to article 51, which states that nothing whatever in the U.N. Charter would deny the right of self-defense, individually or collectively.

This is collective self-defense we are talking about.

The Senator from Oregon has not seen that resolution. I read somewhere in the press, that the Senator from Oregon said that the whole group which had agreed unanimously should take a refresher course in international law.

Well now, if they are going to have to take a refresher course in international law, where would they go to take it? I hope they would go to an outstanding university where they teach international law.

Mr. GRUENING. I will tell the Senator where they could go, to some of the law schools whose deans have taken the opposite position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator may state that there are deans of law schools who are opposed to the U.S. position, but the Senator knows that there are no many schools who teach international law. I happen to be a graduate of Louisiana State University. We do not practice much international law down there. At LSU we do not teach it. Thus, if you wish to study interna-

tional law, you have to go somewhere else, or buy a law book and read about it. If you want to study international law, a good place would be Harvard. They have been teaching it there for a great many years.

Here is the professor of international law at Harvard—he teaches international law—and he wrote a second letter to the President reaffirming his position, that what we are doing is entirely legal, and that the unanimous vote of the American Bar Association, 279 to 0, is correct. Here is a man who teaches international law at Yale University. That is a good law school. They teach international law there. They agree with us.

Here is a fellow who teaches international law at the University of Michigan. I know about that university. I have read their Law Review many times.

Here is a professor who teaches international law at the University of Virginia, where they have taught international law for a considerable period of time.

Thus, when we really get down to it, if we are to take a refresher course in international law as was suggested to the entire American Bar Association—I repeat, the entire American Bar Association—we had better not go back to law schools that have a longstanding reputation in the field, or we will have to be prepared to be in disagreement with the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana, was it not the American Bar Association from which the Chief Justice resigned in disgust a few years ago?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska, if he has any doubts about the matter, I wish he would make some effort to see what the Chief Justice thinks about the issue here, because he was on television last night applauding the President—I saw it with my own eyes—when the President was making his speech in support of this Nation's position. Whom else is the Senator from Alaska going to rely upon besides himself and one other Senator? There is hardly an international lawyer in America who agrees with him.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Louisiana does not know many lawyers, then. There are many who disagree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know a great number of them. Let me say to the Senator that there are several right here in the Senate. Two-thirds of Senators are lawyers. Sitting in the Chamber at this moment is the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), a distinguished Senator and a distinguished judge. He is sitting right beside me.

I had occasion to be a delegate to the United Nations to consider these matters. All the Senator has to do is to read article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and he will see very clearly that we have a right to engage in collective self-defense. That is what the treaty permits, so far as United Nations Charter is concerned. Some have suggested that the issue be taken to the United Nations. All right.

We knew that very little would be achieved, but we did go up there.

What was achieved? That and zero are the same thing. That being the case, we have the responsibility to maintain our position in Vietnam.

Does the Senator want to respond? He had the floor. I will yield to him to respond.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be glad to respond to anything the junior Senator from Louisiana wishes to have me respond to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Might I suggest to the Senator that what the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRUENING) suggests is what could properly be described as a surrender at Washington resolution. It is said that the French were not defeated at Dienbienphu but at Paris, because the French Government did not have the courage to give their courageous volunteer fighting men the help they needed. They would not draft men to send there. They had a number of courageous volunteers who were fighting there for the honor and position of their country. But when they were surrounded, no one else came to help the French troops who were already there.

We have sent to South Vietnam some of the finest fighting men in the uniform of the United States, some of which divisions have fought for the United States ever since its foundation, practically. The 1st Division is as old as the country. The 1st Cavalry is practically as old. The 1st Marine Division is an old division. We have the 101st Airborne Division there. We have some special forces. The 25th Division is there. These are among the best fighting men we have ever had.

I would be embarrassed to have Congress vote that these divisions, which have never been defeated, when they have been confronted by an enemy force, would have no help coming to them if help were needed. It would be a great disservice to men in division that marched behind George Washington, to those whose division raised the flag at Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima—a monument commemorating that battle is close by across the Potomac River—to say that no help would be sent them if they were confronted by an overwhelming force. That would not be in accordance with American traditions, because we do not run out on our allies, and certainly we do not run out on our own boys.

Mr. GRUENING. I think the sequel, the subsequent remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, are not particularly pertinent to the subject we are discussing. We are discussing the issue of whether draftees shall be sent to South Vietnam without consent of Congress. I do not question the gallantry or the courage, and all the rest of the superlative qualities, of our men who are there. That is admitted. Nobody questions that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How about the draftees who are there now? Suppose they were confronted by overwhelming odds, by an overwhelming number of men who came down from North Vietnam and surrounded them as happened to the French at Dienbien

phu. This country is 190 million strong. Does the Senator propose to leave those men there when they are faced with superior numbers, and say we will not send them any help?

Mr. GRUENING. That is not the issue. They should not have been sent there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But they are there. The Senator would not have sent them there. He voted against the resolution. But they are there. They are our own boys. Are we to leave them there to be surrounded by superior enemy forces?

Mr. GRUENING. Nobody is going to leave them there. That is not a relevant argument.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is saying, "We will send no more boys." If they are surrounded, what will we do?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I say Congress ought to stand up and be on record, and if they want to send more boys, vote against the amendment. My idea is that Congress should be on record on an issue of this importance. The only thing on record is the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which many Senators voted for not knowing what it meant.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us see what the Senator's amendment provides. Am I to understand the Senator is saying that no boys will go over there unless they volunteer? So if a wife or mother says, "Don't go, don't go, particularly don't go, because if you do nobody will help you," what do we do with the boys who are left over there? Does the Senator want to get the boys out of there as fast as they can get out, turn tail, or will they have to stay there without help and die for their country which is capable of sending 100 times their number if need be? Are we going to say that we are not going to help men in the 1st Division, the 1st Cavalry, the 1st Marine, the Airborne troops, if they are faced with an overwhelming force, and, if they are surrounded, leave them, as the French left their troops at Dienbienphu, or would the Senator rather say that we are a nation of 190 million people, and an enemy should not take us on unless he realizes that we are strong and have the courage to stand behind our fighting men?

Mr. GRUENING. We have more than 300,000 troops in Europe, who are trained, many of whom have enlisted, and they could be sent. That is what an explanation of this proposed amendment will show. Nobody wants to do what the able Senator from Louisiana is suggesting. Nobody wants to leave those boys there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was at Fort Polk a couple of weeks ago. I saw some of these boys being trained. Many of them were 20 years old. I felt a little sorry for them, thinking how young they seemed. But then I did not feel so sorry when I remembered that my crew which volunteered to take the first boat of its kind to the beaches of south France in World War II, was about the same age at the time.

As a reservist myself, when I saw some of these young men, sorry though I may have felt, I would not want to take any of them on in a free-for-all fight, because

they are to the man well able to take care of themselves.

They are not timorous. They are satisfied they will be successful.

The only thing that would worry them would be to have Congress adopt a law that would result in leaving them there and having them decimated, as the French were in Dienbienphu, when the French Chamber of Deputies did not have the courage to draft men to send over there.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like merely to reply that there would be no question of the united, 100-percent support of any action necessary to defend our country. We are not, in my judgment, defending our country. We have barged into a country which, we are told, has had 96,000 desertions from their own forces, and to defend that country we are sending our own troops to take the place of the deserters from their own country. That is all I am talking about.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. I rise to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. GRUENING. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Well, then I shall ask my question of one and all. I had the honor at one time of wearing the red "1" patch of the First Division on my left shoulder. The boys who belong to that division now are fighting in Vietnam. They were sent there by the Government of the United States. What I am interested in is giving those boys whatever help they need. What I want to know is when I am going to be given the opportunity to vote to aid them.

If the Senator from Louisiana can answer that question, I would certainly appreciate it, because I have two speaking engagements in North Carolina tomorrow. I am supposed to attend a Jackson Day dinner in North Carolina on Saturday also. I wonder whether I should stay here in order to vote to aid those boys who wear the red "1" on their left shoulder, or whether I can keep those speaking engagements, and attend the Jackson Day dinner.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish I could say to the Senator that we will vote tonight, or right now. However, those who oppose the position of their Nation do not appear to be willing to vote. They want to make more speeches. They certainly have that privilege, as the Senator well knows.

From a parliamentary standpoint, the amendment has not yet been offered. I wish the amendment were offered, so that I could speak against it and vote against it. It is inappropriate to speak against an amendment that has not been offered, and certainly one cannot vote against it until it has been offered.

One cannot even move to table the amendment until it is offered. I hope the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. He said he wants to go on record on this subject. I want to go on record, too.

Mr. GRUENING. It will be offered.

Mr. ERVIN. I share the position of the Senator from Louisiana on the

amendment that has been suggested by my friend from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. Personally, I can see no reason for drafting men into the armed services if they are not to be sent to fight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My reaction to this whole matter is shared by the people of the State of Louisiana. Many of them are confused as to how we got there, but they say, "While I do not understand how we came to be there, the fact is we are there."

My people say that we should either go all out or get out. The people say they prefer to go all out. The men have not been defeated, and they say that if our Nation's honor is committed, go ahead and fight. They believe in fighting to win, not fighting to lose. Americans do not surrender if they have not been defeated.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have not supported many of the foreign aid programs, which were passed on the theory that someone else will fight for us when the chips are down. I have not been in favor of the United States policing the entire universe.

The question before Congress now, as I see it, is not whether we ought to be in South Vietnam. As Grover Cleveland would say, we are confronted by a condition, not a theory.

We are there. Our boys are there. As I see it, the American Government and the Congress should give them all of the support they need. When all is said, there is only one of three things we can do. The first is to settle the controversy in South Vietnam by negotiation. Apparently the President has been willing to negotiate with anybody on the face of the earth, but nobody who can put an end to the fighting is willing to negotiate. Hence, negotiation is out the window for the time being. We have only two alternatives remaining: one is to fight and the other is to withdraw.

I believe that if we were to withdraw from South Vietnam, all of Asia would fall into the hands of the Communists. We then would be confronted by the questions of whether we would stand and fight in Japan, whether we would stand and fight in the Philippines, or whether we would stand and fight in Malaysia or in Australia, or whether we would ultimately have to fight, on the American mainland to defend our liberty.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois stepped out. He may be back shortly.

I believe the Senator asked a proper question to get an answer as to what the Senator thinks the prospects are so far as the schedule of Senators is concerned on this debate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I had a conversation this morning, at their request, as to what we thought the prospects are of having a final vote on this matter.

I am certain the Senator from Louisiana would not think it improper for me to disclose that it was pointed out by the minority leader—and that is why I wish he were here—that several Senators on their side and several Senators on this side, whom we all know about, are not going to be here tomorrow and Saturday.

I had said yesterday, and I meant it then and I mean it now, that if the bill went through its regular course of debate, the probabilities were that we could vote by the end of this week. I thought so then. I do wish to say that after the colloquy on the floor of the Senate yesterday I was quite surprised to learn that there are substantially a larger number of speeches to be given on the bill than I was aware of yesterday, when I said in the regular course of debate that we could probably vote this week.

But even taking those speeches into consideration, I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina, I am just as certain as I can be of anything that has uncertainty connected with it—and in debate on the floor of the Senate there is always some uncertainty as to the length of debate—I cannot imagine going beyond Tuesday night on the assumption that because of the absentees on Saturday there probably would not be a Saturday session. But that has not been decided yet, as the acting majority leader will probably tell us in a moment.

Inasmuch as I have been involved in this debate as one who is considered to be among those opposed to the bill, the Senate is entitled to know my plans. My plans are to make my major speech tomorrow. As soon as we call for a quorum it will be a signal for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to come to the Chamber to make his major speech this afternoon. I believe there are one or two other speeches today.

Then, I intend to present my amendment on Monday because I have been assured Senators will be back on Monday. I am willing to have my amendment brought up on Monday.

The difficult matter, the so-called delicate matter, is that some would like to have a unanimous-consent agreement to fix the time to vote. I will not agree to that. A matter of the historic importance of this bill should be handled in regular debate. I will be no party to dilatory tactics. If there ever is any indication that anybody is engaging in filibuster tactics, I will sign a cloture petition.

After this matter is decided and Congress speaks, there is no question that we have to proceed to see to it that our supply lines are maintained.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana will not think that I am in any way violating any confidence when I say that the information presented to us from the administration is that right now there is no shortage of supplies. But one cannot go on indefinitely without having shortages of supplies, and no one could justify that situation.

Limiting myself to the matter of schedule, it is my suggestion for whatever it is worth, that we proceed with debate today and tomorrow. I will offer my amendment on Monday, and we can

proceed with whatever discussion there may be. I will have bespoken myself on the amendment on Monday. It will take me only 5 or 10 minutes to recapitulate.

Then, I assume the Senator from Alaska will offer his amendment. There may be other amendments. I do not know. I cannot imagine not having this disposed of by Tuesday.

Mr. ERVIN. I fully understand the position of the Senator from Oregon. I believe that the safety of our Republic is dependent upon Senators standing on the floor of the Senate and expressing their honest convictions concerning matters pending before the Senate.

For this reason, I do not advocate prematurely setting any time for voting.

I believe that so long as a Senator feels he has something to say which his conscious dictates, it is not only his right, but his duty, to say it.

In view of what the Senator has said, could we reach some agreement not to vote before Monday? Such an agreement would not forestall debate or interfere in any way with adequate presentation on both sides of this matter?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the suggestion that the Senator from Louisiana urges most strongly is that if Senators wish to make speeches to please come to the Chamber and make the speeches.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been most considerate on many occasions when he felt that he wanted to discuss something at considerable length and felt that it might inconvenience other Senators in getting on with bills that they were trying to have passed. He would, on occasion, come to the Chamber on a Friday afternoon and talk at considerable length.

I remember when the Senator from Oregon was the lone spokesman for the Independent Party of the Senate. I volunteered to sit in the Chamber on Friday afternoons because I know a lot of people like to go away and have a long weekend—as part of the TGIF crowd, “thank God it's Friday”—and like to get away ahead of the crowd to take a weekend rest.

The Senator from Louisiana volunteered to preside and to listen to the Senator's speeches. I thought they were good speeches. I learned something from them. Even when I did not agree with the Senator from Oregon, his speeches were still good speeches for his point of view. He made his record without impeding the conduct of the Nation's business.

It is not within the power of the majority leader or the minority leader to compel a large number of Senators to be present to hear speeches. If Senators become interested and their attention is attracted, perhaps they will stay; but it is not in the province of the leaders to compel other Senators to come to the Chamber to make speeches or to hear speeches made by other Senators.

The speeches appear in the Record. If a Senator makes a good speech, other Senators will read it. If it is not a good speech, they will make short shrift of it. If it is an impressive speech, it will attract the attention of the Nation, even

though a relatively small number of Senators were in the Chamber.

The debate on the pending bill has been going on for many days. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. We have been debating it for 7 days on the Senate floor. If Senators desire to make speeches, they should come to the Chamber and make them. They ought to be willing to make them today or tomorrow.

If a filibuster is not taking place, Senators should not insist that a quorum be present to hear their speeches on Saturday. Senators ought to come to the Chamber and make their speeches. The bill has been before the Senate for 2 weeks. It was announced 3 days prior to its consideration that it would be the next measure to be taken up. Senators should not require additional time to compose their remarks; they ought to be ready to come to the Chamber and speak on behalf of their position. If they wish to take a stand one way or the other, they ought to come to the Chamber and take it, so that the Senate can reach a vote.

The bill was taken up following the conclusion of a successful filibuster. Now Senators are holding up the consideration of other important bills. Another urgent bill will shortly be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The tax bill now in the Committee on Finance will be reported next week. The Government loses \$8 million every day that Congress fails to pass the tax bill that will help to pay not only the cost of the war in Vietnam, but also the cost of the Government in general.

So once again, I say that if Senators wish to make speeches, they ought to come to the Chamber and make them. I hope the Senate will remain in session until 7 o'clock tonight. I shall endeavor to be present. Senators who wish to make speeches should not continue to hold up authorizations and other measures that are need to help our boys who are fighting for our country today and our allies who are seeking to come to our aid.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with anything the Senator from Louisiana has said. I do not desire to make a speech on the floor of the Senate, but I have assumed the obligation of making two speeches in North Carolina tomorrow. All I am trying to find out is whether I can go to North Carolina and make the speeches, or whether I should cancel them.

Furthermore, I told the Senator from Louisiana a moment ago that as one who at one time had the honor of wearing the big red “1” on my left shoulder, I am ready to vote at any time the circumstances permit to send aid to the boys of my old division who are fighting in Vietnam.

I am also interested in getting some strength for the Democratic Party in North Carolina. A Jackson Day dinner is scheduled in Raleigh on Saturday. I am trying to find out from the Senator from Oregon whether, in his judgment, there is any possibility of a vote being taken on this issue, or any amendment to it, prior to Monday.

I merely wondered whether the Senator from Louisiana, as the assistant majority leader, and also as acting majority leader, would not reach a unanimous-consent agreement that there would not be a vote on this issue before Monday. If he should do so, I could make some speeches, not on the Senate floor, but in the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot give the Senator from North Carolina any such assurance, but I can make a pretty good prediction of what is likely to happen in the next couple of days. I cannot give the Senator any assurance because, so far as I am concerned, we ought to be voting on the measure. If Senators will seek to press for a vote to bring an end to talking, so that people around the world will know where we stand on this issue.

But it is not within my power to make Senators stop talking. That being the case, we are in for more conversation. The Senator from Oregon has informed us that he wishes to speak on this subject. I heard by the grapevine that he is thinking about talking for 10 hours. I am fully confident that he can talk that long; I have heard him do so. If the Senator from Oregon plans to make a 10-hour speech tomorrow, my view is that the Senator from North Carolina can safely go home.

Mr. MORSE. That grapevine had no grapes on it. I have no idea where anyone got the idea that I was planning to speak for 10 hours.

Mr. ERVIN. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can help me out of a quandary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no vote on the pending measure of any amendment to the pending measure prior to Monday of next week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We discussed the subject at great length this morning. The distinguished Senator from Oregon was as cooperative as I thought he could be under the circumstances. I read into the conversation an assurance that there will certainly be no vote on the bill before Monday.

I discussed the situation with the acting majority leader at considerable length not only today, but yesterday, as well. On the basis of that conversation, I am quite sure that there will be no vote before Monday.

I have taken unto myself the liberty to say to Senators on the minority side that they are free to go home this weekend to make speeches, to pursue their campaigns, and to do what ever else is necessary, with a free and easy conscience, and with no apprehension that there will be a vote.

Mr. ERVIN. I have the assurance of the Senator from Illinois; but I find it impossible to get the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana. Under these circumstances, I intend to back up those who are fighting the war in Vietnam.

They are not forsaking their posts of duty; I do not feel, under the circumstances, that I can forsake my post of duty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Oregon were most considerate of the dilemma that confronts the minority leader. It is one of those things that happen about once in 25 years. They have been most sympathetic, almost to the point where they wept over my difficulties. I am sure that that weeping will endure for more than a night, as the Scripture does not quite say.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from North Carolina is one of the most diligent attendants and most indefatigable Members of this body. I am sure he realizes that we who wish to pass the measure should try to bring it to a vote as soon as we can. The Senator himself has so indicated by saying that the boys in Vietnam are not working bankers' hours; they are not taking off weekends. If they took off weekends, the Communists would likely clobber them on those weekends. The fact that American soldiers are fighting in Vietnam means that we should try to back them up; we should press as far as we can with diligence toward the passage of the bill.

If the Senator from North Carolina feels that it is necessary for him to return to his State, I suggest that we will try to obtain a pair for him, or that we will try to have him return before the vote, in the event that a vote appears to be imminent. We shall cooperate with him in every possible way that we can. At the same time, I feel that we ought, to the best of our ability, seek to bring the discussion to an end without denying any Senator his right to make a speech, so that we may then move ahead with the Nation's business.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Louisiana has said. However, his statement does not give me any assurance that I shall not miss a vote on a bill which I deem to be a bill of major importance.

It seems to me, from what the Senator from Illinois has said, that this is a situation in which the Senator from Louisiana might very well adopt the wise policy of cooperating with the inevitable and agreeing that there will not be any vote prior to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been trying for the last 8 years to restore the respectability of the live pair. Back in the old days, Senators used to have standing pairs. If a Senator found it necessary to be absent for a week, he would make arrangements with another Senator. When a vote was had, a Senator from the other side of the aisle would simply say: "I have a pair with such and such a Senator. I do not know how he would vote, but since we are paired, I withhold my vote." The pair would be so recorded. Neither side would be recorded as to how they would have voted. Neither of the Senators voted at all.

That would be taking it to the extreme, but it would seem to me that, with the

telephone service being what it is today, we should be able to say that if a Senator has commitments which would keep him away, we could accord him a live pair, and that pair could be recorded as if he were present and voting.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I appreciate that. However, those in Vietnam cannot get a live pair. I cannot see anything to do under the circumstances other than to cancel out my plans. My primary duty is to remain on the Senate floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My calculated guess would be that we shall not vote. However, I hope that we shall.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the prospect stares us in the face as clearly as anything can that we shall not vote until Monday. I have tried to cooperate. I could bring up my amendment on Monday and start on Monday.

The minority leader has already said that he has advised people on that side of the aisle that if they have engagements over the weekend they should feel free to keep the engagements, if I understood him correctly. I believe that is the meaning of what he has said.

As the Senator knows, several Senators on this side of the aisle have already made it clear that they cannot be present on Saturday. Some of these Senators want to get away tomorrow. I am not so sure that we can get a quorum on Saturday.

I believe that we shall save more time in the long run if we go through with our regular schedule on tomorrow and adjourn or recess until Monday. We could find out when the Senators will get back. I believe that most of them will be back by Monday morning. We could go ahead on Monday or Tuesday and get this out of the way.

It is for the Senator from Louisiana to decide. However, in my judgment, under these circumstances, there will be other Senators who will want to be present. I do not believe that we would profit by holding those Senators here who have other engagements.

I believe that we should go over to Monday.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the view of the Senator from Oregon. However, I have noted that when an announcement has been made in the past that there would not be a vote or that nothing would happen, Senators who had intended to make a speech would tend to postpone their speeches until the Senate reconvened. They did this because they felt there would not be the proper atmosphere when many Senators were at home, and people could not care less about what was said on the Senate floor.

If we proceed on the basis that a vote is not likely but might happen, the interest in the debate will be greater. There would be a better chance of persuading Senators to go ahead and make their speeches.

I know that we shall not vote right now. I cherish that hope, but I know that it will not happen.

I should prefer for Senators to make their speeches. I should hope that we might vote tonight. If we do not do so, I shall accept that result. However, if I were to announce that there would not be a vote, Senators would go home saying: "I shall wait until we are ready to vote, and then I shall make my speech."

That being the case, I hope that we shall persevere in the matter and come to a vote.

Senators can find out what will happen in the next day or so. The prospects of voting soon do not appear to be very good.

I do not want to make a commitment that we will not vote at this time because Senators would put off their speeches. I hope that Senators will make their speeches, and, I am not trying to cut off any Senator from making speeches, but the Nation cannot wait on them indefinitely.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I understand the situation of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. However, I also understand the situation of the acting majority leader. Is the acting majority leader able to give the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators assurance as to whether it is his intention to attempt to call the Senate into session on Saturday? It seems to me that would clear the matter up.

If I were acting in the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should not make an agreement either. This is too vital a matter. As has been stated, the boys out there do not have any pairs.

I am sure that it would be of assistance to the Senator from North Carolina if it were known that we would not have a Saturday session.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have sometimes given assurance to Senators on my own, not as the majority whip or a acting majority leader. I recall one occasion when I was making a rather lengthy speech on the floor of the Senate at a time when I was outraged about what was being passed through this body. Some Senators said they had engagements. They asked me whether they could leave. I told them: "Go right ahead. I will give you my firm assurance that nothing will happen before midnight tonight."

Senators can assure one another that before a vote is had on Monday, they will make a speech and hold the floor for such a length of time that no vote will occur.

I do not want to take the responsibility of making such a commitment at this time. This is an important measure.

Those who say that we must not vote may go ahead and make their speeches. I hope that no one will tell us that we should not vote because they have other commitments that we should hold up an important measure such as this until they can make a speech somewhere or leave for the week end and then come back.

