

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be considered; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read routine nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Environmental Science Services Administration and in the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and they are confirmed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MCNAMARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I wish to add my own personal comments to those of my colleagues who have recited the accomplishments of retiring Senator PAT MCNAMARA.

Since I came to the Senate 4 years ago I have had the distinct personal privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee with the distinguished Michigan Senator as chairman. Our committee has made considerable progress in the last 4 years, and I wish to echo the comments of other Senators when I say that PAT MCNAMARA's leadership and guidance will be missed. His 12 years of dedicated and progressive service to the Nation shall never be forgotten.

RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on February 6, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix—the largest daily newspaper published in my State—published a thoughtful and well-reasoned editorial on some of the dangers inherent in a program of rent subsidies. I believe this editorial deserves a wider audience and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Arizona Republic, Feb. 6, 1966]

RENT SUBSIDY PLAN

One of the more controversial Great Society proposals is that of rent subsidies for those who do not otherwise qualify for public housing.

Last year Congress approved such a plan, but then the legislators refused to vote the necessary funds, charging that eligibility rules were so vague that persons who were

not poor would qualify for subsidies. Whereupon L.B.J. came right back this year, asking for \$30 million for rent subsidies in the fiscal year ending June 30, and requesting that the yearly payments be increased over 4 years to an annual rate of \$150 million.

Under the plan, tenants would pay a quarter of their wages for rent, the Federal Government would subsidize the remainder. If the family's income increases, the rent subsidy will be reduced proportionately. Unlike public housing, which requires families to move after their income reaches a certain level, these families can continue living in their apartments whatever their income level, although they will not qualify for a subsidy if their income exceeds a specified ceiling.

Few would deny the need for rich America to provide adequate housing for its impoverished. And perhaps the rent subsidy plan will succeed where public housing, for all its good intentions, has not. But we would hope that Congress examines the proposal with a cold eye, to insure that it does not become a carrot for politicians to dangle before voters.

If such a possibility seems farfetched, we need only point to the experience of rent controls, which clearly were used as political bait to curry votes at the expense of a relatively small minority (i.e., the house and apartment owner).

In an incisive recent book, "Welfare, Freedom, and Inflation," world-famed economist Wilhelm Ropke noted:

"We have reached a stage when, to many people, it sounds strange when we ask the question why the earlier rule no longer holds good; that anyone who can afford to buy his suit out of his own pocket at the economic price, should also pay as economic price for his lodging.

"How does it come about that an otherwise perfectly reasonable citizen, who would be ashamed to let anybody else pay for his refrigerator, his motorcycle, or his lunch, has come to look on it as his unassailable right to shift part of the burden of the economic cost of his lodging onto someone else's shoulders?"

Professor Ropke was not, of course, referring to the truly poor, those whose impoverished condition puts them at the mercy of the state. He meant those greedy citizens who agitate for handouts or subsidies because they believe, or choose to believe, that nobody pays for anything that comes from the Government—that a handout or a subsidy is "free."

By all means, Congress should make provisions for those who genuinely need housing assistance. But it must take pains to exclude from the Government watering trough those who merely have their hands out in hope of something for nothing.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 48 years ago on February 16, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. Latvia and Estonia also proclaimed their independence the same year. In the two decades of freedom that they enjoyed great progress was made. Agrarian reform was brought about, culture flourished, foreign trade was expanded, stable currency was introduced and other needed social reforms occurred. In short, the outlook for these small nations was bright. Independence and freedom, unfortunately, were too short-lived, for in 1940, these small Baltic States were ruthlessly overrun by Soviet aggression. In addition to exercising totalitarian political control, the Soviet Union has exploited the economic resources, stifled cultural development and has attempted

to substitute atheistic communistic ceremonies for the deeply religious feelings of these brave people in the Baltic States.

Naturally, Mr. President, the sons and daughters of these captive nations who immigrated to the United States vigorously reacted to the destruction of freedom in their former native lands. Descendants of the peoples of the Baltic States continue to point out to the world this oppression under Soviet rule. All Americans resent the subjugation of these small nations. The policy of our Government reflects these sentiments, for our Government fails to recognize the cruel annexation of the small countries by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I know free people everywhere join me today in hoping that the 25 years of enslavement of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian people will someday be ended and that these small countries together with all the nations of the world will be able to determine for themselves their own destiny.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last November when the Interparliamentary Union Conference met in Geneva, Switzerland, which I attended as president of the U.S. delegation, a most interesting and informative address was delivered to the group by Edward Wenk, Jr., of the Library of Congress on the increasing importance of science and technology to legislative bodies in the world today.

Mr. Wenk made a scholarly and informative presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

INFORMATION REQUIRED BY PARLIAMENTS IN A WORLD INCREASINGLY DEPENDENT UPON SCIENCE

(An address before the Interparliamentary Union Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 5, 1965, by Edward Wenk, Jr., Chief, Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege to have been invited to participate in this symposium of the Interparliamentary Union. And it is all the more an honor to represent the scientific community at this auspicious dedication of the Union's new home.