I shall cooperate in every way that I can and try to give the necessary notice for Senators to return.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished acting majority leader. I do not know what the prospects are of a vote on the bill. I hope that we might have a vote at least on some of the amendments to the bill this afternoon or this evening.

What are the plans of the Senator as to the length of the session today?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope that we shall be in session until 7 o'clock tonight. We could at least get some more speeches out of the way. I hope that Senators will make their plans, in the event we have a quorum call as late as 6 o'clock, to be available.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, no one is more dedicated to the right of full and free debate in the Senate than is the Senator from Georgia. However, I hope that the Senator will give us an opportunity to have ample, full, and free debate. I hope, if we are not going to vote this week, that we will have lengthy sessions next week and that we will get away from this rather desultory system that we have employed until now of addressing ourselves to this bill, and will actually get down to offering some amendments and bringing them to a vote.

This is a very important measure. It does not loom large in the fiscal sense when compared with some others that we see. However, some items involved in the bill are of tremendous importance to the more than 300,000 men who are engaged in this conflict in the Far East.

I hope that the Senator will, as acting majority leader, notify Senators to prepare themselves next week for lengthy sessions in an effort to bring about a vote on at least some of these amendments.

I would not cut off any Senator from the right to have full and free expression here. I doubt whether we will change the minds of many Senators.

We have carried this issue—in accordance with the purpose of those who oppose the measure—to the American people. They have had some week or ten days in which to make up their minds. They have had all of this matter gone over in detail by conflicting witnesses on the television, the radio, and in the press at great length.

I believe that the jury is about ready to render its verdict, as far as the people are concerned, if counsel for the opposing party will let us have a chance to vote.

I hope that the Senator will serve notice that if we do not get a vote this afternoon, we will have lengthy sessions next week until we are at least able to have a test somewhere along the line as to the sentiment in the Senate on this measure.

Until now many of those who are fighting and killing our boys in South Vietnam might be of the opinion that Congress is likely to adopt a defeatist at-

titude and refuse to support our troops there and that it might be necessary to scuttle and run, leaving Vietnam under other than honorable conditions.

It would be very tragic for that impression to become widespread among those who are waging war against our allies, the South Vietnamese, and the force that we have sent to support the South Vietnamese. It might mean that the lives of American boys will be spared if we can get the message home to Vietnam that we have put our hands to the plow and do not intend to turn back. If we give them more indication of the tremendous military power of this country, I think we might see a greater willingness to transfer this fight from the rice paddies and the jungles to the conference table.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is our intention to have long sessions if this matter has not been voted on by Monday. I hoped that we could vote on it by Monday, but I do not see that in prospect. I hope that Senators will not make plans that will keep them from being here past the dinner hour. We can arrange to have dinner available here in the Capitol, and Senators can make their plans accordingly, and keep the Senate in session long hours starting on Monday.

If this Senator is in charge as acting majority leader at that time, that will be the course he will pursue; and I hope that the minority leader will give us his cooperation, and will recognize that on tomorrow and on Saturday, it will be very difficult to keep the Senate in session long hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the acting majority leader is correct; and we will cooperate for reasonably long hours.

As I indicated yesterday, I think the time for discussion is passed and we should be taking action. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Georgia; that is the reason I did not think debate could be concluded this week, and I thought a Saturday session would be rather abortive, because there are a good many Senators gone already, the number will increase very significantly this afternoon, and keeping a quorum here on Saturday will be no easy chore.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As I said earlier, I think we ought to start with morning sessions on Monday, we ought to go right through with morning sessions, and stay a reasonable period each night, until we get this out of the way.

The only difference I have with my acting majority leader, and I have not been able to persuade him, is that I do not think you help at all by simply saying, "I am not going to tell you that you can go." They are going to go; we are going to lose a lot of Senators, in my judgment, between now and Friday night.

Get these speeches out of the way today and tomorrow; we will have most of the major speeches out of the way by tomorrow night, and we can start then with amendments and short speeches on the amendments Monday and Tuesday.

But I say, most respectfully, I do not think you are helping to solve this problem by not being willing to agree to say, "We will start on Monday with the amendments; get your speeches over Thursday and Friday, and forget about a Saturday meeting." I do not think we can get a live quorum on Saturday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

During the delivery of Mr. GRUENING'S speech,

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire with the understanding that his remarks will follow mine and that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am not surprised to note in a news story carried in the Washington Daily News yesterday that:

The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Committee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

There may be justification for making this entire report secret and classified. It might well disclose and specify situations which should not be known to this Nation's enemies and rivals.

I wish to emphasize, however, that this is just one further instance of the cloak of secrecy that is thrown around both our military and diplomatic situation throughout the world and particularly with respect to the Vietnam war.

Obviously, any facts relating to military plans and movements should be closely guarded. I, for one, do not wish to know them.

However, there is an aspect of our present situation from the standpoint of Senators and Members of Congress that would be amusing if it did not involve such grave and critical matters. I recently listened to a pep talk addressed to a group of Senators and Congressmen by a high official in our Government. He stressed the need of our Nation's presenting a united front. He urged us to impress our people with the justice of our cause, the efficiency and wisdom with which the war is being pursued, and the prospect of ultimate victory. I believe that his closing words were "go out and preach the gospel." Of course, that is based on the admonition of the Master to the Apostles. He said, "Go preach the Gospel," but he did not add, "remember it's all classified."

Members of the Senate are permitted to read the testimony presented to committees and subcommittees in executive session. Obviously, it is all classified, and once a Senator reads it his lips are sealed on every detail. He may be subject to suspicion if he uses any of the information after having received it from some other source.

This shroud of secrecy has prevailed ever since Secretary McNamara took over the Department of Defense. It pertained to matters of military housekeeping even before Vietnam. I have never read the

recommendations of a committee to the Defense Secretary which led to an order to phase out an important installation in my State. After considerable difficulty I was told I could do so, but every word of it was classified. I cannot imagine that conclusions about the relative advantages of climate, labor availability, accessibility, and costs as between Portsmouth, N.H., and Philadelphia would fortify the Soviets or even particularly interest them. I refused to read the report because I would thereafter be gagged on every detail.

Our people want answers on the broad aspects of the situation which confronts us. They want general policies justified. The letters that pour into my office show frustration, bewilderment, and doubt. How can we reassure them or even respond to them if part of the facts are kept from us and our lips are sealed on the rest?

They are not satisfied with a simple statement that the President is the Commander in Chief, has access to all the facts, and we are sure he is thinking hard about them.

Referring to the report on the condition of our defense that the Pentagon has just suppressed, Moscow and Peking probably already know most of it. Some of it should be revealed to the American people. Remember the Truman committee, with the express permission of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, investigated and reported on our defense posture beginning right after Pearl Harbor and continuing throughout World War II.

I strongly suspect that if this report is given to the people, it will be a revelation of glaring errors by the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Pentagon Suppresses Hill Report on Army," written by Jack Steele and published in the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1966.

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

PROBERS FOUND SERIOUS FAILINGS AT HOME AND ABROAD—PENTAGON SUPPRESSES HILL REPORT ON ARMY

(By Jack Steele)

The Defense Department has censored in its entirety a highly critical report by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which charges the Army has serious deficiencies in manpower, training, and equipment.

The secret report, according to informed sources, raises serious questions about the Army's readiness—in view of these shortages—to cope with both a further acceleration of the war in Vietnam and the Nation's other worldwide military commitments.

The report is based on an inquiry begun by the subcommittee last autumn. Its investigators toured Vietnam and Europe and inspected Army camps and training centers in this country.

SANITIZING

Completed more than 2 months ago the report was sent to the Defense Department for customary security review. Usually, the Department deletes what it rules is classified information from such reports and clears

what is left for public release—a process known as "sanitizing."

But in this case, the Department has stamped the entire report "classified" and informed the subcommittee none of its contents can be made public—presumably on grounds it would give vital information, as well as aid and comfort, to present or potential enemies.

Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, is reportedly still battling with Secretary Robert S. McNamara and other Defense officials to get the report cleared—thus far without success.

SAID NOTHING

Senator STENNIS and other subcommittee members have said nothing publicly about the Pentagon's suppression of the report—although its investigation of the Army's readiness to meet the Vietnam war buildup was well publicized when it was started last September.

But some subcommittee members are known to be irked over what they regard as the Defense Department's use of its power to classify vital military secrets to cover up past mistakes which cut the Army too thin in both men and equipment to meet an emergency.

Some privately accuse Mr. McNamara of holding up release of the report until the Army can claim that the manpower, training, and equipment shortages cited in the report have been corrected.

MORE CRITICAL

They note that, while the subcommittee's investigation began nearly 6 months ago, the Army deficiencies it uncovered may be even more critical today as a result of the rapid buildup of U.S. ground forces in Vietnam and the recent acceleration of the war.

Senator STENNIS, without mentioning the investigation or report, has called in recent weeks for both stepped up draft calls and at least a partial call-up of Reserve and National Guard forces to meet fast-growing manpower needs.

In a speech last Friday, he warned that the buildup in Vietnam should not be permitted to weaken U.S. forces elsewhere in the world to the point where they might not be able to respond to aggression if it should occur.

Senator STENNIS and Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the subcommittee's parent Senate Armed Services Committee also have taken the lead in urging the Senate to act quickly on the President's request for additional funds for the Vietnam war.

Mr. McNamara and other Defense officials presumably will be questioned closely about the Army's readiness at closed-door hearings of the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees on next year's Defense budget.

But all such testimony presumably will be heavily censored before reports on these hearings are made public.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a distinguished contribution to the debate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2791, a bill to authorize the supplemental appropriation of \$4.8 billion for military procurement made necessary by the fighting in South Vietnam.

This measure, as it has been outlined for us by the experienced, respected, and wise chairman of the Committee on

February 24, 1966

Armed Services, would approve the appropriation of funds for the purchase of weapons, for military construction projects, and for various research, development, test, and evaluation programs. Of the \$4.8 billion involved, \$3.4 billion is needed immediately for aircraft, missiles, tracked vehicles, ammunition, spare parts, and other types of hardware used by our fighting men in southeast Asia. A large proportion of this equipment is required to replace materials already destroyed or expended in combat.

Every member of the Committee on Armed Services, after hearing expert testimony, agreed that this authorization was vital to our troops on the battlefield, if they are to carry out the missions assigned to them. It is imperative to eliminate the shortages that now exist and that will worsen if not quickly remedied. If we delay further in the passage of this authorization, we will have to assume responsibility for an increased number of American wounded and dead.

Mr. President, the Senate has been deliberating over S. 2791 since Wednesday of last week. During that time, several Senators have pointed out the fact that there is no language in this measure either defending or challenging the current policies of the United States in southeast Asia. All that this particular legislation seeks to do is to make possible the appropriation of the moneys required to maintain military personnel already operating in a perilous and dangerous combat zone. It would assure that those men have enough of the best equipment which we back home, can and must supply, in order that they can do the jobs assigned to them by their grateful Government.

Is this not the least that we can do for those men who daily risk their lives? Is it too much to ask that we curb our tongues, suppress our desire to demonstrate our knowledge with respect to foreign policy matters, at least until this bread, butter, and guns bill is out of the way? Would the sacrifice we would be making be anywhere equivalent to that which our boys overseas are making? I think not.

Today over 200,000 American troops are stationed in South Vietnam; an additional 100,000 are based in Thailand and patrol the waters off the coast of southeast Asia. These young men are not architects of foreign policy. They are not privileged to sit in the councils that guide this Nation's destiny. They are given orders by their superior officers, and in the highest tradition of service to their country, they carry those orders out as efficiently and effectively as they can with that equipment which they have at hand. I say again, we supply that equipment, and it is up to us, the Congress, to make certain that the soldiers and sailors, airmen and marines, have in hand the tools to accomplish their assigned tasks with a minimum of personal risk and a maximum of effectiveness.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I could stand to bear my share of the burden of guilt that would fall on the shoulders of Congress should we fail to discharge our responsibility to those men in southeast Asia who look to us for lifegiving support.

For this reason alone, S. 2791 merits immediate and unequivocal Senate approval. The chairman and members of the Committee on Armed Services have sculptured this measure so that it is able to stand by itself, divorced from questions of our overall policy in Vietnam.

But while I have the utmost respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, I personally cannot dissociate this bill from the broader aspect of our commitment to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, there is no question that Congress could bring about a direct confrontation with the President of the United States over the policy currently being followed in southeast Asia by refusing to raise the money required to maintain our military positions in South Vietnam. But, were we to do so, let us remember that we would make it impossible for the President to carry out his constitutional responsibilities of directing this Nation's foreign policy, and his equally awesome responsibility of being this Nation's Commander in Chief in time of limited or of total war. Should this irresponsible course be followed in this particular instance, it is clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the real losers in such a clash would be the young men serving in Danang, in Chu Lai, in Cam Ranh Bay, the men of the 1st Cavalry, the men of the 3d Marine Division, the pilots of helicopters and war planes who—deprived of the means to wage battle—would be quickly driven into the sea by the onslaught of a determined and implacable enemy.

Mr. President, it has been stated by some that the consideration of S. 2791 offers the Senate a prime opportunity to question and attempt to change our policies and programs in Vietnam. They believe this body should extend its deliberations to criticize every facet of a policy that has already been scrupulously examined time and again by three Presidents, a host of administration officials, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A few Senators would have us review again a course of action this country has been embarked upon since we adopted the program of aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947, and—more specifically—since we put our hand and our seal to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in 1955.

Even before this pending appropriation authorization was brought up, there had been countless hours of speeches delivered in this Chamber with respect to our position in Vietnam. In addition, there have been many days of nationally televised hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and every expert, every Senator, and every columnist has had his say, or has had his opportunity to have his say. With respect to those hearings, it seems to me, Mr. President, that from the discussions and the thousands of words which have been written by every real and every self-appointed expert on South Vietnam, there have emerged only two conclusions. First, that the President and the critics of his policies in Vietnam, in truth and in fact, share basic common goals;

second, that the critics of the President's foreign policies have been able to find no shorter, no easier, no more logical paths to the goals which we all seek than the ones which the President is today pursuing.

It goes without saying that today everybody wants a negotiated peace, and the President, if my memory serves me correctly, publicly and clearly made the point that he wanted a negotiated peace—so long as we did not have one which would sell out the rights of the South Vietnamese people or abandon our principles in a wild and hysterical pursuit of peace at any price. It is obvious to all that the alternatives of abject surrender and retreat, on the one hand, and all-out nuclear war, on the other, are unacceptable.

So far as I can determine, no one, from the President on down, likes the situation in which we find ourselves at the present time nor the situation which started developing in South Vietnam in 1954, when the United States made its first commitment to the people of that country. Surely, the revered and respected President John F. Kennedy did not like the situation which he inherited in 1961, when the Communists began stepping up their activities against the people of South Vietnam.

I should like to read some excerpts from the public papers of President Kennedy with respect to this subject.

On September 12, 1963, at a news conference, President Kennedy was asked:

Mr. President, in view of the prevailing confusion, is it possible to state today just what this Government's policy is toward the current Government of South Vietnam?

President Kennedy responded as follows:

I think I have stated what my view is and we are for those things and those policies which help win the war there. That is why some 25,000 Americans have traveled 10,000 miles to participate in that struggle. What helps to win the war, we support; what interferes with the war effort, we oppose. I have already made it clear that any action by either government which may handicap the winning of the war is inconsistent with our policy or our objectives. This is the test which I think every agency and official of the U.S. Government must apply to all of our actions, and we shall be applying that test in various ways in the coming months, although I do not think it desirable to state all of our views at this time. I think they will be made more clear as time goes on.

But we have a very simple policy in that area, I think. In some ways I think the Vietnamese people and ourselves agree: we want the war to be won, the Communists to be contained, and the Americans to go home. That is our policy. I am sure it is the policy of the people of Vietnam. But we are not there to see a war lost, and we will follow the policy which I have indicated today of advancing those causes and issues which help win the war.

That was a statement by President Kennedy in 1963. It was about as unequivocal a position as anyone could take. That was the President's policy then; so far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, that is my policy today.

Quoting again from the public papers of President Kennedy, I read from a

message to President Diem on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the Republic of Vietnam. The message is dated October 23, 1963, and is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the American people I extend greetings and best wishes to the Republic of Vietnam on its eighth anniversary. On this occasion I wish once again to express the admiration of the American people for the unflinching courage of the Vietnamese people in their valiant struggle against the continuing efforts of communism to undermine and destroy Vietnamese independence. The United States of America has confidence in the future of the Republic of Vietnam, in its ability both to overcome the present Communist threat to their independence, and to determine their own destiny. We look forward to the day when peace is restored and when the Vietnamese people can live in freedom and prosperity.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

I emphasize this line in particular:

The United States of America has confidence in the future of the Republic of Vietnam, in its ability both to overcome the present Communist threat to their independence, and to determine their own destiny.

It would appear to me that the President of the United States had no intention of imposing on the people of South Vietnam any government that was not of their own choosing.

I cite another quotation from President Kennedy's papers. At a press conference on November 14, 1963, the President was asked:

Would you give us your appraisal of the situation in South Vietnam now, since the coup, and the purposes for the Honolulu conference?

The President replied as follows:

THE PRESIDENT. Because we do have a new situation there, and a new government, we hope, an increased effort in the war. The purpose of the meeting at Honolulu—Ambassador Lodge will be there, General Harbins will be there, Secretary McNamara, and others, and then, as you know, later Ambassador Lodge will come here—is to attempt to assess the situation: what American policy should be, and what our aid policy should be, how we can intensify the struggle, how we can bring Americans out of there.

Now, that is our object, to bring Americans home, permit the South Vietnamese to maintain themselves as a free and independent country, and permit democratic forces within the country to operate—which they can, of course, much more freely when the assault from the inside, and which is manipulated from the north, is ended. So the purpose of the meeting in Honolulu is how to pursue these objectives.

Under President Kennedy, in order to meet our commitments to SEATO and to the people of South Vietnam, we were forced to raise the level of our assistance and our manpower from a few hundred to over 25,000.

Surely President Johnson did not like the situation which he inherited in late 1963 and early 1964, when the Communists, sensing and smelling a military victory, increased their pressure and their manpower moving from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. Again, more men were required to meet our commitments to South Vietnam and to freedom.

It was obvious, and, in fact, I know of no men—even in the circles of retired military personnel—who contend that we would not have been driven out of South Vietnam and the people of South Vietnam subjugated to the cruel tyranny of the Communists, had we not increased our manpower and our efforts to the level of above 200,000.

I should think that every responsible individual understands that America cannot simply abandon pledges that date back to the administration of Dwight Eisenhower. We cannot lay down our arms and abandon the people of South Vietnam to a bloody slavery merely because it has become bothersome, expensive, or even difficult for us.

Surely we have walked far beyond the "last mile" in quest of an honorable peace in southeast Asia. American envoys have traveled to all the major world capitals with which we maintain relations. In addition, they have gone to the capitals of smaller nations, and they have even made contacts with countries with which we do not normally have diplomatic relations in an effort to find some pathway, some partly opened door which might lead to the table where negotiations for an honorable peace could be undertaken.

At considerable risk to its men and to its tactical position, the United States ceased bombing North Vietnam for 37 days while the first trust of the peace offensive was launched. The only response to this pause was a demonstrable and provable increase in the infiltration of Communist men and arms from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, and an increase in the abuse and the invective poured upon this Government and up its President.

Mr. President, the government of Hanoi in the north, which is the father and sponsor of the Vietcong in the south, has left no doubt that it will continue its aggression until it has achieved its aim of conquering South Vietnam and driving out the United States. They will pursue that course until they are finally convinced that we have placed a military victory over South Vietnam beyond their reach.

Because we have seen that the carrot alone has no effect, we have been constrained to reapply the stick. We have had to match force with force, to meet aggression with steadfastness and determination. Our policy has revolved around this one, steady principle—that we will do whatever is required of us to preserve the right of self-determination of the people of South Vietnam.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations said on August 6, 1964, during the debate on the southeast Asia resolution:

It should be made equally clear to these—meaning Communist—regimes, if it is not yet sufficiently clear, that their aggressive and expansionist ambitions, wherever advanced, will meet precisely that degree of American opposition which is necessary to frustrate them.

Mr. President, that was the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The day after these words were spoken, the House of Representatives and the Senate, with only two dissenting votes, approved the southeast Asia resolution, which came to be known in some quarters as the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This resolution gave to the President the support of Congress:

To take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Mr. President, I am convinced that Congress must affirm its support for the American fighting men in southeast Asia—and for this Nation's policies in that area—by passing S. 2791 immediately and overwhelmingly.

We must demonstrate conclusively once again, to both friend and foe, that the debate over American policy in Vietnam does not show weakness or sharp divisions in our national resolve. We must prove and establish that, behind the clouds of discussion, there stands a strength of purpose and a unity of will that will not be shaken from within or from without.

Mr. President, there can be no greater indication of unwavering determination to keep our commitments, to live up to our written and spoken word, and to aid the people of South Vietnam, than quick and decisive action by the Senate of the United States on the passage of this military authorization program to assist our boys in South Vietnam.

I believe that the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate is as I have expressed it today, that the vast majority would like to get to an immediate vote for the reasons which I have outlined and for other reasons which I have not touched upon.

When we do vote, I believe that it will be clearly and eloquently demonstrated that indeed a vast majority of the Senators support our President and our policies in Vietnam, for, in my judgment, there will not be five votes against the measure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MR. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to support the supplemental military authorization bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Maryland may continue.

MR. BREWSTER. It is abundantly clear to me that the United States is determined that the security of this country is involved in our position in southeast Asia. In support of that position, we now have ashore in Vietnam some 200,000 men in 5 major Army units and 1 Marine unit. We have some 50,000 men in the 7th Fleet at the Dixie and Yankee stations off the coast of Vietnam.

In supporting this measure and the policy of this administration, let me say, following up the colloquy we have just heard, that I should like to vote at this moment; and if we had a chance to vote, this speech would not be made.

But it is clear that we will not have the chance to vote, and therefore the

senior Senator from Maryland would put himself on record as supporting the proposition that if we are going to send men overseas and into battle, and accept the casualties that they are now sustaining, then we must be prepared to back them up.

Mr. President, with all Senators, I have followed closely the recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I was particularly struck with the theme developed by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor, as to the difference between United States and Communist objectives and policies in Vietnam.

Today I should like to expand that point. For the information of my fellow Senators, my words will take about half an hour, and I can cut them short if the leadership asks me to do so, should there be any chance that we can vote on any amendment or on the pending measure at any time.

Consider first the contrast in the objectives of the parties to the conflict. Time and time again, Communist leaders in Red China and Vietnam have made it clear what they hope to accomplish in southeast Asia. I would note, for example, the recent statement of the Chinese Defense Minister. He said bluntly that the seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of all issues by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution, and that it holds good uniformly for China and for all other countries. Just as communism in China, he said, succeeded by capturing the countryside and then encircling and defeating the cities, so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed, first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe—and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and our Western Allies.

And where is this to begin? the Chinese defense minister asks.

It has already begun, he replies. And the principal place in which it is already underway is Vietnam.

Vietnam is now the focus of the revolutionary movement against the United States. No matter what action America may take in Vietnam, the Communist Chinese are unshakable, as of now, in their determination to drive the United States out.

Compare the Communist objectives with those of the United States. I almost hesitate to recount U.S. objectives because they have been so clearly stated so many times by the President, and more recently by Secretary Rusk and General Taylor. Concisely, they are:

First. The preservation of the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to develop as they see fit, without external interference and without serving the policy of any other nation.

Second. A cessation of the fighting and bloodshed in Vietnam.

Third. Protection of the rights and authority of the free Republic of Vietnam.

Fourth. Demonstration to the Communist bloc that indirect aggression through so-called wars of national liberation cannot succeed and to the free

world that the United States stands by its commitments.

The central objective of the President's policy, then, is independence for South Vietnam and freedom for its people to live in peace. I support that policy. Realization of this objective is necessary to the broader goal of creating conditions of stability throughout southeast Asia sufficient to permit a broad development program to which, as the President has stated, we should be prepared to contribute substantially.

We seek this objective in Vietnam in our own national interest. To abandon Vietnam, which the Communists have made the principal current testing ground for their theories of conquest through externally supported rebellion or wars of national liberation, would embolden the Communists and dangerously weaken the confidence in us of many free nations, with whom we are joined in mutual defense or economic development arrangements. It would mean confronting the same challenge in other places, probably under even less favorable circumstances.

The absence of peace and freedom in South Vietnam is due to aggression from the north and support by the regime in Hanoi for the Communists in the south who are seeking to overthrow their own government. Communist China has been increasingly open in pressing Hanoi to continue its aggressive policy.

It is American policy, constant under three administrations since 1954, to support the Government of South Vietnam in its efforts to defend itself and its people against this assault. We are pledged to provide all appropriate support for as long as is required to bring Communist aggression and terror under control.

Not so long ago, I stood on the floor of the Senate at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and voted to support the President in using such force as was necessary to protect the interests of the United States in this theater of war.

In light of espoused objectives of both sides in this struggle, I see no reasonable ground on which to question the validity or, indeed, the essentiality of the American commitment.

If the stated Communist objectives were not convincing, consider the measures employed by them to reach these previously stated objectives.

Despite the buildup of U.S. forces, which I shall discuss later, there has been no indication of any significant change in Communist strategy. Their strategy seeks to:

First. Annihilate and disperse the Vietnamese, United States and other free world forces, while building up the Vietcong.

Second. Intensify military activity around the urban areas, particularly Saigon.

Third. Expand Vietcong controlled areas and consolidate control of the countryside.

Fourth. Organize rural support in order to control the jungle.

Fifth. Intensify economic warfare against the Government of South Vietnam.

How do they hope to accomplish these

objectives? The Vietcong have a set of simple guidelines which emphasize the following courses of action: guerrilla warfare, evasion, ambush, small annihilation squads, and when possible, large scale operations.

And always terrorism in the night. Basic to all of these has been the use of terror and intimidation. By terror, the Vietcong attempt to cut off what lines the government has managed to build between itself and the people. They kidnap and murder land reform workers, rural credit agents, village chiefs, schoolteachers, and malaria workers. They threaten families in order to intimidate and induce cooperation from workers and officials.

They have no reluctance whatsoever to "gut," to disembowel, or to shoot those who choose not to cooperate. This is a statement of fact. In 1965 alone, the Vietcong murdered over 1,800 civilians in terrorist acts and kidnaped over 10,000.

Behind all this terror lies an even more dangerous threat to the freedom of South Vietnam—aggression from without. The case against North Vietnam has been documented too often for me to need to dwell on it at length here. Simply put, the war which the Vietcong are waging against the south is directed and supported politically and militarily from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam. It is commanded on the spot by leaders and specialists infiltrated from north of the 17th parallel—19,000 last year alone. It is largely supplied by weapons and equipment sent by North Vietnam, which in turn is supported by Red China.

In addition to hard core leaders and technicians, some 11,000 personnel from the regular North Vietnamese Army were sent south last year. The United States is not, as is charged from time to time, interfering in what is a local civil war.

The actions of the Communists in Vietnam are pure, unembellished aggression. As Secretary Rusk stated recently, aggression itself is the principal enemy of all civilized world orders and of all those countries, like the United States, which support world order under law—and not under force—and through the United Nations.

Contrary to those who say that the United States has no obligation to meet this aggression, I strongly believe that the course the United States has taken in southeast Asia is entirely proper and the only honorable one we can take.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that on the point of legality, the American Bar Association considered the matter and, I assume, being good lawyers that they are, and most senior members of law firms belonging, they discussed and considered the question and voted 279 to 0 that what we were doing in Vietnam is entirely legal and consistent with the United Nations Charter, particularly article 51, which declares that nothing in the charter would deny any nation the right of collective self-defense.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. As a lawyer myself, I am convinced that to the extent we have international law, the United States is following a legal course of action and that we should and can under law participate realistically as responsible members of the United Nations organization.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Furthermore, recently I placed in the Record a letter signed by 21 professors of international law at our universities and colleges, headed by professors at Yale and Harvard—keeping in mind that a great number of universities do not teach international law, because their graduates have very little need of it for their practice. But these 21 professors of international law agreed to a man that the United States proceeded exactly as it should. I understand since that time 10 other professors of international law have added their names to that list.

So far as I know, there is no professor of international law who has taken a contrary view that this course of action is not inconsistent with our obligations under the charter of the United Nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his comments. I agree completely. If, as a responsible international citizen, we abandoned the world only to those who would apply force, then we would have no law at all. I only wish we had truly enforceable international law. We do have the spirit and fabric of international law, but we must seek to implement this law in support of government by law and not by force.

I argue that unless we face the Communists over there, the last remnants of stability in this already unstable world will begin to disappear. Our reasons for meeting force with force are basically twofold: First, it is in our own national interest to do so; and second, it is the only prudent and honorable thing to do, given the commitments we have made stretching back through three presidential administrations of both political parties.

Let me turn now to a brief discussion of the actions we have taken to meet this obligation.

After the signing of the Geneva accords of 1954 and contrary to the provision of those accords, that Communist forces regroup to the north of the 17th parallel, some of the best Vietcong guerrilla units were ordered to remote and inaccessible regions of South Vietnam. An estimated 10,000 Vietcong faded into the peasant population. Further evidence of these violations were the large numbers of arms and munitions hidden in South Vietnam by the Communist cadres left behind.

By 1956 it had become apparent that the Republic of Vietnam was a viable and increasingly prosperous state that would not fall peaceably under Hanoi's control. North Vietnam, therefore, began to rebuild and expand its covert apparatus in the south. From 1957 to 1959, over 1,000 civilians are believed to have been assassinated or kidnapped by the Vietcong. Terrorism and armed attacks greatly increased between 1959 and 1961. This is the record. During

all this period the American Military Advisory Assistance Command in Vietnam consisted of less than 800 personnel. Finally, in December 1961, President Kennedy in response to a request by the Government of Vietnam increased U.S. strength to almost 2,000. At this point the Americans began for the first time to act as advisers at the battalion level in addition to performing logistic and supporting functions. As the level of Vietcong terror increased, so too did American military support, until the number reached 10,000 in 1962.

Note that the history of escalation in Vietnam was not the result of unilateral U.S. initiatives. What confronts the Communists today is the end-product of their own aggressive military activity.

I need not recount the events of 1965. They are fresh in the minds of us all—the increased infiltration, the introduction of regular North Vietnamese forces, the Vietcong attacks on American bases and installations, the buildup of Vietcong forces in preparation for a monsoon offensive, and the continued atrocities against the South Vietnamese populace. So too is the tremendous and rapid buildup of United States forces to over 200,000 that we have there today.

We should all keep in mind that our response has not been entirely military at all. The military gets the headlines, but the efforts we make in the social and economic fields are supported with equal vigor, and greeted with even more enthusiasm. The theme of the recent Honolulu Conference was on the building of a better life for the Vietnamese civilian. Significant progress has already been made in the economic and social spheres.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I visited that tortured country and saw the active effort we are making in social and economic areas—building schools, increasing agricultural production, training doctors and nurses, expanding medical facilities. To be sure, much more needs to be done, and the President has promised that it will be done. I heartily support these endeavors, without which military success would be without meaning. I am reminded of the few days I spent with the 3d Marine Division in Da Nang and in Hue Phu Bai. I went with the men—in wet, dirty dungarees. I saw them greeted with wide enthusiasm. At the platoon level, during sick call, the American doctors spent a great deal of time treating the civilian population after they cared for our own men. Apart from this, through numerous economic programs, our military equipment is being used to construct canals, roads, bridges, marketplaces throughout the countryside.

But now, looking beyond our present military and nonmilitary programs, we have an even more important responsibility, the paramount responsibility, of achieving and bringing about an honorable peace; not peace at any price, but peace with honor—a peace that would enable the people of South Vietnam to resume their position among the sovereign and independent peoples of the world without fear of outside aggression.

If we could be assured of such a peace, we would waste no time withdrawing our military forces.

We would prefer to see our troops at home rather than in the swamps, jungles, and rice paddies of Vietnam. I am satisfied that every responsible official in our Government would prefer to use our resources for the economic development of southeast Asia, not for its destruction.

Unfortunately for us, indeed unfortunately for all mankind, our efforts to achieve this peace have thus far been to no avail. Representatives of our Government have gone to every corner of the world; they have talked to countless officials of foreign governments—friendly and nonfriendly. All efforts have been rebuffed, in fact, scorned would be a better word.

The President said at Johns Hopkins University in Maryland last April that we were prepared to meet with anybody at any time at any place to discuss any issue, and that pledge still stands. We have not been taken up on it.

Recall what occurred during the recent pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. Vietcong activity in South Vietnam continued at a higher than average rate during the pause, terroristic acts against civilians continued, and infiltration increased under cover of the bombing lull.

Does this indicate a readiness to discuss peace on the part of the Communists? I think not.

And so the war continues, as indeed it must in the absence of prospects for an honorable peace.

But the question is justifiably asked, is success in the struggle in Vietnam of concern only to the United States and the Vietnamese? I think not. In my opinion, one of the most disturbing aspects of the war in Vietnam is the failure of most of our allies to join hands with us in the fight against Communist aggression. I feel strongly that an effective, lasting peace could be arrived at faster if more of our allies—and I speak with special reference to the sophisticated, modern nations of western Europe—were to share with us the massive burden of helping the people of South Vietnam. In view of our own actions during the last 25 years, the sight of so many of our friends standing idly by watching us, or, what is worse, openly criticizing us, while we fight, leaves me perplexed and unhappy.

At a later date I will address myself to the fact that many of our friends are openly trading with North Vietnam. This is reprehensible to me, and it must end.

At a time like this, a passive attitude on the part of our allies is both shortsighted and harmful. We are helping the South Vietnamese, because it is in our interest, and because we are able to do so. Others should help, because it is in their interest, and they are able. The attainment of stability and freedom from aggression in South Vietnam serves not only the interests of ourselves and the South Vietnamese, but of the entire free world. All of our allies should realize that they have a definite part to play in

February 24, 1966

this conflict, and that what happens in South Vietnam will have an effect on their own destinies.

Some countries have already recognized this fact. Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea now have many battle units fighting shoulder to shoulder beside our own troops. The Government of Thailand has given consistently firm support to our policy and to the requirements for logistic preparations in their country. This kind of support is both helpful and heartwarming. It is not too late for other nations to follow suit. As we pledge our continuing support, it is reasonable to hope that the Vietnamese Government, and indeed our own, will continue to urge in many capitals a common response to our common threat.

Let me close with a personal summary of where I believe we stand concerning the most real and immediate threat to world peace—the struggle in Vietnam.

The U.S. view of the struggle as essentially one of aggression mounted, directed, supplied, and supported by North Vietnam has been reinforced during the last year by the increasing direct participation of the North Vietnamese in the war and the demonstrated inability of the Vietcong to mobilize the popular support they have long claimed.

The Chinese Communists, through Marshal Lin Piao's recent statement, have made their view of this struggle still more explicit under a doctrine calling for the expansion of Communist power by similar aggressive means throughout the world.

The immediate implications for the rest of Asia of a failure to suppress Communist aggression in Vietnam remain as clear and ominous as they always have been. In this connection it is not inappropriate to note the increasing subversive efforts being directed against Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia by the Communists and Chinese.

If all small nations on the periphery of Communist power are to retain their faith, that the cause of their independence and freedom is one to which the free world is devoted, we must continue to resist aggression in Vietnam.

If we were to cave in, we would let them down, and our troubles would only mount in the future.

With some degree of accuracy I would like to point to the lessons learned in Manchuria, Ethiopia, in the Rhineland and at Munich where force applied at the appropriate time would have prevented terrible destruction.

Our goal remains one of a peaceful settlement that will bring an end to the aggression, secure freedom of choice for South Vietnam, allow for the withdrawal of U.S. forces, and permit the direction of all our energies to the constructive purposes of economic and social development in southeast Asia.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I compliment the Senator on the very fine statement he has made.

Everybody is well aware of the magnificent record of the Senator as a marine officer serving his Nation on the field of battle.

May I say that the speech of the Senator is in keeping with his past record,

as well as the service he has rendered in this body. It is an inspiring address. As one Member of the Senate I appreciate it very much.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I remember that during the same years that I wore the Marine Corps uniform he wore the uniform of the U.S. Navy. We fought in our way at that time for the same cause that men are now fighting for in Vietnam, the cause of freedom in opposition to totalitarianism, or whatever name one may give it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—
Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum.

I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has a matter that can be disposed of expeditiously.

I would be willing to yield provided I might retain my right to the floor and insist on my right if I find it necessary to insist on retaining the floor.

I yield on the condition that I may regain my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like the Record to show that I have been seeking the floor and that the acting majority leader has refused to yield it until he calls for a live quorum. I do not object.

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

CANCELLATION OF UNPAID REIMBURSABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING, CHARGEABLE AGAINST CERTAIN NON-INDIAN LANDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 16, 1966, the House of Representatives approved, with an amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 9, concerning certain reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project in the State of Wyoming. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House on Senate Joint Resolution 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert:

That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to

the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges. Such cancellation, however, shall take effect with respect to any individual landowner when and only when the said owner obligates himself, his heirs, and assigns by contract satisfactory in form and substance to the Secretary that he will pay all reasonable construction charges incurred after the date of this Act in connection with the Wind River Indian irrigation project which are allocated to his land as provided in this Act and that such charges, if not paid, shall be a lien against the land.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should say also that this matter has been cleared with both Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. SIMPSON]. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the acting majority leader for yielding so that this matter could be considered. It will be of great help to the Wind River Indian irrigation project.

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall insist upon a live quorum. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

[No. 36 Leg.]

Allott	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Boggs	Kennedy, N.Y.	Simpson
Brewster	Kuchel	Symington
Church	Long, La.	Talmadge
Clark	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Morse	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from

Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be requested to direct the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Harris	Muskie
Anderson	Hart	Nelson
Bartlett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Pearson
Burdick	Holland	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, Ga.
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Saltanstall
Cotton	Magnuson	Scott
Curtis	McCarthy	Smathers
Dirksen	McGovern	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Dominick	McNamara	Stennis
Douglas	Miller	Tower
Eastland	Mondale	Tydings
Ellender	Morton	Yarborough
Fannin	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Murphy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show it was not I, but the acting majority leader, who demanded the live quorum which has just been concluded.

I wish to discuss the present situation in Vietnam.

The Senate of the United States has often been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. On many occasions that reputation has seemed ill deserved—as when we permitted ourselves not long ago to become bogged down in a full dress debate on the question of amending the Senate Journal to include the Chaplain's prayer.

But there are also times when the Senate does function in a way which makes it the envy of all the other legislatures of the world. This, I believe, is such a time—and the debate on Vietnam which we are now conducting demonstrates how great a body this can be when it does its best.

There is one point which has become increasingly clear to me during the course of this debate:

The United States should never have become involved in a ground war on the land mass of Asia.

For the 11 years since the French withdrawal from Vietnam, the United States has been gradually sucked into a situation where 200,000 American troops are presently fighting what is essentially an American war on the Asian mainland. Originally, and indeed until the end of 1963, American policy was to call upon various South Vietnamese governments to win or lose their own war. As President Kennedy said in September of 1963:

In the final analysis, it's their war. They're the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it.

As late as the fall of 1964 this was still our policy. President Johnson said, during the course of the Presidential campaign that he did not like to be called upon "to send American boys to do the job that Asian boys ought to do."

The State and the Defense Departments still insist today that primarily this is a war for the South Vietnamese to win; but it is becoming increasingly obvious that the 200,000 American troops now in combat have the primary mission of destroying and defeating the Vietcong and those parts of the regular North Vietnamese army which have been committed to battle.

Thus, for the second time in 15 years, we have ignored the sound advice of Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Ridgeway and committed American ground troops in Asia in what is essentially an American war.

In the fall of 1963 there were only 10,000 Americans in uniform in South Vietnam, all acting as advisers to the South Vietnamese armed forces. Today the number exceeds 200,000 and there is talk in the Pentagon and in the Senate Armed Services Committee to the effect that the number may soon rise to 600,000.

If we had learned from the experience in Burma or the Philippines or, even more recently, in Indonesia, we would have avoided the error we have committed. In none of these cases did our failure to intervene in support of non-Communist governments bring the so-called domino theory into effect. In all three instances the Communist advance was repelled by native Asian governments which scorned to call on the United States for assistance. In fact, U Thant, the sagacious Burmese Secretary General of the United Nations, recently said that had Burma requested American military assistance there would now be either a Communist takeover in that country or a civil war equivalent in violence to the hostilities in South Vietnam.

Our sound position should have been to base our air and naval power on the island chain running from Japan to Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Borneo to Australia and New Zealand. It is nonsense to think that our only stopping place if we lose Vietnam is the beach at Waikiki.

A sound policy would rest our Pacific defenses on this island chain, rather than permitting our superb fighting forces to get mired down in the mud and jungles of southeast Asia.

Let us consider the capabilities and intentions of the Vietcong, the Hanoi government, and Red China.

It is difficult to know for certain what the intentions or capabilities of any of these three parties are. On the one hand, the Vietcong have recently been taking severe losses. It is said that their desertion rate is increasing, that they are losing their will to win. It is said also that Hanoi, having committed a significant part of its well-trained regular army to battle in South Vietnam, is having second thoughts as the determination of the South Vietnamese and the Americans increases. Assuredly, both the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese forces are under considerably heavier pressure than they were a year ago.

Similarly, China is essentially without air or sea power. There is grave question as to whether the Chinese Army can fight effectively as far away from their national boundary as the Mekong Delta. China has suffered a series of diplomatic reverses. Mao Tse-tung must be concerned at the threat of an American offensive, possibly nuclear in form, against his homeland.

It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that our adversaries will shortly be prepared to turn to the negotiating table under a cease-fire arrangement by neutral powers.

On the other hand, there is not the slightest present indication of a desire on the part of our adversaries to stop the shooting. The Vietcong, with the aid of Hanoi, have either themselves occupied or rendered untenable to the South Vietnamese a majority of the land mass of South Vietnam. While perhaps a majority of the people of South Vietnam are still under the jurisdiction of the Ky government in Saigon, most of them are huddled together in cities and towns overcrowded with refugees. And in that part of the countryside still under South Vietnamese control, there is increasing resentment against the totalitarian form the Ky government takes. The Vietcong appear well on their way to acquiring effective control over most of the people of South Vietnam still living in the countryside. And it is no answer to say that this has, to a substantial extent, been achieved by terror. It is, nevertheless, the case.

While the rate of desertion among the Vietcong is significant, desertions from the South Vietnamese Army are heavy too. As their losses increase, as they have done during the last year, it is becoming increasingly doubtful how much longer the South Vietnamese Army will remain capable of carrying the brunt of defeating the Vietcong.

In this connection, Mr. President, I refer to an article from the New York Times of this morning entitled, "1965 Desertions Up in Saigon Forces—Total Is Put Above 96,000—U.S. Aides Concerned."

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

February 24, 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it seems clear that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peiping are still convinced they are winning the war in South Vietnam and that accordingly they believe there is no need to go to the conference table.

Nor, despite the assertions of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, is it clear to what extent, if at all, the Vietcong are controlled by Hanoi, or Hanoi is controlled by mainland China. What seems certain is that further escalation of the American war effort, particularly a stepping up of the bombing of North Vietnam or a commencement of the bombing of Communist China will bring all three of our adversaries closer together. In my judgment, the risks of further American escalation in the light of the capabilities and intentions of our three adversaries, are not worth running in view of the chance of success which such escalation would create.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho. I am glad to have the Senator in the Chamber on this important matter.

Mr. CHURCH. I congratulate the distinguished Senator on the address he is making.

The Senator raised the question of escalation. I was wondering if the Senator had not been encouraged by the remarks of the President on the subject of escalation in his address in New York last evening.

Mr. CLARK. I was very much encouraged. In fact, with the exception of the last portion of the President's address, in which he raises the question of whether what we are doing in South Vietnam is worthwhile, I believe it was a most helpful statement of the American position.

The address indicates a disinclination to escalation and continued willingness to negotiate.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the text of the President's remarks may be printed in the Record at the end of my speech.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Idaho for calling this matter to my attention.

The tactical military situation in Vietnam is worse than most of the American people think. Neither the State Department nor the Pentagon have yet been willing to furnish an unclassified map from which the American people could determine just how badly the ground war in South Vietnam has been going in recent years. But maps whose authenticity has not, so far as I know, been denied, showing the steady deterioration of the South Vietnamese-American position since 1962 have been printed widely in American newspapers and magazines.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I apologize for not having intervened immediately following the question of the distinguished

Senator from Idaho. I wish to ask another question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The Senator from Pennsylvania expresses satisfaction with the President's speech of last night, with the exception that he has noted.

Does the Senator feel that the President's explanation of his policy in South Vietnam, especially relative to escalation and restraint of our military effort, reflects a change or constitutes a change from our policy, as the Senator previously understood it?

Mr. CLARK. I have difficulty answering that question categorically because this administration speaks with so many different voices from time to time that no one can be certain who is making the uncertain note on the trumpet.

I would say that since the President is the Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive of the United States his word should be the last word.

We heard from a Member of this body that testimony has been received in the Armed Services Committee that in the foreseeable future we might well increase our forces in Vietnam from 200,000 to 600,000.

We have had some fairly strong statements from the Secretary of State. Yesterday Secretary of Defense McNamara indicated the possibility of calling up the Reserves.

Hanson Baldwin—and if I may be mildly facetious for a moment, he is a fairly faithful exponent of Pentagon opinion—indicates that we are spread so thin that we may have to have massive troops called to the colors.

The President's statement of yesterday was helpful. I have great sympathy for the position in which he finds himself. I know he is subjected to differing views. I know that he listens carefully before he makes up his mind.

The President's speech of last night does tend to clarify matters in a most helpful way.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe it is true in this debate, to a greater degree than other debates, that words get in the way of understanding.

Mr. CLARK. One of the real problems is semantics.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

It strikes me, and I would like to have the reaction of the Senator, that the principal concern that resulted in that surge of alarm and present debate on Vietnam policy is not attributable so much to our ability to manage a war in South Vietnam, as such, as the fear that what we do there may or may not trigger a direct Red Chinese intervention which would lead to an Asian war. Is this the impression of the Senator?

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid that I could not agree with that. I do agree that the concern over getting into a wider war with China is a real and deep one. I believe there is a similar or greater concern about our commitment in Vietnam.

My feeling is that we should not have gotten in there, and until the Baltimore

speech of last spring we did not make a serious effort to get out.

I mention again the figures which I cited before the Senator came into the Chamber. At the time of President Kennedy's assassination we had only 10,000 American soldiers in South Vietnam, all of whom were engaged in advisory missions. Now, we have over 200,000 troops there.

The answer given is that South Vietnam might have been overrun by the Vietcong if we had not done that. Then, I say, was the game worth the candle? I doubt it.

I say further to my friends from Maine that the inevitable result of escalation from 10,000 men to 200,000 men is an increase in the rate of American casualties in a cause which I cannot convince myself is essential to our national security or the defense of our national honor.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand, of course, that there may be differences of opinion, although not to the extent that there might have been a few years ago, as to whether we should have been involved in the first place. If we were to debate that question today, in terms of the situation when we first became involved in South Vietnam, I suspect that there might be quite a broad consensus as to what our policy is today.

Mr. CLARK. As to what our policy should have been.

Mr. MUSKIE. As to what our policy should have been. As of today, I still feel—and I am merely conveying to the Senator my view—that the great concern that grips the country so obviously and clearly today is not related to any doubts as to our ability, eventually, to get out of South Vietnam, if our problem were confined to South Vietnam, with honor, and still to leave the situation subject to the control of indigenous elements in Vietnam. I think we could manage this. But my concern is that the means we may have to use in order to achieve that objective may at some point trigger a larger war. This is where my concern focuses, whatever the questions I might have had earlier, about our involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's concern deeply.

The Senator said something a moment ago about the problem we have about words. I agree with him. What do we mean by "getting out of Vietnam with honor"? What is honor? The Senator and I could discuss that for a long time without coming to any obvious solution.

Mr. MUSKIE. We get some light thrown on that question—at least, I do—when we realize that there are few in this body, or in Congress as a whole or in the country as a whole, who defend unconditional, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I do not think there is anybody who does.