The long history and high purpose of this body in seeking world peace and enhancement of the democratic process are well known. Especially in Geneva, the city of peace, I felt it all the more appropriate to recall the basic relationships of science and politics that constitute the theme of my assignment. Science knows no national boundaries. In a troubled world, communications between scientists have often supplemented and aided international understanding when political solutions seemed remote.

In the United States, we have a long tradition of recognizing that politics and science mix. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson actively sought advancement and applications of science to serve public purposes—then to help a newly developing nation.

Science and the democratic process were found to blend easily. They still do today.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3575

ness was going off the books than was being issued.

The company, along with the rest of the country, began to recuperate from the shock and the initial effects of the depression, however, and in 1936 Bertrand J. Perry was elected president of the still-growing company. Mr. Perry served as president until 1945, when he became chairman of the board. When he retired as a director in 1955, his association with the company spanned 58 years. Alexander T. Maclean had succeeded Mr. Perry as president and served until his death in 1950. On May 19 of that year Leland J. Kalmbach became president and served in that position until 1962, when he was elected chairman of the board and chief executive officer, and Charles H. Schaaff became the company's 10th president.

In 1951, the company's 100th anniversary year, its assets were \$1.4 billion. Insurance in force totaled \$3.2 billion. New insurance delivered that year amounted to nearly \$348 million.

This past year—1965—new insurance delivered amounted to well over \$1.8 billion. Insurance in force passed the \$12 billion level. And assets, which have doubled about every 12 years since 1928, increased to more than \$3.3 billion. New alltime records in the sale of both individual and group life insurance were set during the year with individual insurance sales topping \$1 billion for the 7th consecutive year. January of 1965 was the largest individual-life-sales month in the company's history.

Another milestone achieved in 1965 was the surpassing of the \$1 billion level in outstanding mortgage loans. The company's first mortgage loan of \$2,000 was made in 1859.

The company today ranks as the 10th largest in assets of the more than 1,600 life insurance companies in the Nation. It also is ranked among the country's top 22 financial institutions and the top 40 business organizations in general. The company lists more than 700,000 individual policyholders, and is licensed to do business in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Its Springfield home office staff numbers some 2,200 and its field force of 3,500 is distributed in 120 general agencies, 285 district offices, 42 group insurance offices, and 9 mortgage loan and real estate offices.

Also in 1965, the company occupied a four-story addition to its home office site. The new east building, which provides some 184,000 gross square feet of additional floorspace, is one of the largest commercial structures erected in the Greater Springfield area since the present home office was built in 1927. The entire home office complex now occupies some 85 acres of land.

The company also reported in 1965 that its new investments now average more than \$1.5 million each working day. Total amount of the company's entire investment portfolio now at work in the Nation's economy is approximately \$3 billion. The company's investment division comprises three major departments—securities, mortgage loans, and real estate.

The company is considered to have one of the outstanding field forces in the life insurance industry today. Substantiating this is the fact that one out of every eight company field men and women is a member of the industry's elite sales group, the million-dollar round table. The industrywide average membership in this group is one of every 72. In addition, one out of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives is a chartered life underwriter, the industry's highest educational designation, compared to 1 of every 18 for the industry. Also, two of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives have qualified for the National Quality Award, an industrywide honor, compared to 1 of 13 in the entire industry.

The company prides itself on its quality field force, as well as on its contracts and its policyholder service. The company's letterheads are impressed with the trademark, "In Our Second Century of Service."

Best's Life Insurance Reports, an annual edition reporting on many aspects of "legal reserve companies, fraternal benefit societies and assessment associations operating in the United States," makes these comments on the Massachusetts Mutual:

"The company, now in its second century of operation, is purely mutual and is particularly a policyholders' institution. It has long been most ably managed. It ranks very highly and enjoys a most excellent reputation in all respects * * *. Every important benefit and privilege which the company has given to new policyholders has been given to old policyholders on the same terms, except when expressly forbidden by State or other laws."

In another section, the report adds: "In operations a very important item is expenses, which have been kept remarkably low. Careful selection and underwriting of business has produced a very favorable mortality experience. Policy lapses and surrenders have been low. Net cost to policyholders is remarkably low."

Throughout its history, then, one of the company's foremost objectives has been superlative service to its policyholders. Though the implementation of ZIP codes to its master file is merely one area of service, it points up the company's constant efforts toward that foremost objective. The company, in this area alone, has at all times cooperated with the Post Office Department. Since its inception in July 1961, company secretary, Harrison B. Clapp, has chaired the Springfield Mail Users Council, which has sponsored discussion meetings on the nationwide improved mail service program, the accelerated business collection and delivery program, the ZIP code program, and the scheduled parcel post program. Communications Manager Alexander T. Muir has spoken on postal matters to various groups, and through nationwide test mailings has assisted Springfield Postmaster Morin and the New England regional office to provide substantially improved airmail service for the area.

In this area of policyholder service and in every other area, the company, indeed, takes pride in Best's comment that the Massachusetts Mutual is "particularly a policyholders' institution."

POLICY BACKED

(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, Thailand understands the domino theory much better than some of us back home, the Atlanta Constitution is convinced.