Mr. MUSKIE. So at least honor means that we must get something out of our withdrawal that will serve the national elements, the freedom elements, and the independence elements in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. Let me pose a question to the Senator: Does the Senator believe that we could negotiate with the Vietcong and still get out of Vietnam with honor? Would that be an honorable thing to do in the light of the terror and the murders of the Vietcong, and their determination to install a Communist regime? Can we tie up our ideas of honor with negotiation with the one people who are fighting with us?

Mr. MUSKIE. The role that the Vietcong would play at the conference table, if we were to get that far, is a sticky problem. If we gave the Vietcong too large a role before we negotiated, we might hamper the ability of whatever government emerged in South Vietnam to develop viability, independence, and the ability to decide its own country's destiny.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with that.

Mr. MUSKIE. So we are concerned about that. Second, we are not really sure—and this has been the point of great debate in the Senate and throughout the country—as to what the Vietcong will do in South Vietnam. To what extent is the Vietcong wholly the agent of North Vietnam? To what extent is the Vietcong made up of indigenous elements in South Vietnam who would truly like to play a role in the destiny of their own country?

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that there are both kinds. It is fairly obvious, despite the view of Secretary Rusk to the contrary, that a large part of the Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese, sincerely, although mistakenly, believing they are fighting for the freedom of their own country, which they think includes North Vietnam—and it used to—in order to repel the white invader from their shores.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator would agree, would he not, that this is a point on which we cannot be enlightened under conditions of war?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is not possible to conduct a Gallup poll to establish that point to our satisfaction. This is why I believe there is some reservation on the part of our policymaking leaders in determining the role the Vietcong ought to play, first at the conference table, and then in the subsequent Government of South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. If we are ever going to have the shooting stop, that is a problem we shall have to face up to. Even though our policymakers may not be willing to disclose their hand, they will have to think the problem through and determine whether they are going to demand unconditional surrender by the Vietcong or will sit down and talk with them.

Mr. MUSKIE. From my point of view, we would be in a better position to refine our policy on that score if we were to get some kind of response from the other side.

Mr. CLARK. I could not agree more.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for this exchange.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have found the discussion very interesting, indeed. Was not the first government of France, following the end of World War II, a coalition government?

Mr. CLARK. It was called a popular front, and my recollection is that the Prime Minister was a Socialist, Mr. Blum.

Mr. GORE. Did not, in his previous term, General de Gaulle head a coalition government?

Mr. CLARK. He did. Actually, he had a good deal of trouble in preventing the Communists from taking over that government at the time he first went back into Paris.

Mr. GORE. If the Vietcong is the principal element of our adversary in South Vietnam, would it be possible, in order to get a negotiated settlement, to ignore a principal element of opposition?

Mr. CLARK. I do not see how it would. This is where I find myself, unfortunately, in strong disagreement with the Secretary of State, who takes what I consider to be the oversimplified view that the Vietcong is merely an arm of the North Vietnamese Government, and that we do not have to deal with them directly; that we have to deal only with Hanoi and perhaps with Peiping. To me, that is utterly unrealistic.

Mr. GORE. Does the Vietcong constitute some 80 percent of the fighting force in South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. Of the fighting force against us.

Mr. GORE. Of the fighting force against us.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that while there are several regiments, perhaps as much as one division, of North Vietnamese troops fighting us, the Senator's statistics are correct.

Mr. GORE. Is the Vietcong a force that is indigenous to South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that it is. The Vietcong have established diplomatic posts abroad in various capitals. I am not aware as to who their leaders in South Vietnam are; but there is not a shadow of a doubt, in my mind, that many Vietcong are indigenous South Vietnamese who just do not like what they consider to be the tyrannical and totalitarian government of General Ky.

Mr. GORE. Has there been a coalition government in Italy in recent years?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; but I do not believe Communists have participated in it. The same has been true of recent governments in France. The Senator may recall that the Communist Party is the largest party in Italy and the second largest in France.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation that bears upon that point?

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield to permit me to make one further observation?

Mr. CLARK. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, then I shall yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GORE. Following up these questions, will it not be acknowledged that there are dangers in coalition governments if a part of the coalition is a Communist force?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, history shows very clearly that that is so.

Mr. GORE. But history is not unanimous in that regard, is it?

Mr. CLARK. No; but I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that very dangerous coalition governments which were set up initially in certain countries in Europe contained Communists who succeeded in getting hold of ministries of the interior. Czechoslovakia is a good example.

Mr. GORE. Whenever Communists in a coalition government have succeeded in obtaining control of the ministries of propaganda and police, and perhaps the ministry of defense—but at least the former two—that has proved to be almost without exception, so far as I recall, a coalition fatal to freedom.

If on the other hand, the head of the government succeeds, as I believe did the head of the French coalition, in giving to the communistic element within the government, welfare, social security, or some ministry that does not give them control of a vital ministry, or public information, propaganda, police, or military authority, then it has not proven fatal.

I am not so concerned about who the parties to a negotiation may be. As I understand, President Johnson has said that there will be no insurmountable problem so far as this is concerned. I believe the President is maintaining commendable flexibility in this regard.

The structure of the government that may follow the cease-fire negotiation is, in my opinion, very important.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree that there are two quite different things involved here? First, who does one talk to in order to arrange a cease-fire and establish a truce? Second, what will the composition of the interim government be while an attempt is being made to hold free elections? The questions are not the same at all.

Mr. GORE. I agree. Free elections in the circumstances that prevail in Vietnam is another subject. However, lest I delay the thoughtful intervention of the Senator from Maine, I desist.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator is correct in distinguishing between whom we talk to and the composition of the government. However, the question of whom we talk to must be subdivided. It depends on the role we are willing to accept for the Vietcong in the conference. If we accept them merely as a participant in the war, entitled to a place at the conference table and entitled to engage in the discussion, I believe that would create very little difficulty. However, if we are asked, as the North Vietnamese have insisted, to consider them to be representative of

South Vietnam at the conference table, that is another extreme.

There is a sticky situation somewhere in between.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to another solution. One solution might be that neither we nor the Chinese Communists go to the conference table, but that the Vietnamese people settle their problem for themselves. That may be the best way to do it, but it might not be practical.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 21, 1966, there appeared an article by Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary.

The Senator may have seen this article.

Mr. CLARK. I did not.

Mr. MUSKIE. In this article Mr. Nagy said:

As far as I know I am the only former political leader in exile in America who was the head of a coalition government in Central Eastern Europe after World War II.

On the basis of my experiences in my own country and observations in the whole central and Eastern European area I would like to comment on Senator ROBERT KENNEDY'S proposition of a coalition government for South Vietnam.

In an aside, I suggest that the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has since refined his position on those points. However, at the time the article was written, he had not.

I continue to read from Mr. Nagy's article:

The first thing to know is that if a coalition in an ideologically troubled country is established with the assistance of outside power or powers, then the strength and endurance of the participating political parties or groups is not dependent at all on domestic popular support but on the help of the outside great powers which are behind them politically.

In my government the Communist Party had only 17 percent of popular support while my party alone was supported by more than 80 percent of the voters and the Parliament. Still the Communist Party could get in power in 2 years because they were supported by the Soviet Union and I was overthrown because no outside power gave me any help.

I believe this is a very interesting and useful illustration of the problem of a coalition government.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that it is, too.

I have many serious doubts about whether a coalition government could be successful in South Vietnam. However, I point out that the situation which existed in Eastern Europe is really entirely different from the situation in South Vietnam at the moment. We had no American presence in Hungary. We have a big American presence in Vietnam, a much bigger American presence than Red China has.

The need for leaving the President great flexibility is clear. There are all kinds of possibilities, it might be feasible to have a coalition government of the sort suggested by the Senator from Tennessee, and not unlike the one we now have in Laos. With the existing power concentration, and the American physical presence, it would not be nearly

so dangerous as the situation which existed in Hungary when we were a long way off.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, what we are discussing is the integrity of a coalition government after the American presence is withdrawn. This is the problem which we are discussing.

Mr. CLARK. I would not for a minute advocate a withdrawal of the American presence until after a free election had determined the composition of government that the people of South Vietnam wanted, and whether it was to be independent, a federation or, indeed, a unified government with North Vietnam.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in connection with the exchange that has just occurred, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania feel that there might quite properly develop a role for the United Nations or some other specially established international commission, that could have governing significance in the interim period so that, pending elections, we might be certain that no single element in South Vietnam could come to dominate. In other words, does not the Senator from Pennsylvania see the possibility of a role developing for the United Nations which might even substitute for a time for a local government in preserving the requisite order and in supervising the conduct of the requisite elections, on which an indigenous government could thereafter be formed?

Mr. CLARK. I should hope so. But, frankly, although I was gratified by our decision to go to the United Nations with the Vietnamese problem, we must remember that our adversaries are not members of the United Nations. If we were to have a cease-fire, both parties would have to agree. If we were to have international machinery to supervise an election, both parties would have to agree.

I should be somewhat skeptical as to whether Hanoi—or Peiping, if they were to inject themselves into the situation, as they well might—would be willing to turn the conduct of an election over to a United Nations team.

It occurs to me that a far more hopeful course would be to go back to the Geneva Conference or, in the alternative, to the International Control Commission, consisting of, I believe, India, Canada, and Poland, as the international agency for supervision.

Mr. CHURCH. That might be the kind of international commission that in the end would emerge, but I do think that an article which appeared in a recent edition of the Nation magazine, captioned, "The Tactics of a Truce," written by Jack D. Forbes, is worthy of the consideration of the Senate.

It envisions a supervisory role by the United Nations, though the article could be read in such a way as to substitute some other suitable international commission for the United Nations wherever that term appears.

Since the article specifies steps that might be taken toward a satisfactory truce, and ultimately toward self-determination for the people of South Viet-

nam, and since it is, in spirit, an article that conforms to the character and thrust of the excellent address that the Senator from Pennsylvania is giving this afternoon, I wonder if the Senator would mind if I asked unanimous consent to have the article published in the Record at a point following the conclusion of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. CLARK. I should be very happy to have that done.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there have been several references to Eastern Europe, and particularly to Czechoslovakia. I suppose I have probably had more nuts-and-bolts experience there than any other Senator, because I was in charge of the consulate general in Slovakia at the time of the Communist putsch in 1948.

I remember at that time, or a few months earlier, thinking that this putsch would occur, because an election was about to be held, and one knew that the Communists could not afford the results of an election, because they would have lost ground.

One also knew that when Jan Masaryk indicated that he would like to join the Marshall plan, that would be strong medicine for the Soviets, their immediate neighbors to the east.

So I remember, about 6 weeks before the putsch, I predicted that there would be a putsch, because the Communists could not accept a loss of power through election, which would be the inevitable result.

The powers that be above me in the State Department chain of command did not agree, and thought that the election could be held and all would work itself out. Lo and behold, when the time came, the Communists preferred the putsch to waiting for and abiding by an election.

The governing factor here is whether or not a strong presence would remain to enforce election results. If that presence were there to enforce the elections, one would not worry too much about the results of the election.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will permit an interjection, I would worry very much about them.

Mr. PELL. The Senator is probably more experienced in the Far East. I know he was in the Far East in the war. But from my experience in eastern Europe, in most of the countries there, the public will did not seem to go in the Communist direction when there was a truly free election.

Mr. CLARK. I merely point out that if for 11 years you support a totalitarian government, and then you go in with B-52 bombers and heavy artillery and small arms and shoot up the villages; and the other side does the same thing, with terroristic tactics, I think it is a pretty close question who the poor people are going to vote for if they once get a chance to vote.

Mr. President, I return to the subject I was discussing before this most inter-

esting colloquy, and I thank my colleagues for their intervention. That was the question of why we cannot get an accurate map out of either the State Department, or the Defense Department, which will show the territory either controlled by the Vietcong or contested by them.

I was pointing out that they give us classified maps, small in scale, which purport to show some of this information, but then tell us we cannot use them to alert the American people to the situation.

We have seen many of these maps in news magazines and in the daily newspapers, but when I called one of them to the attention of Mr. David Bell in open session the other day before the Foreign Relations Committee, he said the map I was showing him was not accurate, and that he would give me an accurate map, but I could not use it.

I hope that when Secretary McNamara comes before the Foreign Relations Committee next week, he will be prepared to bring with him a meaningful map, and I would hope it would be unclassified. But even if he insists on classifying it, on the ground that this might give aid and comfort to the enemy because it would show them that we know where they are, at least he might let us have a classified map, so some of us on the committee can have some real understanding of what the military situation in Vietnam is with respect to the holding of real estate. If you do not hold the real estate, how can you go through with a social and economic program that is anything more than a rescue operation for refugees and the dwellers in a few overcrowded cities?

Mr. MUSKIE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Simply for clarification. As the Senator knows, like many Members of Congress, this year, I spent some time in Vietnam. While there, we pressed for some enlightenment on the very point the Senator is discussing; in other words, to give us as accurate and precise a pictorial impression as possible as regards the state of control of real estate.

We were told over and over again that although we could be given something that might approximate the situation at a given instant of time, the nature of the war there is so fluid that almost any map that might be offered would in a sense be misleading as to what the situation is at the moment the beholder might be looking at it.

So when we were given maps, we were asked to withhold them, for the reason that they might be misleading at such time as we released them.

This may be too great a sensitivity on this point. I think the Senator is right in raising it, but I simply wished to state what we learned when we were there, and match it against what the Senator has been told.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his information. I have been told exactly the same thing.

Perhaps I am dealing more in logic than in common sense, but I do not see why one cannot draw a map which says, "We hold this particular province so firmly that we can go in there and build a school building, or a rural electrification plant, give fertilizer to the peasants, help them harvest their crops, and nobody is going to change it; that is our backyard. Here is another area where the control of the province changes back and forth; perhaps the Vietcong control it at night, we control it in the daytime."

We had an interesting example the other day of what happens when we build these schools. Sometimes the Vietcong burn them down, if they are built by the Saigon government. If the local people participate in building them, the Vietcong do not burn them down; they use them for evening meetings, at which they teach the children to sing Vietcong songs. Sometimes they use them as sanctuaries, because when there is an attack on a particular hamlet, they are pretty sure our troops or the South Vietnamese will not attack the little red schoolhouses. Then, as soon as the attack is over, they open fire from the schoolhouses.

Maps would also show that there are other areas which are all jungle and elephant grass, and are virtually uninhabited.

That kind of map, I think, considering our position in having to determine how much to vote in the way of social and economic aid for South Vietnam, is an important source of information to which I think we are entitled.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yet there is no way of determining whether an area identified as a secure area on the map is indeed secure, or controlled to the point where we cannot suffer damage. For example, Saigon itself is a secure area, but there is terrorism going on there all the time. When we were there, a hotel housing American servicemen was blown up.

Mr. CLARK. There is a strong school of thought—I believe this was mentioned in the Mansfield report—that Saigon is a hostage for Hanoi, and vice versa.

Mr. MUSKIE. There is a school of thought to that effect. My own feeling is that the reason the Vietcong do not move in on Saigon with greater force is that they are not in a position to do so, not because of any inhibitions tied to the protection of Hanoi. I doubt very much that they consider them mutual hostages, but I understand there is that view held by many people on our side.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, more or less attention is being directed to the problem of the Vietcong. Indeed, that seems to be the principal problem.

Now, should our goal be similar to intimations the Senator and I heard earlier today, suggesting the extermination of the Vietcong?

Mr. CLARK. I believe that is a hopeless objective. I do not believe we can ever do it. They can quit, of course. But I saw in the newspapers the other

day that we have shot off 25,000 bullets for every Vietcong we have killed. That is not an effective method of warfare, in my opinion.

Mr. GORE. Just what is to be done, then, if the Vietcong are not to be admitted to negotiations, are not to have a part in the government, are not to be permitted to exist? What kind of war is this? What kind of war would it be necessary to wage to achieve the goal of extermination of the Vietcong in South Vietnam?

Mr. CLARK. I can see no other course but to demand unconditional surrender, which I deplore as being neither wise nor feasible. This is a problem which the administration must face.

Mr. GORE. In asking these questions, please understand that I have no fixed conclusions as to how the problem of Vietcong insurgency in South Vietnam should be handled. I doubt whether those who wish merely to ignore it, or to exterminate them, realize the extent of the areas held, according to such maps as the Senator and I have been privileged to see; and I doubt whether the problem is quite so simple as that. No attempt was made to exterminate the Communists in France after World War II because of their political affiliations. No attempt was made to exterminate Communist sympathizers in Laos before this settlement was reached.

I raise these questions only for contemplation, not to make an assertion myself as to how it should be done; but, it seems to me, that some of the sentiments which the Senator and I and others have been hearing recently are certainly unrealistic and not quite relative to the problem that prevails in South Vietnam.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator; yet, in all candor, one has to give some thought to the analogy in Malaya after the war where, for 7 years, the British and the Malaysians fought against the infiltration of Chinese Communists and, finally, exterminated them or persuaded them that they had so little chance to succeed that they returned to China.

We know of the present efforts of the Belaunde government in Peru to exterminate the Communists in the Andes. They seem to be doing rather well. The Betancourt government in Venezuela has been successful recently in exterminating the Communist minority. Therefore I agree fundamentally with the Senator since I do not believe that we can do this in South Vietnam. We must examine these analogies with great care.

Mr. GORE. The disturbing problem—which I believe it truly to be—is that apparently some of our colleagues have easy and simple solutions to exterminate the Vietcong. I do not believe that is quite so easy as some appear to think it to be.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, a few final thoughts about the maps. In my judgment, these maps are substantially accurate. They

show, as stated above, that most of the food producing area in South Vietnam and, indeed, most of the villages and hamlets are either completely under control of the Vietcong or so subject to raids which requisition the crops or, in the alternative, collect heavy taxes as a condition to permitting the peasants to harvest them, that South Vietnam, once a rice exporting country, is now importing at heavy cost a substantial part of its food supply. Moreover, the writ of the Saigon government runs feebly, if at all, to the overwhelming majority of the areas where the peasants live and cultivate their fields.

Nor do the present military tactics pursued by the American troops hold much prospect of success.

Mr. President, here one must be cautious, because I do not purport to be a military expert. A few moments ago, one or two of our colleagues congratulated themselves on having served with distinction in the Armed Forces of our country during World War II. Many of us served. I do not believe that makes any of us a military expert. However, as legislators, charged with the responsibility for voting authorization of funds for a war so far away from our shores, we have a duty, at least as civilians, to look at the facts. In my opinion, the search-and-destroy tactics are not a sound and feasible way to win the war.

Indeed, as Walter Lippmann has well said, these tactics are much like punching water. The "search and destroy" policy of killing Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers is a sterile one. The end result is an unnecessary increase in American casualties without any real countervailing advantage. Moreover it requires the investment of a fortune in terms of equipment and ammunition expended in bombing raids, amphibious expeditions, and the direction of our enormous firepower into the elephant grass and the jungles in efforts, often fruitless, to find and kill the enemy. In all too many cases, the enemy slips out of the traps we so elaborately lay for them. And once a contested area has been secured by American might, it is only a short time before our troops withdraw and the Vietcong come right back into the area where the battle took place.

In the course of all this, hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent women and children, as well as South Vietnamese farmers, are killed or rendered homeless. Surely this policy is certain to lose the hearts and minds of the very individuals we are trying to get on our side.

A good example of this was the recent highly publicized American offensive in Binh Dinh and Quang Ngai provinces. These provinces are densely inhabited, rich in rice, and have been largely under Communist control for the last year and a half. The major offensive against them was aimed at four North Vietnamese regiments which, with minor exceptions, refused to stand and fight. Having failed to corner the enemy, but having killed an unknown number of civilians, the Americans are now withdrawing, leaving devastation, destruction and curses, not loud but deep, behind them.

One may ask concerning this "search and destroy" policy: How many Vietcong must we kill to persuade them to give up? How many Americans must die in the effort? How many South Vietnamese must also die, including innocent men, women, and children not engaged in the battle? What will the country look like after the engagements are over? Is this the way to secure the loyalty of the local population? And can we hold the real estate we reconquer in the course of the search and destroy offensives?

Additional unanswered questions, of course are: Cannot the Vietcong with Hanoi's support continue guerrilla warfare indefinitely, gradually, with our unwilling collaboration, bringing about the destruction of the economy and the countryside of South Vietnam? Perhaps more important, how much treasure and manpower, in the light of our other global commitments, will the military request from the White House in order to keep this kind of unrewarding warfare going?

A word about the political, economic, and social situation in South Vietnam. Ever since the French departed 11 years ago, we have been urging a series of frequently changing South Vietnamese Governments to establish a free democratic society in that part of their country not under Vietcong control. Several abortive efforts to achieve this result were, in truth, made, but every one of them has failed. Now it appears from the Honolulu Conference that still another effort will be attempted. The totalitarian Ky government has committed itself to reforming its habits and customs and installing social, economic, and political justice in the countryside under its control.

Yet dispatches from South Vietnam make clear that there is little opportunity for the average South Vietnamese peasant to participate in any significant way in the Government of his own country or, indeed, to rise in the ranks of that Government. Educational requirements and an inbred autocratic oligarchical society, confine positions of honor and good pay to the military, the civil servants, and the families of the landlords who still control the overwhelming proportion of the real estate in areas in which the writ of the Ky government still runs. Moreover, the age-long quarrels between Catholics, Buddhists, the various other religious sects, and long-standing jealousy between families originating in South Vietnam towards families from the north create a complicated social picture which gives little opportunity for a democratic solution in freedom. Over and above all these, Ho Chi Minh is still the father figure to most of the Vietnamese, North and South, who think in national terms. There is no comparable individual around whom the South Vietnamese can rally.

A good example of the difficulties confronting the efforts to bring social justice to South Vietnam appears in the New York Times for Monday, February 21, in an article by Charles Mohr under the headline "Saigon Social Ills Worry U.S. Aids." The heart of the article

appears in the first two paragraphs, which read as follows:

Many of the Americans who work in the South Vietnamese countryside believe that nothing short of major changes in the country's social system and in the performance of the Government can ever produce the political conditions necessary for victory over the Vietcong.

They hope desperately—but skeptically—that Vice President HUMPHREY was right when he said with exuberance in Saigon recently that it was "our side," not the Vietcong, that would make a true social revolution in South Vietnam.

The article then points out the typical difficulties which arise in Kienhoa Province in the Mekong River Delta where, despite earnest efforts of American and South Vietnamese officials, there seems little hope that the 1966 pacification plan can succeed. In this area the Government controls only 30 percent of the terrain and a little more than a third of the population. Despite the B-52 bombings and wide military operations against them, the Vietcong guerrillas have tightened their hold on the countryside. As one American official was quoted as saying:

The truth is, we are not offering these people any very good reason to switch sides.

Both because we and our South Vietnamese allies hold so little of the real estate, and because the whole social, economic, and political system in South Vietnam requires a drastic revision, almost impossible to accomplish in less than a generation, I have little confidence that our aid program will be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator would prefer to complete his remarks without my interrupting them, I would be pleased to withhold my request.

Mr. CLARK. No. The speech has been chopped up already.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am sorry another commitment will prevent my hearing all of the Senator's speech, but I have read most of the statement that he is making today. I think it is one of the most thoughtful and constructive statements yet offered on the Vietnam crisis. I hope very much that it will be carefully read by our officials in the State Department and the executive branch.

Mr. CLARK. I hope so, too, I may say to my friend, but I have some doubts about it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I know the Senator is highly regarded in the Government. I suspect that what he has to say is very carefully read, although not always followed as fully as it should be.

I share the Senator's conviction that the President of the United States very much wants to achieve a negotiated settlement of this conflict. I have never for one moment doubted the President's very real desire to achieve a peaceful and honorable settlement of this conflict. I think perhaps more than any one of us, he is concerned about the bloodshed and the sacrifice of American lives in that

part of the world, and that he has a very strong and clear desire to move the conflict from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have thought about what prevents the other side from accepting the invitation to negotiations and it seems to me there may be at least three factors that explain this unfortunate situation.

I think the first factor has been the reluctance of the administration to state clearly that it is willing to enter into direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, while it is an unpleasant fact, that political group nevertheless controls a major portion of the countryside. It is an effective political and military force in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting and killing the Government troops in South Vietnam. It is the force that has been shooting at our own men there. So, unpleasant as it may be, they represent a power to be dealt with and not merely as an appendage to Hanoi.

Second, I think we must state our willingness to permit that front some share in whatever provisional government is established. The Saigon government has, of course, a voice in this matter too as do other interested groups. But we must indicate our willingness to have the National Liberation Front involved in any kind of provisional government that is established before elections are held:

The third factor that I think stands in the way of negotiations is that every time we have expressed a desire for negotiations, we have stepped up the military operations. There have been more search and destroy operations, or more bombing attacks. Those offensive activities are doubtless interpreted by the other side as an indication of lack of good faith on our side to negotiate. We should be able to understand that, because various officials in our own Government have said that the other side did not seem to be interested in negotiations when they have accelerated their military activities.

I wonder if the Senator agrees with me that these three factors are pertinent. There may be others, but are they not factors which make the other side reluctant to enter negotiations?

Mr. CLARK. I agree. We cannot expect the other side to come to the negotiating table while we are engaging in military attacks.

There is an additional factor involved, which I think is important, and I wonder if the Senator will agree with me. The other side still thinks it is going to win. I have been accused of being a dove, and in some respects I am. I do not think we can permit them to think we are tired. I think we must stay to convince them that we mean what we say. I do think we should try to minimize the casualties. But we must remember that they think they are going to win, that we are not going to win, that we will get tired and that we will get out.

I would like to point out for the Record that there is not a single U.S. Senator

who wants us to get out of Vietnam unilaterally.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have never recommended U.S. withdrawal before an honorable settlement and I know of no other Senator who has.

I do not believe either side can win a military victory. The cost of a clear-cut victory on either side is so high that it is beyond any interest that either they or we might have. This is not a war in which military victory is feasible for either side.

We have enough firepower in Vietnam so that we are not going to be pushed out. By the same token if we were to use that firepower to try to score what some call a victory, we would have to kill 3, 4, or 5 times as many innocent civilians as the number of guerrillas that would be killed.

We have reached what amounts to a military stalemate in the war, and that leaves no reasonable alternative other than a negotiated settlement.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from South Dakota not agree that the President expressed the point very well yesterday in New York, and that what he said there is applicable to us as well as to the other side? I quote the President:

We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched with caution in deed.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is an excellent point. It is a more eloquent way of stating that old rhyme we used to state in childhood:

Sticks and stones will break my bones but names will never hurt me,

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. Mr. McGOVERN. Many times the words, particularly those of the Chinese, are phrased in much more belligerent terms than their actions.

Mr. CLARK. I agree.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator on his excellent address.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment about American capability. If we go for all-out war we could, of course, with our enormous firepower and the interjection of several hundred thousand additional American ground troops, together with a stepping up of our bombing in the south, wipe out the Vietcong; but we would wipe out South Vietnam with it and earn the undying enmity of those still living after the assaults had terminated.

We could also destroy the economy of North Vietnam and kill a good part of its population in order to induce surrender.

If China were to come in as a result of all this, we could win a war against China.

In short, to paraphrase the words of the well-known poem, it would be indeed a famous victory. But what would be left afterward?

None but madmen would advocate such a solution. There are limitations on the cost we can pay for total victory. As a civilized nation, there must be some limit to the number of people we are willing to kill and the amount of havoc we are pre-

pared to wreak on a fundamentally innocent and, until recently, friendly people. There are limitations on our war capabilities in South Vietnam even short of a war with China. Among them, and they are important indeed, are, first, the number of American coffins our administration is prepared to see come home while the war is escalated and, second, the cost in terms of moving forward with our Great Society program, redressing the balance of our international payments, maintaining our friendly posture with the other nations of the world and, indeed, our own self-respect.

In the light of the foregoing, what should be American policy? Our present Vietnamese policy has: First, alienated most of our allies; second, impeded the conduct of our overall foreign policy; third, spread American military power too thin for our own safety; fourth, set back, for the foreseeable future, any prospect of a detente with Russia; fifth, set back the pacification of China and the bringing of that country into the family of nations; and, sixth, seriously damaged our hopes for arms control and disarmament.

On the domestic front, the costs of an expanded war will mean abandonment of the Great Society program or, in the alternative, a substantial increase in Federal taxes. Our problems in balancing our international payments have been substantially increased. So has the threat of inflation. There is a danger that measures may shortly have to be taken to combat inflation which could bring an end to the 5 consecutive years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

And perhaps the most frustrating part of the unhappy position in which we find ourselves is that no one can be sure whether our present policy may not succeed before we realize it. It is entirely conceivable that the Vietcong, with the acquiescence of Hanoi and Peiping, may give up tomorrow. Yet I, for one, am unwilling to see us put all our chips on that possibility. It is true that our opponents are not 10 feet tall. It is true that they have grave weaknesses. But it is equally true that the creeping escalation into which our country has been sucked holds grave dangers for all Americans if it is further pursued. The time has come for us to draw up a balance sheet, and look at the advantages of further escalation, if there are any, as against the costs.

Before presenting my own view, I should like to say a word about the function of the Senate. There are Members of this body and many outside, both in and out of the administration, who believe that Senators should remain silent in the face of these critical problems lest by speaking out we give aid and comfort to the enemies of our country. But to me this is a primitive and wholly unacceptable view. In our pluralistic and democratic society the right of dissent is secured. Under our Constitution the Senate is required to give its advice and consent in matters of foreign policy. In my judgment, both the current hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the debate now going on on the floor of the Senate provide an important national service. In fact, I believe it my

duty, as well as that of other Senators, to speak out on the subject of Vietnam.

Already the debate has accomplished much. We have forced the administration to carry out an "agonizing reappraisal," to borrow an old phrase, of its basic assumptions about our involvement in Vietnam. We have helped to sharpen the issues for the American people. We have pinpointed the dangers of following the belligerent course advocated by some administration leaders as well as some highly respected Senators. And in the end I hope we shall be successful in shaping a new course of action which will produce an honorable negotiated settlement.

What, then, should our course be? I conclude:

First. Viewing Vietnam in the light of our global commitments and our national capabilities, the military realities are such that the cost in casualties and money of further escalating the war in order to crush the enemy, to retake lost real estate and to pacify the country are too high to be acceptable.

Second. More and bigger bombing or a substantial buildup of American ground forces cannot change the military realities in our favor without unacceptable casualties and the expenditure of billions of dollars badly needed elsewhere. The forces arrayed against us can be increased indefinitely. The notion that we can achieve a decisive military superiority in South Vietnam is a dangerous fantasy because the adversary land powers of Asia, with substantially greater military manpower, will not permit us to do so except at the cost of entirely destroying the country and leaving nothing but devastation and ruin as the result of our efforts.

Third. The real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities. While efforts are going forward at the United Nations and elsewhere to bring the shooting to an end, we should stay where we are in South Vietnam with what we have in terms of naval, air, and land power. We should increase our forces, our armaments, and our financial commitment only to the extent necessary to maintain our present position. We should require that the major burden of any effort to retake enemy-held territory should fall on the South Vietnamese, not on us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is probably going to say it; therefore, I may be intervening unnecessarily. As the Senator knows, I have not listened to all of his speech, but he has favored me with the text of it, and I find myself in general accord with it. I am proud to tell him this because he and I have agreed on major objectives. We have had variances of opinion as to how to implement the objectives we have in mind.

The Senator's descendants will have every reason to be proud of the record he is leaving behind today in his speech in this historic debate. In my judgment, it is a magnificent speech.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator in the advancement of some of our reasons for urging some modification of our Government's policy.

When the Senator makes the suggestions that he started to make as to what our policy ought to be, this does not mean that we are in any way going to risk our position in South Vietnam militarily. It does not mean that we are going to jeopardize the welfare of our boys over there. I think it means that we are going to save the lives of many of them who otherwise would be killed.

So far as I am concerned, I am proud to say that I wholeheartedly support General Gavin and his definition of an enclave program in South Vietnam. I strongly urge my Government to accept that program.

But the point I want to make is that we now hold this position, which means that the Vietcong cannot takeover. It means they cannot succeed in advancing. Many people get the idea that the enclave theory means some kind of retreat or some kind of surrender. That is pure nonsense. It does mean that in the holding operation we, I think, strengthen the possibility of other nations moving in with an entirely different status and for an entirely different purpose—the purpose of peacekeeping; the purpose of trying to work out a cease-fire; the purpose of trying to work out a negotiated settlement, not to be carried on under a bilateral arrangement between the United States and South Vietnam, on the one hand, and the Vietcong and North Vietnam, on the other; but with noncombatants sitting at the head of the table, leading the parties to an honorable and negotiated settlement. That must be the approach.

I shall stop now. The Senator has heard me say this many times. We have to play for that period of time when we can get multilateral participation in a settlement of this problem. It cannot be done, in my judgment, under the program that our administration has outlined.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator from Oregon and thank him for his helpful intervention.

I return to a discussion of my third point, which is what our course should be for the future. I had started to say that the real problem is to achieve a settlement consistent with the military realities.

I believe that from our present military position we should give our military commanders complete flexibility to utilize their present forces to the maximum extent consistent with an acceptable rate of casualties; and, in my judgment, such an acceptable rate would be very low indeed.

Fifth. In our search for a cease-fire and a peaceful settlement we must be prepared to deal at the conference table with the Vietcong.

I think it is generally agreed that our goal in Vietnam should not be unconditional surrender by our opponents. The President has stressed, over and over again, that our aim is an honorable peace, not total victory.

But by pretending that the Vietcong do not exist—except as a sort of North Vietnamese expeditionary force—we are, in effect, demanding their unconditional surrender.

True, we are not seeking total victory over North Vietnam. It is not our aim to invade North Vietnam and occupy Hanoi. But this does not change the situation in the south.

It is absurd to contend, as the North Vietnamese do, that the National Liberation Front is the "sole" representative of the people of South Vietnam. In order to make that assertion a fact, the Vietcong and their allies from the north would have to achieve a total victory over the Saigon government. This we can never permit, either on the battlefield or at the conference table.

But if our position is that the Saigon government is the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people, then our objective must be that the Vietcong lay down their arms and submit to the Saigon government—in other words, total victory for General Ky. There is a difference between negotiating a compromise settlement which is not fully acceptable to either side, but not unacceptable to either side, and simply negotiating about where the Vietcong are to stack their arms before heading to the prison camp. The first type properly deserves to be called a negotiation; the second sort is not negotiation at all—it is simply settling the details on an unconditional surrender. And obviously nobody would agree to a so-called negotiation of the latter sort unless they were thoroughly beaten.

The one salient point in the Mansfield report—in which I understand there is general agreement—is that this is an "open ended" war. In other words, if our goal is to defeat the Vietcong to the extent that they are willing to come to a conference merely to settle the terms of their surrender, then we are in for a much larger war, because the other side can match us man for man into the hundreds of thousands, even without Chinese intervention. I hope we all appreciate the dangers of a war with China—and perhaps ultimately with Russia—if this escalation should occur.

However, if our goal is a genuine negotiation—and not just a negotiated Vietcong surrender—then I think we should say so plainly to the other side. Of course, we should not reveal our minimum bargaining position; there is not much room left for bargaining if we do that. But we should make it plain that our objective is not the unconditional surrender of the Vietcong, and the best way to do that is to make it plain that we expect them to come to the bargaining table in their own right. So long as they are under the impression that we expect them to stack arms and surrender, one could hardly expect them to take a positive view about our "peace offensive."

If we are really interested in a genuine negotiation—and not just a negotiated surrender by the Vietcong—what can we expect the negotiators to talk about? The answer is simple—setting the conditions under which the wounds of the

war can be healed and the people of South Vietnam can achieve some measure of democracy and self-determination. It is essential that we not commit ourselves to any specific formula, and that we not bar any formula which might achieve this result, because the formula is what we will be negotiating.

We should be canvassing—and I hope our State Department planners are now studying—a variety of alternatives. It is likely that some sort of provisional government will have to be set up. I think it is most important that a definite date for the holding of free elections be established, that all the negotiating parties pledge themselves to guarantee the holding of such elections—unlike the prior Geneva accords, which the United States did not sign—and that a strong international force be sent into the country to enforce a cease-fire and to assure that the election, when held, is as free as it can be made.

The International Control Commission from the 1954 accords, made up of India, Canada, and Poland, still exists; perhaps it could do the job, given a sizable increase in manpower. Perhaps a new all-Asian International Control Commission should be set up, in which countries such as Burma, Malaysia, and the Philippines might participate. This is obviously a proper subject for negotiations.

If a decision should be taken to set up a provisional government which would have the duty of governing South Vietnam until free elections under international controls are held, obviously one of the toughest jobs for the negotiators—which would have to include the Saigon Government and the Vietcong as well as North Vietnam and ourselves—will be determining the makeup of the government. Since the establishment of some kind of government is an essential precondition to the holding of free elections, there is no way of avoiding the painful job of negotiating such a provisional arrangement.

It is most vital that we not walk into the bargaining session with inflexible attitudes and firm preconditions on this point.

To my regret, I note that a really inflexible position is still held by some people high in the administration. It may be possible to work out some form of international custodial government which could run and pacify the country until the holding of elections; this might be the best way out of the dilemma.

The negotiators might favor a hybrid arrangement for a provisional government with certain key functions—such as police, information, and justice—under temporary international control, and with other functions under South Vietnamese control. Or they might come up with a plan for an all-South Vietnamese provisional government, with the International Control Commission staying in the background and merely keeping the peace and guaranteeing the freedom of the elections, including, of course, the freedom to organize for political activity and campaign for office.

I think we have a right to expect that the other side will not take an adamant

position requiring the exclusion of representatives of the Saigon Government in such a provisional arrangement. But, by the same token, I think they have a right to expect that we will not prejudge their claims for NLF participation.

So far as I can determine, and I confess the recent rash of confusing statements has tended to cloud the atmosphere, this is precisely what President Johnson's position is.

While he did not deal at any depth with the subject in his speech in New York last night, yet I think everything that I have said is consistent with the position he summarized during that talk.

According to press reports I have seen, Press Secretary Moyers has expressly declared "that kind of question is one that should be decided at the negotiating table." This statement was apparently made in response to a request for comment on the proposal that the United States keep the door open to the possibility of participation by the National Liberation Front in any provisional government which may be set up as a result of peace talks before free elections are held.

As one Senator who has long supported the President's efforts to achieve an honorable negotiated settlement, I am quite frankly grateful to the White House for this much needed clarification. I hope the President will seize every opportunity to bring this message home, and help to dispel the confusion which exists both here in the United States, and in Hanoi, about our aims. For I am one of those who continue to hope that when the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have become convinced of our desire to achieve a settlement which is honorable without being unrealistic, the negotiations for which we have sought so long can begin.

I close my remarks with the hope that the President and his principal military and civilian advisers will give prayerful thought to the point of view which I have expressed this afternoon, and will refrain from further escalating the war in what, in my judgment, would be a vain effort to achieve that most elusive of objectives, military victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a series of editorials, columns, and comments by the editors of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, Mr. Joseph Kraft, Mr. Walter Lippmann, and Mr. Max Frankel, from which documents I have drawn much of the inspiration for this speech.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have listened to the address of the Senator this afternoon with attention and with admiration. He continues to display independence of thought.

I believe that he has made a most constructive contribution to the continuing dialog on Vietnam.

I commend him very strongly for the forthright and courageous address he has given this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his kind words. As he knows, he and I have stood pretty much together in this matter over the last several months.

Mr. CHURCH. I especially congratulate the Senator for his determination to advance the discussion in a dispassionate way, since we are searching for light instead of heat. This is obviously the need of the moment if our country's best interests are to be served.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania and he understands mine. However, I disagree with the views of the Senator.

I ask the Senator what his judgment is concerning the legality of the position of the United States. Is the Senator one of those who believe that this Nation at present does not have the power to put troops there, that the authorization given the President in August is not sufficiently broad to empower the President to put those troops there, or that we are in violation of our United Nations Charter and treaty commitment?

Mr. CLARK. I have mixed views about that. I really have not attempted to firm up any definitive view. This is a rather secondary matter.

I do not believe that the Tonkin Gulf resolution added a single thing to the powers that the President had as Commander in Chief.

I do not think the repeal of that resolution or its modification would take away any of the powers which he had. Yet, from a purely legalistic point of view, I believe that a very good case can be made for the position that we find ourselves in a state of war, an obvious war, without that war having been declared by Congress as the Constitution requires. But I do not want to get legalistic about it because there are very many reasons, with many of which I sympathize, why it did not seem either feasible or wise to come to Congress to request a declaration of war.

The whole character of war has changed since our Constitution was framed. When we deal with so-called wars of national liberation, subversion, and sabotage, I am not at all sure that the strict constitutional requirement—which I believe has been violated—should nonetheless prevail.

With respect to the SEATO Treaty, only recently stressed by the Secretary of State, I do not believe that we have any obligation under that treaty to commit 200,000 men to the jungles of South Vietnam. On the other hand, I agree that we have the right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure I agree at least in part with what the Senator has said here.

When President Eisenhower occupied the White House and John Foster Dulles was urging us to vote for a Near East or Middle East resolution, this Senator insisted that the President had the right to send troops to the Near East in the absence of any declaration by Congress.

It was the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana at that time that the

February 24, 1966

necessity and wisdom of the President in sending the troops would be best declared after the event occurred, or after the provocation occurred, rather than in advance.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator could make a very good case for that, and I would not necessarily quarrel with him. However, trying to put oneself in the position of the President of the United States, one would be very reluctant to take massive military action without reassuring himself that the Congress was not going to shoot him down from behind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We fought the Korean war that way, though, as the Senator very well knows.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; we did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The President declared that such was our duty under the United Nations Treaty, and put troops in there, and Senator Taft of Ohio repeatedly criticized the President for not coming to Congress and seeking a resolution. We fought that war to a conclusion, such as it was, on that basis.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There have been 125 times, at least, if not more, when Presidents have undertaken to put the Armed Forces into action, either in defense of a position or to take a position, without a declaration of war.

The Constitution says that Congress shall declare war, but it does not deny the President, as the Commander in Chief, the right to put the Armed Forces of the United States into action prior to a declaration of war.

In this case, the President of the United States, recalling the Korean situation and Senator Taft's criticism of what happened, came and asked Congress for approval of what he had done; and those of us who voted on it—that is, many of us—clearly understood the meaning of those last words, which said that he would take whatever steps were necessary to prevent further aggression.

My thought at that time, as the Senate was voting on it, was that we could expect that the North Vietnamese might react violently to our response to their attack in the Tonkin Gulf, and that if that should happen, we proposed to counter whatever they would do thereafter; and it was my belief that when we sent troops down there, the President had the necessary authorization.

The Senator, of course, is familiar with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the so-called Vandenberg proposal, which says that nothing in the United Nations Charter would impair the right of any nation to act in individual or collective self-defense.

Inasmuch as we had a treaty, we certainly had the right to construe that treaty—as we did with the August resolution last year—as requiring us to act to meet aggression.

In view of that, it would seem to this Senator, just as it seemed to the American Bar Association by a unanimous vote—I think it was 279 to 0—that we had a treaty obligation, and we had an act of Congress telling the President that “We think the treaty obligation is involved here, we have been attacked, we have struck back, we have anticipated

further aggression,” and we authorized the President to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to meet further aggression.

While I appreciate the Senator's argument, in the last analysis, it would seem to me that it would be the President, in compliance with that resolution, who would determine what he thought was necessary to meet that aggression, not the Congress, because the resolution explicitly states he should take the steps he thought necessary to meet the aggression.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to become involved in an argument with the Senator from Louisiana, because I think he can make a pretty good legal argument; in fact, he has just done so. I know that my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] does not agree with him, and perhaps he will speak up in a moment.

But to me, the problem involved here is not the right of what the President did; it is the wisdom. We have a right to do a great many things which are not very wise.

It is in this area that, with deep reluctance, I find myself in some disagreement with what has been done. But I say again, as I said earlier in my speech I hope we are on the way to correct that situation.

I have put in the RECORD the President's speech in New York last night. I do not agree with the 10th point, about whether what we are doing there is worthwhile, but I think the rest of it was a temperate statement of a position which is opposed to escalation, and shows determination that we will not be thrown out; and I am in accord with that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

THE 1965 DESERTIONS UP IN SAIGON FORCES—
TOTAL IS PUT ABOVE 96,000—U.S. AIDS
CONCERNED

(By Neil Sheehan)

SAIGON, February 23.—About 96,000 men deserted from the South Vietnamese armed forces last year, a total equivalent to nearly half of the American force that has been committed to the defense of this country.

Actually, the figure reported by the South Vietnamese Government was higher, but informed sources said it did not take into account the fact that some of the deserters had later reenlisted. In addition, the figures are considered less than completely accurate because of the crude administrative procedures of the armed forces.

Nevertheless, the sources said, U.S. military officials consider the desertion rate very high and are deeply concerned about it.

Total desertions for 1965 were put at 113,000. Of these, 47,000 were from the regular armed forces—army, navy, and air force—and 17,000 were from the regional forces, equivalent of the U.S. National Guard; 49,000 were from the popular forces, or local militia.

The sources could offer no specific reasons for the high rate of Government desertions other than the intensification of the fighting and a general war weariness that has overtaken the country.

Most of the men who desert, the sources said, do so either while still in training camps or while moving to their first assignments.

Figures were not available for desertions during 1964, but it was understood that they

had been substantially below the 1965 figures.

Desertions from the regular armed forces nearly doubled during the last year, reaching about 14 percent of their total strength. Desertions from the 270,000-man army, which forms the great bulk of the regular armed forces, showed a gradual increase during the year. They ran near 18 percent of total strength in December.

The armed forces discharged 48,000 men for various reasons in 1965 and suffered 13,000 killed, 23,000 wounded, and 6,000 missing in action or captured.

OVERALL FORCE INCREASES

Despite the high desertions and other losses, the Government relied on intensive recruiting, more stringent conscription methods and the return of wounded to duty to increase the overall strength of the Armed Forces from 510,000 men in December 1964, to 571,000 in December 1965.

The regular Armed Forces, for example, inducted 114,000 men during the year—77,000 volunteers and 37,000 conscripts.

Most of the deserters were men who had originally volunteered for service. The regional forces and popular forces—two militia units heavily affected—are composed entirely of volunteers. A majority of men in the regular Armed Forces also enlisted.

Most deserters, qualified sources suggest, do not defect to the Vietcong, but return to their homes in the villages, go into hiding or drift into the cities to look for civilian jobs.

Vietcong defections to the Government during 1965 totaled about 11,000. No estimates are available for guerrillas who deserted from Communist units and did not report to Government authorities, but the number is believed to equal only a fraction of the desertions from the Government Armed Forces because the Vietcong usually exercise tighter control over their areas.

FOE STILL OUTNUMBERED

Although Government forces still outnumber the enemy by more than 2 to 1, the Vietcong have shown an ability to increase their overall strength more quickly than the Government. The total enemy force increased in the last year from 103,000 at the beginning of 1965 to 230,000 in December.

About 20,000 troops were North Vietnamese regulars who had infiltrated the south since last winter. About 40,000 more are political and administrative workers who do little fighting.

In another report made available here today, a U.S. military spokesman said that in the week that ended Saturday, 83 American servicemen were killed in South Vietnam, 354 wounded and 4 reported missing in action. Twelve South Koreans and Australians were also killed, 17 wounded and 1 reported missing.

In the same period, 197 South Vietnamese troops were killed.

The Vietcong guerrillas suffered 1,357 dead and 122 captured, according to the spokesman.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 24, 1966]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS IN THE FREEDOM AWARDS

Twenty-five years ago—to a world darkened by war—President Franklin Roosevelt described the four freedoms of mankind:

Freedom of speech and expression.

Freedom of every person to worship God in his own way.

Freedom from want.

Freedom from fear.

Franklin Roosevelt knew that these freedoms could not be the province of one people alone. He called on his countrymen to

assist those who endured the tyrant's bombs and suffered his oppression.

He called for courage—for generosity—for resolution in the face of terror. He said that:

"Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights—or keep them."

Wendell Wilkie—Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in the campaign of 1940—shared his belief that freedom could not be founded only on American shores or only for those whose skin is white. "Freedom is an indivisible word," he said. "If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin."

That was Republican policy 25 years ago. It was Democratic policy 25 years ago. It is American policy tonight.

How well have we done in our time in making the four freedoms real for our people, and for the people of the world?

Here in America we accord every man the right to worship as he wills. I believe we are more tolerant of religious or sectional differences than we were a quarter of a century ago. The majority of our people believe that a qualified man or woman—of any race—any religion—any section—could hold any office in the land. This was not so clear in 1940.

We are committed, now—however great the trial and tension—to protecting the right of free expression and peaceful dissent. We have learned to despise the witch hunt—the unprincipled harassment of a man's integrity and his right to be different. We have gained in tolerance—and I am determined to use the high office I hold to protect and encourage that tolerance.

I do not mean to say that I will remain altogether silent on the critical issues of our day. For just as strongly as I believe in other men's freedom to disagree, so do I believe in the President's freedom to persuade. Let me assure you that I will do everything in my power to defend both.

AMERICAN RECORD

Twenty-five years ago "freedom from want" had the ring of urgency for our people. The unemployment rate stood at 14½ percent. Millions of Americans had spent the last decade in the breadlines or on farms where the winds howled away any chance for a decent life.

Tonight there are still millions whose poverty haunts our conscience. There are still fathers without jobs and children without hope.

Yet for the vast majority of Americans, these are times when the hand of plenty has replaced the grip of want. For the first time in almost 9 years, the unemployment rate has fallen to 4 percent.

This liberation from want—for which we thank God—is a testimony to the enduring vitality of our competitive economy.

It is a testimony also to an enlightened public policy, established by Franklin Roosevelt and strengthened by every administration since his death.

That policy has freed Americans for more hopeful, more productive lives.

It has relieved their fears of growing old—by social security and medicare.

It has inspired them with hope for their children—by aid to elementary and higher education.

It has helped to create economic opportunity—by enlightened fiscal policies.

It has granted to millions, born into hopeless deprivation, the chance of a new start in life—by public works, private incentive, and poverty programs.

For the Negro American, it has opened the door—after centuries of enslavement and discrimination—to the blessings America offers to those willing and able to earn them.

Thus we address the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, 25 years after his message to America and the world, with confidence and with an unflagging determination. We have served his vision of the four freedoms essential to mankind—here in America.

DENIED ELSEWHERE

Yet we know he did not speak only for America. We know that the four freedoms are not secure in America when they are violently denied elsewhere in the world.

We know, too, that it requires more than speeches to resist the international enemies of freedom. We know that men respond to deeds when they are deaf to words. Even the precious word "freedom" may become empty to those without the means to use it.

For what does freedom mean when famine chokes the land; when new millions crowd upon already strained resources; when narrow privilege is entrenched behind law and custom; when all conspires to teach men that they cannot change the conditions of their lives?

I do not need to tell you how five administrations have labored to give real meaning to freedom—in a world where it is often merely a phrase that conceals oppression and neglect.

Men in this room—men throughout America—have given their skills and treasure to that work. You have warned our people how insatiable is aggression—and how it thrives on human misery.

You have carried the word—that without the sense that they can change the conditions of their lives, nothing can avail the oppressed of this earth—neither good will, nor national sovereignty, nor massive grants of aid from their more fortunate brothers.

You have known, too, that men who believe they can change their destinies will change them.

Armed with that belief, they will be willing—yes, eager—to make the sacrifices that freedom demands. They will be anxious to shoulder the responsibilities that are inseparably bound to freedom.

They will be able to look beyond the four essential freedoms:

To the freedom to learn, to master new skills, to acquaint themselves with the lore of man and nature.

To the freedom to grow, to become the best that is within them to become, to cast off the yoke of discrimination and disease.

To the freedom to hope, and to build on that hope, lives of integrity and well-being.

This is what our struggle in Vietnam is about. This is what our struggle for equal rights in this country is about.

We seek to create that climate—at home and abroad—where unlettered men can learn, where deprived children can grow, where hopeless millions can be inspired to change the terms of their existence for the better.

THREAT OF TERROR

The climate cannot be created where terror fills the air.

Children cannot learn—men cannot earn their bread—women cannot heal the sick—where the night of violence has blotted out the sun.

Whether in the cities and hamlets of Vietnam, or in the ghettos of our own cities, the struggle is the same. It is to end the violence against the human mind and body—so that the work of peace may be done, and the fruits of freedom won.

We are pitting the resources of the law—of education and training—of our vision and our compassion—against that violence here at home. And we shall end it—in our time.

On the other side of the earth, we are no less committed to ending violence against men who are struggling to be free.

It is about that commitment that I wish to speak now.

Tonight, in Vietnam, more than 200,000 young Americans fight for freedom. Tonight our people are determined that these men shall have whatever help they need and that their cause—which is our cause—shall be sustained.

But in these last days there have been questions about what we are doing in Vietnam, and these questions have been answered loudly and clearly for every citizen to see and hear. The strength of America can never be sapped by discussion—and we have no better or stronger tradition than open debate in hours of danger. We believe, with Macaulay, that men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely.

We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

What are the questions that are still being asked?

First, some ask if this is a war for unlimited objectives. The answer is plain: It is "No." Our purpose in Vietnam is to prevent the success of aggression. It is not conquest; it is not empire; it is not foreign bases; it is not domination.

It is to prevent the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

Second, some ask if we are caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war that no one wants. The answer—again—is "No." We are using that force—and only that force—necessary to stop the aggression. Our fighting men are in Vietnam because tens of thousands of invaders came South before them. Our numbers have increased—because the aggression of others has increased. The high hopes of the aggressor have been dimmed, and the tide of the battle has turned. Our measured use of force must be continued. But this is prudent firmness under careful control. There is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation.

Third, others ask if our fighting men are to be denied the help they need. The answer is again, and will be, a resounding "No." Our great Military Establishment has moved 200,000 men across 10,000 miles since last spring.

These men have, and will have, what they need to fight the aggressor. They have already performed miracles in combat. The men behind them have worked miracles of supply—building new ports, transporting new equipment, opening new roads.

The American forces of freedom are strong today in South Vietnam. And we will keep them so. They are led by a brilliant and resourceful commander—Gen. William C. Westmoreland. He knows the needs of war and he supports the works of peace. When he asks for more Americans to help the men he has, his requests will be immediately studied, and, as I promised last July, his needs will be met.

Fourth, some ask if our men go alone to Vietnam—if we alone respect our great commitment in the Southeast Asia Treaty. Still again the answer is "No." We have seven allies in SEATO and five of them are giving vital support, each with his own strength and in his own way, to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Fifth, some ask about the risk of wider war—perhaps against the vast land armies of Red China. And again the answer is "No," never by any act of ours—and not if there

is any reason left behind the wild words from Peiping.

We have threatened no one—and we will not.

We seek the end of no regime—and we will not.

Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply. We have measured the strength—and the weakness—of others, and we know our own. We observe in ourselves—and we applaud in others—a careful restraint in action. We can live with anger in word as long as it is matched by caution in deed.

Sixth, men ask if we rely on guns alone. Still again the answer is "No." From our Honolulu meeting, from the clear pledge which joins us with our allies in Saigon, there has emerged a common dedication to the peaceful progress of the people of Vietnam—to schools for their children, to care for their health, to hope and bounty for their land.

The Vice President returned today from his constructive and highly successful visit to Saigon and other capitals, and he tells me that he and Ambassador Lodge have found a new conviction and purpose in South Vietnam—for the battle against want and injustice as well as the battle against aggression.

So the pledge of Honolulu will be kept, and the pledge of Baltimore stands open—to help the men of the North when they have the wisdom to be ready.

We Americans must understand how fundamental is the meaning of this second war—the war on want. I talked on my farm last fall with Secretary Freeman, and in my office last week with Secretary Gardner—making, over and over again, the same central point: The breeding ground of war is human misery. If we are not to fight forever in faraway places—in Europe, or the Far Pacific, or the jungles of Africa, or the suburbs of Santo Domingo, then we must learn to get at the roots of violence. As a nation, we must magnify our struggle against world hunger and illiteracy and disease. We must bring hope to men whose lives now end at twoscore or less. Without that hope—without progress in this war on want—we will be called to fight again and again, as we must today.

Seventh, men ask who has a right to rule in South Vietnam. Our answer there is what it has been here for 200 years: The people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. We will insist for ourselves on what we require from Hanoi: respect for the principle of government by the consent of the governed. We stand for self-determination—for free elections—and we will honor their result.

Eighth, men ask if we are neglecting any hopeful chance of peace. And the answer is "No." A great servant of peace, Secretary Rusk, has sent the message of peace on every wire and by every hand to every continent. A great pleader for peace, Arthur Goldberg, has worked at home and abroad in this same cause. Their undiscouraged efforts will continue. How much wiser it would have been, how much more compassionate toward its own people, if Hanoi had come to the bargaining table at the close of the year. Then the 7,000 Communist troops who have died in battle since January 1—and the many thousands who have been wounded in that same period—could have lived at peace with their fellow men. Today—as then—Hanoi has the opportunity to end the increasing toll the war is taking on those under its command.

Ninth, some ask how long we must bear this burden. To that question—in all hon-

esty—I can give no answer tonight. During the Battle of Britain when that nation stood alone in 1940, Winston Churchill gave no answer to that question. When the forces of freedom were driven from the Philippines, President Roosevelt could not and did not name the date we would return. If the aggressor persists in Vietnam, the struggle may be long. Our men in battle know and accept this hard fact. We who are at home can do as much. There is no computer that can tell the hour and day of peace, but we do know that it will come only to the steadfast—never to the weak in heart.

Tenth, and finally, men ask if it is worth it. I think you know the answer. It is the answer that Americans have given for a quarter of a century, wherever American strength has been pledged to prevent aggression. The contest in Vietnam is confused and hard, and many of its forms are new. Yet our purpose and policy are unchanged.

Our men in Vietnam are there to keep a promise made 12 years ago. The Southeast Asia Treaty promised—as Secretary John Foster Dulles said for the United States—"that an attack upon the treaty area would occasion a reaction so united, so strong, and so well placed that the aggressor would lose more than it could hope to gain." But we keep more than a specific treaty promise in Vietnam. We keep the faith for freedom.

PRESIDENTS' PLEDGES

Four Presidents have pledged to keep that faith.

The first was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his state of the Union message 25 years ago. He said: " * * * we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom."

The second was Harry S. Truman, in 1947, at a historic turning point in the history of guerrilla warfare—and of Greece and Turkey and the United States. These were his words:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

"I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

The third was Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his first inaugural address. He promised this: "Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed, all freemen, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

And then 5 years ago, John F. Kennedy, on the cold bright noon of his first day in office, proclaimed:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

This is the American tradition. Built in free discussion, proven on a hundred battlefields, rewarded by a progress at home that has no match in history, it beckons us forward now to the work of peace in Vietnam.

We will build freedom while we fight, and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high hard road of freedom. We are too old to be foolhardy and too young to be tired—too strong for fear and too determined for retreat.

Each evening when I retire, I take up—from a bedside table—reports from the battlefield and from the capitals of the world. They tell me how our men have fared that day in the hills and valleys of Vietnam. They tell me what hope there seems to be that the message of peace will be heard, and this tragic war ended.

I read of individual acts of heroism—of dedicated men and women whose valor matches that of any generation that has gone before. I read of men risking their lives to save others—of men giving their lives for freedom.

Always among these reports are a few letters from the men themselves.

If there is doubt among some here at home about our purposes in Vietnam, I do not find it reflected in these letters. Our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, know why they are in Vietnam. They know—as five Presidents have known—how inseparably bound together are America's freedom and the freedom of her friends in the world.

Tonight I ask each citizen to join me—in the homes and meeting places our men are fighting to keep free from oppression—in a prayer for their safety.

I ask you to join me in a pledge to the cause for which they fight—the cause of human freedom.

I ask you for your help—for your understanding and your commitment—so that this united people may show forth to the world that America has not ended the only struggle worthy of man's unceasing sacrifice—the struggle to be free.

EXHIBIT 3

THE TACTICS OF A TRUCE

(By Jack D. Forbes)

To one degree or another all the parties engaged in the Vietnamese civil war profess a desire for peace, and yet the war continues. In part this is because no peace proposals made by either side have thus far included guarantees to protect the interests of all participants. The North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front appear to desire conditions very unfavorable to the Saigon junta and the United States, while the latter groups appear intent upon the annihilation or disappearance of the NLF. No peace can be arranged until conditions are set forth which recognize the interests of all Vietnamese factions, including tribal groups, Buddhists, and neutralists.

In making any peace proposal, it must be assumed that all parties truly desire an end to hostilities, providing only that their relative positions of strength are not diminished by the immediate postwar stage of developments. Any serious peace proposal must realistically respect that condition.

The first step in any move toward peace would be the recognition by the United States that the Vietnamese war is a civil war, that the several most interested participants—NLF, Buddhists, tribesmen, neutralists, Saigon junta leaders, North Vietnamese, Catholics, et al.—deserve recognition as legitimately concerned groups and that no one of these parties can pretend to speak for the South Vietnamese or the Vietnamese as a whole. The United States must also face the quite obvious fact that the Saigon junta has no claim to call itself a legitimate government, being merely the end result of numerous unconstitutional seizures of power. It has no more claim to represent the South Vietnamese people than does the NLF or FULRO (the tribal alliance). In brief, there is no government in South Vietnam, but rather several factions engaged in

a military-political struggle. And the United States must admit that it is the only significant non-Vietnamese participant in the civil war and that if it were not for the U.S. intervention the war would doubtless involve only Vietnamese.

Any serious peace proposal must, I believe, rest upon the following principles: (1) that a cease-fire must be arranged as a pre-condition for real negotiations under United Nations supervision; (2) that only the United Nations can properly supervise the transition to peace; (3) that South Vietnam will have to be under international control for a number of years to prevent a resumption of the civil war or the seizure of power by one faction; and (4) that all interested parties must not only be involved in the peace negotiations but must be provided with face-saving arrangements which will give all groups the opportunity for claiming a moral if not a military victory. I believe that the following proposal meets these conditions.

A cease fire should immediately be arranged, on the basis of existing "fronts," no matter how complicated the boundaries may be. Second, all military units in South Vietnam should be immediately placed under United Nations command and all non-Vietnamese (principally United States) and North Vietnamese troops should be withdrawn under United Nations supervision according to a carefully arranged schedule.

At the same time that United States, North Vietnamese, Australian and South Korean troops are evacuated, equivalent numbers of United Nations units, derived from neutralist or nonaligned nations, should be introduced. Once all foreign and North Vietnamese troops have been replaced, a coalition government should be created, representing all factions, including tribal groups and non-Vietnamese minorities. As soon as conditions are appropriate, within perhaps 6 months, free elections should be held under the close supervision of United Nations authorities. Proportional representation for all parties and factions should be guaranteed, so as to insure the participation of all groups.

The United Nations forces should remain in South Vietnam for a period of at least 5 years subsequent to the first free elections and at least 1 year after the second free elections in order to guarantee that no powerful faction violates constitutional guarantees in the interim. Such a United Nations presence should also guarantee full freedom of speech and political activity.

During the 5-year (minimum) period of United Nations supervision, the armed forces of all South Vietnamese factions should be demobilized and replaced by a minimum-sized police force under civilian control. Likewise, the Mekong River project (or a similar scheme of economic development) should be implemented. The United States should—as it easily can—bear much of the cost of both the U.N. operation and the Mekong project.

Such a procedure as proposed above would, I believe, provide adequate protection for all factional interests. It would avoid further bloodshed and allow the South Vietnamese time in which to determine their own destiny. It would make full use of the United Nations, the only agency designed to settle a conflict such as exists in Vietnam. Finally, it would set a precedent for United Nations interim control of contested regions which might well be useful in Laos, Korea, Germany, and elsewhere.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1966]

"BUT 'T WAS A FAMOUS VICTORY"

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told two groups of Senators that "in the long term, we can achieve mili-

tary victory" in Vietnam. But President Johnson has said: "We know, as our adversaries should also know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side."

It is being asked here and abroad: What is American policy? The American military men, on the whole, believe that the United States can and should achieve what they call a victory in Vietnam. The aim, as President Johnson has usually—but not always—expressed it, is that of a limited war proving that the United States cannot and will not be driven from South Vietnam. However, Secretary McNamara says he knows of no military expert in the Department of Defense who supports the "enclave," or limited strategy, concept; and after hearing Gen. Maxwell Taylor's testimony yesterday, Senator FULBRIGHT concluded that present U.S. policy "logically leads to unconditional surrender" and "to unlimited commitment."

The war cannot be won on the military front, and it is deceptive to let Americans and South Vietnamese believe that it can. Of course, the United States has the manpower and the firepower to destroy the Vietcong—but only by destroying all of South Vietnam in the process.

A "victory" that kills a few hundred Vietcong and at the same time destroys whole fertile valleys with their crops, their pitiful villages and huts and many of their innocent men, women, and children, is not going to "win" the war in Vietnam for anybody. Yet, as the Times correspondent Neil Sheehan showed in a vivid description, this is exactly what happened in Binh Dinh Province in the recent massive allied sweep.

No one wins in such a victory. Everybody loses. Multiply the experience of Binh Dinh Province a hundred times; spread it over all of South and North Vietnam, and what will the United States then proudly show to the world and to history? "A famous victory"?

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1966]

WASHINGTON: THE RUSK DOCTRINE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Secretary of State Rusk has put a grim doctrine before the people of this country. He was a responsive and forthright witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and it is important that we understand what he thinks our duties and responsibilities are in the world.

First, in Vietnam, we are to commit to the battle whatever is necessary to end the aggression and bring about the freedom and security of South Vietnam.

What this means, he conceded, depends primarily on what the enemy commits (the Chinese committed 1 million men to the battle in Korea). He would not say there was no limit to the men and material the United States would send to Vietnam, but he stuck to his proposition that we would maintain military superiority there no matter how long it took to stop the fighting.

RUSK'S OBJECTIVE

This objective, it should be noted, was not made conditional on what the South Vietnamese or any of the other allies contributed to the fighting. There is no longer much talk here of victory depending primarily on the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. Rusk discussed the freedom of South Vietnam as a vital American interest, essential to our own security and critical to all the other security commitments we have taken to over 40 other countries. This is a formidable doctrine.

Second, the Secretary of State gave an interesting interpretation of America's obligations as a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the event of armed aggression against the territory covered by that treaty, he said, America's obligation to

oppose the aggression did not depend on all the members agreeing to oppose it, but it was America's duty to do so regardless of what the others did (which in Vietnam is very little).

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENTS

This did not mean, Secretary Rusk remarked, that the United States was obligated to oppose Communist aggression everywhere in the world or that we were going around looking for fights to put down. For example, we did not oppose Communist China's aggression in Tibet or the Soviet Union's aggression in Hungary, for we had not taken any commitment to do so, but this still leaves us with commitments the like of which no sovereign nation ever took in the history of the world.

For the United States is committed to oppose Communist aggression all along the periphery of the Communist nations from the North Cape of Norway through the heart of Europe to Greece and Turkey (NATO); along the southern frontier of the Soviet Union in the Near and Middle East (the Eisenhower resolution); and thence through southeast Asia (SEATO) to Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan and Korea. And if you add our obligations under the Organization of American States and our obligations under the United Nations, you take in most of the rest of the world.

The Rusk doctrine makes the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine seem rather cheap. Monroe limited his commitments to the Western Hemisphere. Truman wanted to oppose communism primarily by economic means. And even John Foster Dulles, who was not a timid man, thought each alliance should stand on its own terms and depend to some degree on what the other members of the alliance did.

But the Rusk doctrine draws no distinction between powerful industrial democratic states in Europe and weak undemocratic states in Asia. His view seems to be that the United States must redeem the promises of every alliance it has signed regardless of what the other signatories do, and that failure to keep everybody's promise in one alliance will destroy the confidence of the world in all other alliances we have signed.

THAT BLANK CHECK

If this is true, it is odd that most of our allies in Europe, the Middle East and even in Japan are critical of our operations in Vietnam, but this is the thesis Mr. Rusk placed before the Foreign Relations Committee.

And the interesting thing is that the Senators cannot really do much about it, which accounts for all the frustration they have demonstrated on the TV screens in the last few days. For in the moment of crisis during the Communist attack on our ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson asked for a blank check to deal with aggression all over southeast Asia—including the right to use any force "he" deemed necessary—and once he had published that request, the Congress had no choice but to grant it to him or—what was unthinkable—repudiate him in the face of the enemy.

THE SENATE'S DILEMMA

Nor can the Senate do anything to take back this promise under present circumstances. If Senator MORSE presses his resolution to withdraw the Tonkin Gulf resolution, obviously few if any Congressmen are going to vote with him and turn their backs on the 200,000 Americans now fighting in Vietnam.

But their helplessness merely emphasizes the transformation that has taken place in American and world politics. The President, if he chooses his time carefully, can obviously get almost any commitment he likes from the Congress in the moment of crisis, and under the Rusk doctrine, we are then obliged to redeem each commitment, re-

regardless of what the other parties to the agreement do, or risk the destruction of the entire system of American alliances created since the last war.

All this goes well beyond Vietnam in space and time. Mr. Rusk has asked the Senate to contain the expansion of communism all along the periphery of the Communist empire, by force of arms and without allies if necessary, and the Congress cannot oppose him in present circumstances without opposing its own men in Vietnam, which it obviously will not do.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]
THE AGNOSTIC VOICE
(By Joseph Kraft)

One voice, it seems to me, has been missing from the clamor over whether or not to resume bombing North Vietnam. It is the voice of those who don't know, and know they don't know—the voice of the agnostics.

Perhaps above all others, however, the agnostic voice deserves to be heard. For while dogmatic assertions are expressed in all quarters at all times, the fact is that American policy in Vietnam is largely grounded on hunches, guesses, prejudices, and assumptions—on propositions that are unknown and unknowable, untested and untestable.

For example, there is the assumption that the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong insurgent movement, is the pure puppet of the Hanoi government in North Vietnam. To hear the Secretary of State tell it, no doubt on that score can even be admitted.

But the U.S. Government knows next to nothing about the politics of the Vietcong. Systematic investigation was not even begun until late last summer. The study that resulted offers no explanation of why the Vietcong changed its secretary general three times in less than a year—a critical development. It does not indicate why the admittedly Communist element of the front, the People's Revolutionary Party was not set up until 1962, or why it was set up then—another critical development. It asserts that the secretary general of the Communist wing of the front is a man who has been for the last 3 years in Algiers—a manifest absurdity.

A second assumption in Washington is that there is no interest in negotiating on the part of the Hanoi government. That view is now supplemented by confident assertions that such experienced and Western-oriented leaders as President Ho Chi Minh and Premier Pham Van Dong have lost power to a Chinese-oriented hard-liner—Le Duan, the secretary general of the North Vietnamese Communist Party.

But that whole story finds its source in an English scholar, P. J. Honey. Mr. Honey has been out of North Vietnam for years. He has argued that since Ho Chi Minh is a clever fellow who would not work his country into a box, and that since North Vietnam is now plainly in a bad box, Ho Chi Minh cannot possibly be running the country. That theory, even if it had a respectable base in logic, is at least put into question by several visitors who have seen Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi during the last 2 months.

As to the notion that Le Duan is a Chinese-oriented hard-liner, it is pure speculation. It is matched by an equally justified speculation that Le Duan takes a middle position between those in Hanoi who look toward Moscow and those who look toward Peiping.

Still a third Washington assumption is that the Vietnamese struggle is a first step in a long-range Communist Chinese program for world domination. In support of that view Secretary of State Rusk and, following his lead, Secretary of Defense McNamara, have cited as the "Chinese Mein Kampf" a long article on strategic doctrine written by the Chinese defense minister, Lin Piao, last fall.

But as a recent study of the article by the Rand Corp. indicates, the Lin Piao statement

can be read as a move by Peiping to wash its hands of the Vietnamese war. And to me, at least, there are indications both in the Lin Piao statement and in the important speech made recently by the political director of the Chinese army, Hsiao Hua, that the true point at issue is a struggle between Hanoi and Peiping for control over the Vietcong.

It may be, of course, that all the ruling official assumptions in Washington are right. But that is not the point. The point is that they rest on a foundation of guesswork. This country cannot be certain, or even close to certain, about any of the central political relations on the other side.

In this circumstance, agnosticism seems to me a healthy state of mind. And if it does not solve the question whether or not to bomb, it suggests the wisdom of caution; of not moving except when absolutely necessary; of a modest no-lose, as against an ambitious win; strategy: of small steps by small things.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]
THE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL KY
(By Walter Lippmann)

The Honolulu meeting has a critical bearing on the attempts to bring about some kind of negotiation. There are several parallel attempts now underway—by the Secretary General of the United Nations, by the Pope, by a group of unaligned governments, as well as various private diplomatic explorations. The status and the role of the Vietcong or as it calls itself, the National Liberation Front, in the negotiations is the key problem which must be solved in order that any kind of talks can begin. For inasmuch as the Vietcong is in military control of a large part of South Vietnam, a peace cannot be negotiated if the Vietcong does not participate in the negotiations.

There are, I understand, under consideration two formulas for dealing with the Vietcong. One is that a reconvened Geneva Conference should consist of the five great powers—China, the Soviet Union, the United States, France, and Great Britain, plus representatives of the North Vietnamese Government, plus two delegations from South Vietnam, one representing the Saigon government and the other the Vietcong. This formula reflects the actual military situation. For there are in being two powers in South Vietnam. Neither can be ignored in the making of peace.

This formula has been vetoed by the United States because it refuses to give the Vietcong any recognition as a government. There is now under consideration, therefore, a second formula. The reconvened Geneva Conference would consist of the Big Five, the two governments in Hanoi and Saigon, plus a delegation from the Vietcong. It may be as Ambassador Harriman seemed to suggest in a radio interview on Sunday, that this formula would be acceptable to the Administration. It would be very good news indeed if it were also acceptable to the other governments concerned.

In any event, since we are informed that no new important military decisions are being taken in Honolulu, the most important thing we need to know is what understanding the President reaches with General Ky about the format of the negotiations which we have asked the U.N. to promote. The fanfare of the reception could mean that the President has decided to commit this country to liquidate the Vietcong and to establish undisputed rule by General Ky or his successors over all of South Vietnam. But it might also conceivably mean that the President is talking turkey with General Ky and is telling him to get ready for the readjustment of U.S. policy in accordance with the real military prospects in Vietnam.

What, in short, has General Ky been promised? That is the question which will have

to be answered if the American people do indeed have the right to know what they are fighting for and what kind of war they are involved in.

The President's speech of welcome to the two Vietnamese leaders was full of righteous indignation and scorn for those of us who still adhere to the long-established American military doctrine, followed by every President until Lyndon Johnson, that we must refrain from becoming involved in a land war fought predominantly by Americans against Asians on the Asian Continent. They believe, as Winston Churchill is reported to have said, that we must not jump into the water to fight the sharks.

Even General MacArthur, who fought the Korean land war, insisted repeatedly that the old American doctrine was sound. This was also the view of General Ridgway and of General Gavin, and of their Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower. No one needs to be abashed because he adheres to this doctrine. Nor need he refrain from pointing out that what is going on in Vietnam has been demonstrating that the doctrine is sound.

I do not think that the President is a good historian when he says that those who are looking for ways to liquidate as humanely and honorably as possible what has proven to be a gigantic mistake "belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." The historical truth of the matter is that those who think the President is mistaken base their conviction on a reading of the history of our era, particularly on the relations between the Western white governments and the peoples of Asia. In this historical perspective it is Lyndon Johnson who has broken not only with the old American wisdom but also with the new knowledge of the world as it is.

"We cannot accept their logic," said the President, "that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us." The President's critics are not saying that tyranny 10,000 miles away does not concern us. They are saying that we cannot and should not set up alone as judges, juries, and policemen wherever there is tyranny on the face of the globe. They are saying that we have enough to do within the undoubted areas of our vital interests in Europe and in this hemisphere and in the Pacific and that we should not pretend to omnipotence and omniscience.

The President's hot and unexamined generalities are a moral commitment to endless crusading in all the continents. As one who has never been an isolationist or a pacifist, I am dismayed by the exaggerations and generalizations which have been allowed to grow out of the great debate about isolation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S SEARCH FOR PEACE
(By Walter Lippmann)

The resumption of bombing in North Vietnam is not a surprise, indeed it has been inevitable since the diplomatic content of the peace offensive was set. For on neither side has there been any overt effort to find the terms of a truce which reflect correctly the actual military situation. On both sides there has been some suggestion of softening the demands a little. But the basic objective of our adversaries remains the ascendancy of the Vietcong in South Vietnam, and our basic objective, as articulated repeatedly by Secretary Rusk, is the liquidation of the Vietcong and the ascendancy of General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

The whole worldwide attempt to end the fighting by negotiations is stalled on this disparity. The essential fact about the conflict of aims is that each side has a political objective which is beyond its military capacity. Insofar as Hanoi, and more certainly Peiping, are demanding the withdrawal of

the U.S. forces before there is a political settlement in Indochina, they are demanding more than they have the military power to achieve. The United States is able to stand fast and hold on.

On the other hand, insofar as we are tied to Secretary Rusk's objectives, to defeat and eliminate the Vietcong, to keep the 2,800 villages permanently secured against the Vietcong, and to create a government in Saigon that, without being an American colonial government, is the ruler of the whole of South Vietnam—insofar as these are our purposes in Vietnam, we are fighting a war which is far beyond our or anyone else's military and political capacity.

The search for peace, to which the President rededicated himself as he announced the end of the bombing pause, will succeed or fail as we and they bring war aims into balance with military capacity. This will certainly not be done simultaneously by both sides. But if one side makes the first move, it will be difficult for the other not to follow suit.

Thus, if Hanoi says clearly, what it has hinted at vaguely, that the American forces need not withdraw before negotiations bring about an agreed settlement, it would be difficult, indeed impossible in the long run, for the administration to deny that the Vietcong must in fact be a principal party to a negotiated truce.

It is also within our power to break the deadlock which has caused the peace offensive to fail. And as we are the stronger power, the more invulnerable, it is both our duty and our interest to take the initiative. No one, I suppose, imagines any longer that the deadlock can be broken by bombing, by a little bombing or by a lot of bombing. And there are few observers of the war who think that the deadlock can be broken by doubling or tripling our forces. The way to break the deadlock is to adopt a military strategy which, because it has a limited objective, can be made to prevail by limited means. Thus, when and if we move to a holding strategy, we shall have revised and reduced our war aims to something more modest but more credible than Mr. Rusk's unattainable pursuit of the independence of the whole of South Vietnam under General Ky and his successors in Saigon.

I regard both the bombing pause and the resumption of the bombing as irrelevant to the real problem, which is how to make a truce which is consistent with the military realities. Some will say that by more and bigger bombing and by a big buildup of troops we shall be able to change the military realities in our favor. Experience and the history of this wretched war are against that hope. For the forces against us can be increased indefinitely, and the notion of a decisive military superiority over the land powers of Asia is a dangerous fantasy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1966]
NEW LIGHT ON U.S. POLICY—GENERAL TAYLOR
SAYS AIM IS TO COMPEL ACCEPTANCE OF A
FREE SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor brought out in public today what other high officials here have made increasingly plain in private—namely that the U.S. terms for peace in Vietnam are much stiffer than the offer of "unconditional" negotiations has implied. Though caught up in a debate with some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about whether the administration's goals were "limited" or "unlimited," General Taylor left little doubt about what those goals are. He said the United States could, should and would achieve military and political successes of sufficient magnitude to force the Communists to accept an independent and non-Communist South Vietnam.

The Johnson administration has never wavered in the pursuit of that objective. Nor has it said anything to contradict the retired general's assertion that his personal testimony was wholly consistent with official policy.

Many observers and diplomats here and abroad, however, have misinterpreted the administration's offer to negotiate as an offer to compromise with the Vietcong in South Vietnam. General Taylor's testimony should have made it clear that such a compromise is not anticipated here.

That clarification was explicitly recognized at the end of the long hearing today by Senator J. M. FULBRIGHT, the committee chairman. The Arkansas Democrat said it seemed to him, in the language of the Ozarks, that the United States intended to apply the pressure until the Communists "holler enuff."

He said he wished instead that the administration was ready to deal with its principal adversary, the Vietcong, to seek "a compromise to stop the slaughter" and to give up the policy of waging a war that can end only "if all the Vietcong would go home and go north."

THE BASIC QUESTION

General Taylor did not dispute this summation of the essence of the argument between the administration and its critics. If the Vietcong would in fact go home and stop trying to take over South Vietnam, he said, they could at least obtain "compensation"—presumably in economic aid to North Vietnam. But his basic reply was a question "How do you compromise the freedom of 15 million South Vietnamese people?"

Compromise has had no appeal here because the administration concluded long ago that the non-Communist forces of South Vietnam could not long survive in a Saigon coalition with Communists. It is for that reason—and not because of an excessively rigid sense of protocol—that Washington has steadfastly refused to deal with the Vietcong or to recognize them as an independent political force.

It has offered to consider the Vietcong's "views" in negotiations and even to let the Vietcong sit in the delegation of North Vietnam, whose agents it says they are. Washington's purpose at such negotiations would be to ratify the end of the Communist threat to South Vietnam and not to compromise on the basis of the existing military balance.

As General Taylor reiterated, the administration believes the Communists have not been hurt sufficiently on the battlefield to enter into the kind of negotiations that have been offered. Privately, officials here agree with this presumed Communist assessment. They believe the Communists would now negotiate or give up only if they were prepared to honor the potential force that the United States can bring to bear.

As General Taylor also made clear, even the potential American military might is not enough to assure success. Force on the ground must be used to put the Communists into a "highly unfavorable" situation in South Vietnam, he said, while force in the air is used to inflict increasing loss and pain in North Vietnam.

NEED FOR VIABLE REGIME

In addition, he emphasized, the United States must construct a reasonably viable and stable government in South Vietnam and demonstrate a determination at home to see the struggle through.

The general said he was convinced that when all four conditions were met, North Vietnam would have been brought to the point where it was willing to talk. The purpose of the talks, he stressed, would be to "free South Vietnam from the Vietcong" and the essential ingredient is to "have them so beaten they'd be glad to come in and accept an amnesty."

These goals are not only "limited" but realistic, the general contended, although he would not be pinned down on the number of American troops that might have to become involved. The present 205,000 are not enough, he said, and 800,000 would be "fantastic" and unnecessary.

It is the realism of this assessment that troubled most of the administration's critics on the committee. They fear that no limits to the American involvement are in sight and that it could lead to an even more costly war with Communist China. Some seek more precise estimates of the ultimate cost, while others would prefer a reduction of the objectives—in other words, a compromise on the basis of present military and political strength.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would hope that other Senators desiring to speak on this subject would make themselves available to discuss it. I realize the difficulty of bringing Senators in, particularly those who have gone home in the snow, at this time of the evening. I had hoped that at least until 7 o'clock this evening, those who wanted to discuss the resolution would discuss it. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, and try to send word to all those desirous of making speeches that we would appreciate it if they would come and get their speeches made.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to tender my judgment and the information I have received, but it is certainly not information involving all Senators; it is information, apparently involving those who are opposed to the bill, or think they wish to make some qualifying statements before they vote on it, that none of those are ready to make any speeches tonight, but that they will be here to make speeches tomorrow. I do not think, unless there are some in favor of the bill who wish to make speeches, that we will be very successful in getting any more speeches tonight.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I doubt very much that we will. My only feeling about the matter is—and I do not expect to vote tonight—that I would like to get the speeches made; and so I think it might be well to let the clerk call the roll, and while he is doing it, undertake to ascertain if any Senators desirous of making speeches are ready to make them.

I would urge Senators who wish to speak to make their speeches, so that we can proceed to a vote. They have been on notice now for at least 17 days that this matter was going to be before the Senate. We have had at least 7 days of debate. There have been 7 days that have intervened in between, when Senators had time to prepare their speeches;

and I would hope that those who wish to make speeches would come and make them.

So I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for one moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I plead with the Senator to recognize the existence of the snowstorm, the lateness of the hour, and the fact that there are still several Senators who desire to make speeches who were not advised that we might be held in late tonight.

I call the Senator's attention to the custom of the majority leader in this regard, and express the very friendly hope that he will be willing to adjourn the Senate now, and come back in tomorrow. If he wishes to come back earlier tomorrow, that is all right, but—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not plan earlier than usual. As a matter of fact, may I say to the Senator that I hope to make some progress with the Senate Finance Committee tomorrow; it is my thought that we might make some headway there, even if we fail to do so here.

I am on notice that a request to permit the Committee on Finance to meet while the Senate is in session would also meet with objection and, therefore, I do not propose that the Senate come in until noon tomorrow; but, I am merely trying to ascertain if there are any Senators available who desire to make speeches and put themselves on record on this matter. If none are available, then we will adjourn and meet tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I certainly wish to cooperate with the Senator from Louisiana. I was off the floor. I had to go over to my office for a manuscript-judging program. I am one of three judges on projects for some honors; but while I was there, I got in touch with two Senators who I know are going to speak on the bill. I asked each one of them if there was any chance of their making speeches tonight, and both told me that they had not gotten them "out of the typewriter" yet. Therefore, they cannot possibly make them until tomorrow. Of course, I can speak only for those two Senators. They will be given tomorrow. I do not know about the others. I believe that the Senator will find—as I told him earlier—that the speeches will probably all be delivered by late Tuesday, and the Senate can begin to vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon predicted some time ago, if I recall correctly, that the Sen-

ate would be able to vote on this measure this week. I know that he made that prediction in good faith. I am sure that he will, in all probability, conclude the speeches he wishes to make on the subject this week.

However, I cannot bind other Senators. They are entitled to come in and be heard, make their views available for the RECORD, explain how they will vote and why they will vote, and how they believe others should vote.

I am therefore merely going to suggest the absence of a quorum in order that anyone who might wish to make a speech will be able to make it. If a Senator has, by this time, managed to get his speech "out of the typewriter," we would appreciate it if he would come on over and make it. Therefore, Mr. President, for those reasons, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have made the effort to determine if there are any other Senators who desire to make speeches tonight and are available to make them. My best information is that no one is available to make speeches this evening.

I would hope that one of these days we could find the answer to the problem of Senators who wish to make speeches and ask the leadership to hold up the Nation's business because they are not ready, when we have given them more than 2½ weeks to get prepared. Further, I would hope, one of these days, that we could work out some modification of the rules of the Senate so that we would not have requests by Senators that the Senate not vote because they have made commitments in their States, or elsewhere, and cannot be in the Chamber at the time of voting on a very important matter.

It occurs to me that perhaps one answer to the latter problem would be that we might agree to a modification of the rules of the Senate so that, let us say, on 5 days out of the year a Senator could, by unanimous consent, have a live pair arranged, so that he could be absent, and the person who agreed to give him the live pair could ask unanimous consent that both he and the absentee Senator be paired and be recorded as voting, rather than being recorded as not voting.

If that could be done, it would expedite the work of the Senate. It would be convenient to Senators and would help the Senate get on with the Nation's business. It would also greatly reduce the requests upon Members of this body, particularly at the leadership level, to keep the Senate in session because they could not be in the Chamber for a particular vote and did not wish anything to happen until they got back.

Mr. President, I know that Senators make these commitments and wish to be present and recorded as voting. We should, in my judgment, seek to restore respectability to the live pair as it existed in the Senate 30 years ago. We should also seek to restore some of our fine old traditions, and establish new ones, in order to carry on more efficiently the Nation's business.

My thought would be that, if we could arrange it so that—without abusing the privilege—if a Senator could not be present, he could be recorded as voting rather than as not voting, by unanimous consent of the Senate, it would very much expedite the procedures of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are Senators who are still disposed to make speeches, although they are not prepared to make them at this time, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1966:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1970.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The nominations beginning Clinton D. Upham, to be commander, and ending John K. Callahan, Jr., to be ensign, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 10, 1966.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The nominations beginning David Gershowitz, to be captain, and ending Charles R. Polly, to be chief warrant officer, W-3, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1966.

are of the community facility type, and the program is administered by the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: On January 7, 1965, the State of Alaska accepted the offer of the U.S. Government to purchase \$25 million worth of bonds, at 3 3/4 percent interest, as authorized under this section. This would include \$19.5 million in series B bonds, with maturity between 1970-94 and \$5.5 million of series A bonds with maturity between 1955-2004. This guarantee has made it possible for the State to sell temporary notes at a reasonable rate of interest, and funds obtained from these sales have financed recovery programs in Anchorage, Valdez, Cordova, Kodiak, Seldovia, and Seward.

The following describes the status of these two separate issues:

Nineteen and one-half million dollars in series B bonds: There have been no further developments with respect to these bonds since February 3, 1965, when the State of Alaska sold bond anticipation notes totaling \$19,104,100 at 2.29 percent. The supporting bond issue must be delivered to the ultimate purchasers not later than October 1, 1968.

Five and one-half million dollars, series A bonds: As indicated in the report for the previous period, judicial determinations were required before this part of the loan could be finalized. We are advised by bond counsel engaged by the State—Hawkins, Delafield & Wood—that action to secure determination as to the validity of the sale of these bonds was filed in the Superior Court of Alaska in September 1965. Briefs have been filed by both appellants and appellees in the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska. Bond counsel reports that notice was received on November 26, 1965, that the case is scheduled for oral argument on February 1 and 2, 1966, in the Supreme Court of Alaska.

Section 57. This section provides Federal financial assistance to the State of Alaska to support a mortgage indemnification program to retire or adjust outstanding home mortgage obligations upon one- to four-family homes that were severely damaged or destroyed by the 1964 earthquake or subsequent seismic wave. Authorization for a \$5.5 million grant by the Federal Government is established, to be matched by an equal amount to be contributed by the State of Alaska. Federal responsibilities under this program have been delegated to the Federal National Mortgage Association, a constituent agency of HHFA (HUD).

Action taken: As of June 30, 1965, it was reported that the formal Alaska mortgage adjustment plan was in the course of being amended to change the date before which all claims must be filed from July 1, 1965, to July 1, 1966. On July 6, 1965, the executed amendment was received by Federal National Mortgage Association, the agency representing the HHFA Administrator in the performance of duties delegated to him by the President in Executive Orders 11184 and 11196. The amendment had been executed by the HHFA Administrator on June 24, 1965, and by the Governor of Alaska on June 29, 1965.

The suit in the State courts of Alaska testing the constitutional validity of the State's prospective issue of series C bonds for financing the State's contribution to the Alaska mortgage adjustment fund has proceeded to final decree in the trial court. The decree affirmed that the Alaska mortgage adjustment plan, the amendment thereto, the special session laws of Alaska implementing the plan; and the program of borrowing and expending money of the State, authorized pursuant to said plan and said statutes, are legal, constitutional and valid in every respect. The decree was entered on July 13, 1965.

No. 32—5

An appeal to the Supreme Court of Alaska has been perfected and it is now expected that the matter will be considered and adjudicated by the supreme court in early 1966.

Regulations of the Alaska Mortgage Adjustment Agency, with amendments as required by the HHFA Administrator, are to be approved and issued when the plan is put into operation. Two things remain as prerequisites before the plan can be put into operation. They are (1) an appropriation by Congress and (2) a favorable ruling by the Supreme Court of Alaska.

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Reverend Duncan Howlett, minister of the All Souls Unitarian Church of Washington, recently preached an able sermon on the American conscience and Vietnam. Mr. Howlett is in no sense a war hawk. He appreciates the feelings of many conscientious Americans that we should withdraw in order to reduce immediate bloodshed. But he correctly points out that if North Vietnam were permitted to take over South Vietnam by force, a reign of terror would follow. Santayana once observed that those who refused to learn from history were condemned to repeat it. This, in my judgment, applies to the present situation. To allow the police state of communism to sweep on unchecked is to reenact a second Munich and to assist in a cumulative ascent to power of tyrannical forces.

Dr. Howlett is to be commended for his vigorous and brave defense of freedom. I believe that as the issues become more clearly understood, the liberal and religious forces of the Nation will more and more agree with President Johnson's program for South Vietnam:

First. To resist and root out Communist attempts to take over South Vietnam by force and terror.

Second. To resist efforts to widen and deepen the war and to bomb the city of Hanoi. This would kill tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children, set the public opinion of the world against us, and run the danger of bringing first China and then Russia into the war. If this last development were to happen, a nuclear war would almost inevitably result.

Third. As fast as territory is cleared from the Communists, to introduce land reform, the furnishing of seed and work animals.

In any event, Dr. Howlett's sermon is worthy of careful reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AND VIETNAM

There are two sermons I have owed you for a long time, one on the sex revolution, which comes next week; the other on Vietnam, to which we come today. Few questions have troubled me as much during my years in the ministry and none any more than these two. There is no unanimity in the congregation on either issue. On both, feelings run high and convictions lie very

deep. According to our tradition I shall not attempt to resolve either question on your behalf. Having thought each through as far as I can, I set the result before you in the hope that it may be of some use to you as the many people with whom I have talked and the many things I have read have helped me.

Perhaps never in our history have we, the people of the United States, wrestled with our conscience as people as we are doing today over the war in Vietnam. To begin with, it is not even a war in the technical sense that it has never been declared. Yet, because of the size of our military commitment, everybody, with full justification, speaks of the struggle as a war. Moreover, we are a peace-loving people and we always have been. We have our hawks and doves, to be sure, but as in the kingdom of birds, the doves far, far outnumber the hawks. Our blood curdles at pictures of wounded and dead Americans, wounded and dead Vietnamese, North, South and the Vietcong. We cannot bear to look at the pictures of wounded children, helpless victims of a conflict of which they know nothing.

As civilians, safely at home, comfortably housed, secure from ambush and terror, we nevertheless cannot quite escape the war, among other reasons just because it is not a war, officially speaking. With no censorship as in wartime, the news media, in particular the TV cameras, constantly thrust the horrors of the conflict before us. The Second World War, infinitely worse, at least in magnitude, was carefully screened from us at the time, except insofar as the suffering it caused could be used to inflame our passions against the enemy. But now for the first time we are permitted to see what war is like while it is going on, to know what American soldiers look like when they have been hit by enemy fire, and to see pictures of little children maimed for life by our machines of destruction. We see, and we turn away, our conscience as a people seared by the wrong that we do.

"In God's name stop it," cried a group of clergymen and others in a New York Times ad 2 years ago, after seeing some of these pictures. "Get out of Vietnam," cried another group unable to tolerate any longer for any reason American bombing of Vietnam villages and American killing, even of Vietcong soldiers. Since American soldiers first moved from advising to fighting, the call for a ceasefire has mounted steadily. Now we hear it in Congress as well as in teach-ins and peace marches across the land. "Negotiate. To the peace table. Now." And this cry, echoing up and down the United States, echoes and reechoes around the world.

Except for a few hawks who would like to tackle China before she becomes a full-fledged nuclear power, most of the American people agree with these sentiments. We want a world as peaceful and as prosperous as our own country. We believe such a world is possible. But we believe that it can come only as the democratic ideal itself is made real among the nations of the earth. As Clarence Streit reminded us before the Second World War, democracy has brought peace wherever it has gone. Wars of aggression always come from tyranny and dictatorship. The people, given the chance to make their views known, demand peace. The truth of Streit's observation has been demonstrated over and over since he first made it 30 years ago.

But the two ideals, democracy and peace, are not necessarily consistent. They were not when we entered World War I: they were not when we entered World War II, or the Korean war, and they are not now. Otherwise we should have no problem in Vietnam. If peace and democracy required the same course of action, we should call an immediate

ceasefire and go forthwith to the conference table. But this is not the case in Vietnam. Neither the Vietcong nor North Vietnam accept the democratic ideal. South Vietnam does, although even there it is an ideal far from being fully realized. If the Vietcong and North Vietnam took over South Vietnam, as they would do if American forces were withdrawn, world democracy would shrink and world dictatorship would advance by that much. This is the American dilemma. In Vietnam today the two ideals of peace and freedom dictate two quite different courses of action.

Most of the argument raging about the Vietnam war has to do with detail: to bomb or not to bomb; the effect bombing has for and against our cause; when, where, how often to bomb, with what kind, and so on. Should we return to the Geneva accord of 1954? Should there be a new Geneva conference? or some other kind of peace talks with Hanoi? or the National Liberation Front? with whom, on what, when, where, under what conditions, if any, and so on. The proposals can be numbered by the dozen. Should our policy be one of containment? or enclaves? or all-out attack with invasion of North Vietnam? Shall we use nuclear weapons? What about the U.N.? the efforts of the Pope and other intermediaries?

I would not minimize the importance of any of these considerations. Decisions of many kinds must be made and in great detail. But if the average citizen like you and me is to talk intelligently on these questions, he has first to make up his mind on the central issues. Having done so, he can then more profitably move to the debate on the specifics. Do we choose peace or do we choose freedom? Here the battle on the facts begins and the basic issue is soon forgotten. Those who choose peace say that it will eventually lead to freedom, and those who choose freedom say it can only be established by driving out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. What is the truth?

The administration has chosen freedom and has been pursuing it by military intervention of ever increasing size, scope, and cost in human lives on both sides. If you project where we are to be 5 years hence from the distance we have come in the last 5 years, you might find us at war with China. Is this the intent of the Government? The American people want to know.

We are aware that there is a political and social revolution in process in Vietnam today and that this revolution is but an aspect of the movement of peoples everywhere from traditional cultures, centuries old, into the commercial, industrial, technological civilization of the 20th century. In Vietnam and everywhere, this movement is accompanied by an equally basic political turnover—the emergence of millions from colonialism to self-government, whether by democracy or dictatorship. We are aware, too, that our involvement in Vietnam has no meaning apart from our involvement in the world struggle for power.

The President has seemed to say on more than one occasion that because of this, he and the military had a virtual blank check to do what they thought necessary in Vietnam. He has steadfastly refused to say how far he would go. But the clamor of public opinion in the teach-ins, peace marches, and public statements, backed up by the Senate hearings, demanded that the President more sharply define his objectives and the methods he will use to achieve them.

It is all to the good. The American people on the whole want to get off the war escalator. It has, they feel, gone far enough. Only the war hawks, of whom there are always some around, want to go to Peiping.

But our military presence in Vietnam raises a deeper question. Even though we

escalate the war no further: even though we adopt General Gavin's and Ambassador Kennan's enclave formula, have we any right to be in Vietnam at all? Can we support this war in any moral sense? What is the national conscience on the more basic issue of war itself? We can answer this question, like the others, only by arguing it out with each other as we are now doing. In my mind the debate that has been going on for several years, now mounting to a climax through the nationally televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is a great thing. For in this debate, as in all things, we are united as a people, not because we agree as to the course we should follow, but because we agree on the ideals in accordance with which we shall decide what to do.

One of the favorite ways of attempting to solve the problem is by historical analogy, in particular with the thirties, when Hitler was rapidly gaining strength, and Europe had to decide whether to let him go on gobbling up territory or to risk war in an attempt to stop him. From the second alternative Europe turned away, for the suffering, death and destruction of the First World War were still too vivid in the minds of everyone. There was much talk even then that another war would bring an end to civilization. Almost any alternative seemed better than to resort to arms.

Most observers quite properly dismiss this analogy as too facile. But to reject the Munich accord analogy is not to dismiss all history as worthless in this instance or any other. Surely history can help us to profit by our mistakes. And certainly it can help us to understand current thought trends by tracing them back to their roots. In my mind, the present torrent of declarations by churchmen, educators, and others on the war in Vietnam is understandable only in terms of the background out of which they come. The most immediate and therefore the most obvious of these origins is the civil rights movement.

The remarkable involvement of the clergy, and to a lesser degree students, educators, and others, in the civil rights movement in the last 3 or 4 years did two things. It gave thousands of individuals a chance to participate actively in social change, when heretofore they had been, at best, commentators upon it. Secondly, it gave them a sense of power. No one doubts that the physical participation in freedom marches by men and women from all walks of life had much to do with the progress we have made in civil rights legislation and practice. The peace-now people who were active in the civil rights movement naturally feel that their views on Vietnam might be as successfully advanced by peace marches as their views on race were advanced by freedom marches.

There is, however, a profound difference beneath the superficial similarity between the two movements. The civil rights protests were directed against an intransigent government by an oppressed segment of our people. When the protests failed, as they did at first, citizens who were not oppressed began to join in the demonstrations. They joined in ever greater numbers until at last the government began to mend its ways. By last year, solid citizens were marching in America's streets for freedom for the Negro, who would have been appalled at such an idea not long before.

The Vietnam protests are different. To say this is not to deny the right to stage peace protest demonstrations. But it is to emphasize the fact that these are not protests made in the streets, because they can be heard nowhere else. The demand for civil rights want almost unheeded until the American people took to the streets in great numbers. This is not true of American for-

eign policy in Vietnam. Protests against it have constantly been heard, weighed, and considered in high places. The organized demand that we get out of Vietnam goes back far beyond the civil rights movement. It has its roots in the peace movement itself as it emerged among clergyman and others in this country during the latter part of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This was the period of the establishment of the Hague Peace Conferences, and the International Court of Justice. At that time many ministers took the position publicly that all war was wrong. Many held to that position when war broke out in Europe in 1914. But when the United States became one of the belligerents in 1917, almost to a man the clergy repudiated their former position and led the call for the raising of arms and men to defeat "the Beast of Berlin," in that instance Kaiser Wilhelm II.

When the war was over and the world had been made "safe for democracy," in Woodrow Wilson's words, the denouement came, and it was shattering. The war to end war had not brought war to an end, for fighting continued in various parts of the world. Neither was the world safe for democracy, for communism and dictatorship was now on the march. Nor was it any longer so clear that the Kaiser alone had brought on the war. Historians began to point out that the economic and political rivalry of France, Germany and England, and to a lesser degree Italy, Austria and Russia, had been basic factors in bringing the nations to a test of arms. Many of the atrocity stories that had aroused the ire of the Americans were shown to have been pure propaganda. The complete turnaround of the clergy was then documented in a biting volume, "Preachers Present Arms" by Ray Abrams. Many a minister was truly ashamed to think that he had been so easily led to abandon his principles. In a wave of repentance, many signed peace pledges renouncing all war as an evil in and of itself. As a result, during the years when Hitler strode to power in Europe, the American Protestant clergy, to a marked degree, took the high-principled but simplistic position that all war is wrong. They called, not for resistance to nazism, but for negotiation looking toward keeping the peace.

The revelations following the Second World War were opposite to those that followed the first. We learned in the late forties that the worst atrocity stories we had heard about nazism were not half as bad as the truth. Far from being the victims of propaganda as we had been in World War I, during World War II we had neither known nor believed when we heard the depths of bestiality to which the Nazis had sunk.

These revelations had a profound effect upon the group we used to call the absolute pacifists. And again there was a change of heart. There were few now to say that war against another Hitler might not be justified. It is one of the dogmas of our age—one to which I fully subscribe—that the Nazi regime was the personification of evil, and that since it employed force to seek its ends, only force could have deposed it. Therefore such a war is justified. In this I wholly concur. As a result we are more sophisticated today, and there are few to say that they would never fight a war under any circumstances. What the Nazis actually did virtually destroyed the power of the pacifist arguments of the 1930's.

Nevertheless we hear today the same simplistic approach to the problem of peace we heard before the First and Second World Wars. Today again we hear the demand for peace on the part of high-minded people who find it intolerable to be citizens of a nation that visits the horrors of war upon another people. There might be war that could be justified, they say, but this is not one of them.

I share their sense of shame and guilt. I face the fact, as we all must, that every bomb that is dropped in Vietnam, I drop; every child that is hurt, I hurt; every village that is destroyed, I destroy. I settled for that back in the thirties, when in the face of the rising Nazi menace, I parted company with the pacifists forever. I first faced the fact then, and I hold to it today, that my guilt is not lessened by becoming a conscientious objector, and my hands are not kept clean because I personally do not wield a knife or discharge a gun against the enemy. While I enjoy the peace and safety of this country, I kill and destroy with the Armed Forces that keep this country safe from subversion at home and safe from invasion from abroad.

Can I then assuage my guilt for the havoc wrought by American arms in Vietnam by seeking to force the administration to terminate the war? Like everyone else, I devoutly desire peace, and think we should pursue it by every means possible. But here, it seems to me, history does have something to say to us. It can remind us that the simple way of peace was wrong in 1916. It was wrong in 1939, and I would say that for the same reason it is wrong in 1966. If peace is right now, then we never had any business in Vietnam in the first place. Some say we didn't. How you resolve this question depends upon your view of the role of the United States in the contemporary world. Are you one who thinks we should stay home and mind our own business? Or should we take a hand in the political affairs of the world? Should we withdraw from Germany? From our military bases around the world? If not, then why from Vietnam? The one question we must answer is: Where shall we take our stand for freedom, even if we have to fight? Where shall we say to those who would subvert a nation through terror: Beyond this point you shall not go.

We would all say it, I suppose—or almost all of us—should terrorists appear in the United States, whose purpose was to claim this country for the Communists, the America Firsters, or the Ku Klux Klan. We have asserted the right to do this in Europe, and there have been few to complain chiefly perhaps because we have not had to fight in order to do it. Do we draw the line there? At the moment we are saying to the Vietcong in Vietnam, "This land you shall not bend to your will by terrorizing its people." The origin of the liberation front in the revolt against the Diem regime does not alter the situation that exists now. The justice of the cause that brought the liberation front into being does not justify either the presence or the methods of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam now.

We have chosen freedom in Vietnam rather than peace. But the trouble is, it has never been really clear that our choice was freedom for the Vietnamese. It has never been clear that we were doing more there than fending off the ultimate Communist threat to ourselves, with little or no thought for the Vietnamese themselves. To many, it looked as though we were trying to impose a new kind of colonialism on Vietnam as intolerable to most Americans as to the Vietnamese. As the weeks and months went by, as the war steadily escalated and the bombing of North Vietnam increased, stopped, and began again, the conscience of the American people was increasingly troubled.

Then came the Honolulu declaration. If, as that declaration stated, the reconstruction of the economy of Vietnam is our aim, if a free and independent Vietnam is our goal, then we have a role to play in that unhappy country that we can defend on principle and point to with pride.

The administration would have been in a far stronger position if it had formulated these policies and declared them definitively long ago, rather than now, as it appears, under the duress of an aroused public opinion. But the administration has now stated its objectives in Vietnam and now we know what they are: (1) to drive out the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, and (2) to help the South Vietnamese to live in freedom, in peace, and in prosperity. We have long been engaged in both endeavors and our growing success may be seen in the increasing number of Vietcong defectors now coming over to the South Vietnam side. These defections show that the Vietnamese want what we all want—a chance to live in peace under a regime stable enough to maintain it.

We have now to remain true to these two specific goals, whatever the cost. While the military are driving the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong out, let us proceed with our program of hospitals, schools, dams, and factories. This program we can support with all our moral conviction. For every soldier we send to Vietnam, let us send a worker for AID or one of the several voluntary agencies now helping there. For every rifle, let us send a plow, for every round of ammunition a set of handtools. Let the buildup of arms be matched by the buildup of economy. Let an ever-widening stable social order be established in the wake of our military successes. Let the world see by what we do that we are in Vietnam, not for our own good primarily, but for the good of the free world as a whole.

If the Honolulu declaration is our blueprint, then our conscience as a people is set free again. In the light of that statement, amplified by testimony at the Senate hearings last week, we can support administration policies, despite our abhorrence of war and the suffering it brings. We can do so because we have been offered a course of action dictated by harsh reality, but guided by the humanitarian ideals for which we, as a people, have always stood. In Vietnam today, as so often in the past, we have chosen freedom, even in the face of war. We have done it because we believe it to be the only road to a final lasting peace.

Prayer: God of men and of nations, lead us to the right whence both peace and freedom flow. Amen.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, at this time I wish to state my opposition to any reduction in the school milk program.

I feel it is an efficient but effective way of helping provide a soundly nourished youth in this country.

In the past decade attention has been brought to the need for a healthy young America. We have initiated all manner of programs, on Capitol Hill and elsewhere, aimed at improving the overall physical condition of the Nation's youngsters.

The school milk program has certainly contributed to this.

For whether we like it or not, too often youths not considered financially needy are nevertheless nutritionally needy. Cash in the pocket does not always mean calories in the body.

The cost of this program is not of such magnitude to forestall other major programs of importance. The program, in fact, is one expenditure where there is definitely great value received for the dollars spent.

According to the President's proposal, the current appropriation of \$103 million for the school milk program across the Nation would be reduced \$21 million—an 80-percent cutback.

The Department of Agriculture estimates for this year indicate this program will help provide 36.6 million half pints of milk for Kansas schoolchildren. Under next year's proposal this would be reduced drastically—and thousands of children would be excluded from it.

Looking at it financially, it would cost Kansas taxpayers nearly \$1 million in additional revenue to maintain the program as it now operates.

Here we have a program that is operating effectively and without problems, and it should be retained.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT EFFORTS: POLLUTION

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the President yesterday called upon the Congress to do something about restoring the quality of the American environment. It was a strong message, but it certainly did not exaggerate the urgency of this need. It would be impossible for that need to be overstated.

The deterioration of our environment has become an extremely serious matter. It is something we may have been able to ignore or overlook in the past, but it is a problem we can ignore no longer.

For we now possess means to eliminate the human race. We normally think of this awesome possibility in terms of the atomic bomb. Thousands of words have been written and spoken about the dangers inherent in our use of atomic fission. But the poet who said that the world will end, "not with a bang, but a whimper," he may have been more prophetic than he knew.

The simple fact is that we now possess means more insidious than the atomic bomb to eliminate ourselves from the face of the earth. More insidious because they are less dramatic, less obvious, more pervasive, more subtle, more a part of our daily existence. The automobile, the powerplant, the diesel engine, and the rest of our industrial complex, as it expands to meet the needs of increased population, threatens our very existence.

If it is to be used wisely, and by the very nature of water itself the attack upon pollution must be carried on in the context of a unified water conservation program. The Department of the Interior has traditionally been concerned with the wise conservation and development of our water resources. Assigning the war on pollution to the Department will complete the gearing up process. The full, comprehensive and concentrated fight to clean up our rivers can now begin.

REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the recently issued seventh annual report of

3784

the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been receiving considerable attention around the country. The Commission is a bipartisan group charged with exploring problems and relations among Federal, State, and local governments. It has been my pleasure to serve as one of the three Senate members of the Commission since its inception, along with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

One of the major dilemmas of our Federal system as highlighted in the recent report of the Commission is described in a recent article in the Idaho Evening Statesman by Mr. John Corlett. He pleads for greater compassion by the Congress toward the States in the light of the efforts they are making to meet their problems. I ask unanimous consent to place the text of the article at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Idaho Evening Statesman, Feb. 1, 1966]

STATES MUST SEEK TO BE PARTNERS IN FEDERALLY AIDED PROGRAMS
(By John Corlett)

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was created 7 years ago by Congress with the avowed purpose of creating a climate of cooperation among National, State, and local units of government.

It was hoped that the Commission would serve as the forum for strengthening the federal system whereby there would be a balance of power among the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Commission has moved strongly in this direction, but in its seventh annual report, just off the press, it notes that the last Congress made some giant steps toward federalism by which the National Government assumed greater powers. This, of course, serves to unbalance the federal system.

The report noted that the National Government, by congressional action, moved into three fields in which the States heretofore held nearly unlimited autonomy—voting rights, financing, and administration of the public schools, and law enforcement. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would place the Federal Government squarely in the field of State taxation. This would be done in the name of "interstate taxation," but the States would lose many of the powers they now hold in assessing taxes within their own borders.

The last Congress enacted some 25 grants-in-aid programs or major expansions of existing programs, including the National Government's advent into the three new fields listed above.

It is no wonder that the Commission views these steps with some alarm, particularly since they all were consummated in such a short period of time.

In the short time it has been in existence, the Commission has sought to develop studies and programs in which roles of National Government, the States, the counties, and the municipalities are clearly outlined. The Commission, by its very makeup, is not anti-Federal or anti-State. Instead its research programs are based on the assumption that in governmental fields where the Federal Government should be supreme, the States have no place in them. And conversely, if the States have unquestioned dominance in other fields, the Federal Government ought to stay out.

But there are so many fields in which all the segments of government can play their roles in a cooperative manner for the benefit of the people. The Commission has sought above all else to promote these programs in order to vitalize the federal system.

Undoubtedly, the Commission will soon be making inquiries into the three fields in which the Federal Government has ousted the States as lone administrators, with the intent of making sure that the States and the local units of government retain as much say as possible in them.

It does no good to moan that the Federal Government should not be in these three areas because the moves were made without great outcry from the States and the people themselves.

The Commission, if it is to be effective in its avowed purpose of trying to strengthen the Federal system, must receive all the moral support possible from the States, the counties, and the cities.

Legislatures, county commissioners, and the city councils must begin fighting for retention of their powers and build the necessary public support for themselves. Congress listens to strongly expressed public opinion.

This doesn't mean that the States must take an "anti-Federal" stand, but they must, as the Commission's report pointed out, seek to be "real partners" in the Federal system.

More importantly, they can not look to the Federal Government exclusively for funds for public programs, no matter what they are, but must share with the Federal Government in program costs.

"If the States stand aside and do not participate in a massive financial way in these programs," the Commission said, "the problems to which the funds are directed will eventually come to be viewed as primarily a Federal responsibility."

The States have been assuming a greater responsibility in the solving of problems in this growing age of urbanization. Most States are taxing almost to their limit and are making far-reaching changes in their governmental form. This Congress must be made to understand.

BOB HOPE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for many years, Bob Hope has been touring areas all over the world bringing laughter, entertainment, and an all-too-brief moment of pleasure to our men, who man freedom's battle stations throughout the world.

These trips have been conducted during the Christmas season at a time when all of us like to be at home with our families. With the lovely family that he has, I know it is not easy for Bob to be away. Fortunately for our troops, his wife and family are most understanding.

The Congress of the United States, of course, is very much aware of Bob's great contributions, and in 1962 enacted Public Law 87-478, authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to him in recognition of his services to the country and his work for peace. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the law be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

As all my colleagues know, Bob's most recent trip was to southeast Asia where he entertained our young men who are doing such an outstanding job resisting Communist aggression. Joining Bob and also to be congratulated were Jerry Colonna, Les Brown and his band, Anita

Bryant, Jack Jones, Peter Leeds, Kaye Stevens, Carroll Baker, Joey Heatherton, Dianna Lynn Batts, Fayard Antonio Nicholas, and Harold Lloyd Nicholas. This trip was a great success and I know it helped to convey to our fighting men the appreciation of the American people for what they are doing.

The San Diego Union editorially commented on the Christmas 1965 trip and made particular note to Bob's closing words on the Chrysler television special, which highlighted the trip. Because I believe as did the editorial that Bob's eloquent concluding statement penetrated the confusion that exists in this country regarding the role of the United States in Vietnam, I requested a complete transcript of his closing remarks so that my colleagues and the Nation might benefit from them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the San Diego Union together with the closing television remarks of Mr. Hope be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 88

Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent, and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States armed services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized "Ambassador of Good Will" throughout the world; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500 for this purpose.

Approved June 8, 1962.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Jan. 24, 1966]

THANKS FOR MEMORIES

About 30 years ago when Will Rogers, entertainment's early-day Art Buchwald, died in a plane crash, a fellow named Bob Hope

I like MIKE MONRONEY, FRED HARRIS, and ED EDMONDSON plying the skill and resourcefulness and persuasion for which they are known, I firmly predict that no amount of obstruction will be able to hold back indefinitely the coming reality of the central Oklahoma project.

As one Congressman from a neighboring State, I pledge to you that—as long as I have the privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee—this practical and necessary development will have my hand and my heart, my voice and my vote, and whatever help that I can give.

The time is rapidly coming in the United States when that area blessed with a maximum development of its water resources will be better off by far than if it had oil or gold or uranium, or any other resource of the earth, but lacked water. I have never heard a more ridiculous or more specious argument than that forced upon the Corps of Engineers by the Bureau of the Budget that a better set of freight rates through other modes of transportation, brought about by a navigation project, should be considered as a cost rather than a benefit factor.

It is obvious that the better rates will not come unless the canal is built. And if they should come as its competitive result, then I can't count that as anything but an additional benefit to the people.

Development of our waterways was one of the first functions of government recognized by the Congress in the 1st decade of the 19th century. But the history of their development has been a history of thinking too small and acting too slowly.

Not Oklahoma alone, but the Nation, will benefit by the central Oklahoma project. The best homiletic I have ever read on the subject was delivered on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1848 by a young Congressman named Abraham Lincoln. He was speaking out against a Presidential veto of an omnibus public works measure.

Lincoln demonstrated through the flawless logic that came to be his hallmark that, because of an inland waterway in remote Illinois, the sugar merchant in New Orleans sold his wares a "little dearer" and the housewife in Buffalo, N.Y., sugared her husband's coffee a "little cheaper."

The history of that splendid professional group known as the Corps of Army Engineers has been a history of cautious calculations and conservative estimates to tonnages.

The Engineers' projection on the Mississippi waterway was 9 million tons a year. In 1963, it carried almost 40 million tons—or 344 percent of the estimated volume.

The Engineers projected 9 million tons a year for the Ohio waterway. In 1963, it was carrying 88 million tons, or almost 9 times the estimated amount, and the locks were having to be rebuilt to accommodate the burgeoning volume of usage.

The original estimate, just a very few years ago, for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and Corpus Christi was only 7 million tons a year. That canal last year exceeded the official estimates by more than 10 times.

But the value of water resource development cannot be written in tonnages alone. The great complex of industrial development in the United States has grown up primarily along our inland waterways system, and from this the Nation has benefited beyond measure.

Last year, some 300 new industries sprang up along the banks of our Nation's navigable streams. This development not only creates a tax base for the local communities, it provides the payroll which generates other economic activities ad infinitum. In context with all we have been discussing, this may be far more important for the future than we realize.

Mr. President, the central Oklahoma project, an extension of navigation from the Arkansas River to the vicinity of Oklahoma City, has recently undergone emasculation due to the application of this formula. Although the district engineer and the division engineer recommended to the chief of engineers the authorization of the central Oklahoma project, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after reviewing the project and applying the new formula, recommended deferment of navigation until a demonstration of its worth could be made. We had been told repeatedly that the central Oklahoma project was one of the best, if not the best, of the navigation projects the corps had before it for consideration.

It is my understanding that this new criteria will result in no more navigation projects being built in the United States until the Congress or the executive agencies of this Government determine that the developing of the water resources of this country is of such importance to our growth and economy that they will return to the criteria which built the inland waterways of the country and provided the basis for billions of dollars of new industry along these waterways.

Mr. President, I join with others of this body in resisting a policy that is a detriment to the development of our country.

UN VIETNAM—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF LAST NIGHT AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S RECENT TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it was my privilege to hear the television broadcast of the President's speech last night. He spoke the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the American people in support of our Nation's position and in support of our men who are fighting in Vietnam at this very hour.

This morning it was my privilege, along with other Senators, to hear the Vice President speak about his trip to the Far East—Vietnam and other nations in that area—and his discussions with heads of governments there. In my opinion, that was one of the most eloquent and impressive statements which this Senator has had the privilege of hearing in a great number of years.

It is my hope that in due course the Vice President, while eliminating from his statement items that are necessarily confidential and secret, will make available to the American people information about his experiences and his conclusions as the result of his trip to that area.

Our Vice President exposed himself to considerable danger in order to visit our men on the battlefield, and in order to discuss with many leaders of foreign nations the desirability of stepping up aid they are giving this Nation, and also the desirability of working together toward social and economic reforms.

It would be best for the Vice President to speak for himself in these matters. Any Senator did not hear the Vice President this morning would be well advised to seek the opinion of the Vice President

and let him explain what were his experiences and what his conclusions were.

Senators, of course, are privileged to know a great deal of secret information that the Vice President would not be privileged to give to the Nation as a whole.

One fortunate thing about our Vice President is that he is not inarticulate. He is very well able to explain his views and get across his ideas, even though some of the information he might like to marshal on which his conclusions are based might be of such secret or confidential nature that it cannot be made available generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I repeat, as one who was fortunate enough to hear the Vice President this morning, I was extremely impressed. I hope all Senators who, for one reason or another, did not have occasion to hear him will have occasion to speak with him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

George A. Avery, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia; and Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, U.S. Army, and Paul L. Sitton, of the District of Columbia, to be members of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

By Mr. RUSSELL, of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Irma V. Bouton, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we pass all matters on the Executive Calendar and start with the nomination of Lee C. White to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

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

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.