Editorially the paper declares:

We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand knows it is "one of those parts of the world," the paper continues, adding that the Vice President visited Bangkok "to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area."

Because this editorial discusses an

issue on which we are committed to stand firm, it will be of general interest to my colleagues and I therefore am making the article available in the RECORD.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Feb. 15, 1966]

THAILAND UNDERSTANDS

Vice President HUMPHREY's mission to Thailand pulls back into focus the underlying reasons for our massive commitment in South Vietnam. That focus often slips away in the day-to-day heat of battle and debate over specific tactics.

We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand is one of those parts of the world. The kingdom's rulers know it. Already, externally trained or inspired guerrillas are practicing terrorism in northeastern Thailand.

In fact, Thais are concerned that if the war is ended in South Vietnam, Chinese and North Vietnamese efforts may be centered on Thailand. So they are less than enthusiastic about a negotiated settlement.

Thailand has been a consistent friend of America in southeast Asia. It provides air bases that bolster our Vietnamese operations. And if we should later find it necessary to expand our troop commitments extensively and attempt to seal off the Vietcong's supply routes from the north, Thailand would be a base of our operation.

So the Vice President is in Bangkok to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area.

To the Siamese leaders, the domino theory is not such an object of ridicule as it is to some back home.

LANDOWNERS BATTLE BRUSH PROBLEM TO RESTORE GRASS AND SAVE NEEDED WATER

(Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. Moss) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, landowners of my State and probably of your State are engaged in a real fight to repulse the spread of moisture stealing, worthless, woody plants and brush—more than 50 percent mesquites—that threaten to engulf the land.

It may sound like so much science fiction, but these dense, prolific brushes are suffocating the livestock industry throughout many other sections of our country, robbing the ranchers of soil, water and livestock grazing.

The Soil Conservation Service and its range conservationists have surveyed the problem twice in the past 18 years and verify the alarming situation that more than 80 percent of the grassland in Texas has become infested with brush.

Neither livestock operators, nor the Nation, can afford grasslands in poor condition, nor can we afford to lose the millions of acre-feet of water consumed annually by brush and weeds. Water lost to brush is water lost to all beneficial use. In Texas alone there is more water lost in 1 year to brush alone than is

used by the city of Los Angeles. Just this morning the President sent this Congress a special message pointing out our critical shortage of water. Where can we hope to save so much water as cheaply as we can through adequate brush control?

In the face of this tenacious enemy farmers and ranchers, not only in Texas, but throughout the rangelands of the entire country, are struggling to restore the abundant grasslands that once covered our plains and prairies.

The landowners in my district—the 11th Congressional District of Texas—are excellent representatives of the stalwart stewards of soil, water and grassland who are waging this battle all across the United States.

The whole Nation owes these people a continuing debt of gratitude for their efforts at increasing grassland agriculture, to maintain its role in production, and to protect American agriculture.

Though treatment is going on all the time, the progress being made against the woody invader is far from encouraging. Treatment is costly, it is complex, and there is the disheartening probability of reinfestation on treated acres after a few years. Actually, most treatment results only in control, not elimination of brush.

This is a serious matter and Texas landowners have no illusions about the toughness of the job. On the other hand, I have no misgivings about their competence and will to handle it, but they must have the cooperation of their government, and above all, we must not lose to enthusiasm and the momentum which has been built up over the years. The Nation will suffer or benefit as these landowners lose or win the struggle.

The Soil Conservation Service is keeping close watch on the problem and providing technical assistance in treatment programs. Its plant materials centers are working at adapted grasses and legumes to recapture the land from brush, but a great deal more research and work is needed, and important as it is, brush control is only one of the many problems which should be studied in a grass and forage research center. Until such a center is a reality, one of the largest and most vital segments of our food supplying effort is going to be without needed coordination.

REDWOODS

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on restoring the quality of our environment is a remarkable document. In addition to masterfully summarizing the problems we face, and the opportunities which we have neglected, it sets the stage for a meaningful exposition of the whole problem in the public forum. It is time that we begin to give our best thinking to this vital subject.

I am at heart an optimist. Therefore I have concentrated my attention on the opportunities outlined in the message. The various recreation proposals which

are outlined in the message seem to me to be the essence of these opportunities.

The proposal that we establish a Redwood National Park is a case in point. But it is not one on which we can ponder long. We must not allow hesitation or procrastination to overcome the need for quick action. Even as I talk, the last of the great redwoods forest is being felled. Only a fraction of virgin forest still remains and the lumber industry is making short work of that fraction.

The redwood is a valuable resource. The wood has many unique and desirable characteristics. It resists rotting. It is almost impervious to insect attack. It weathers well. It is beautiful and can be worked easily. This is the reason there is a steady demand for its use in lawn furniture, house siding, and decorative fences. Its resistance to insects is also the reason why it lives for thousands of years in its native state.

But the redwood is also a national resource that must be preserved. I do not suggest that we deny the lumber industry the right to use redwoods. I do suggest that, considering their needs, we devise some way to preserve part of the forest for future generations.

Redwoods are fast-growing trees. They replace themselves as usable lumber within 100 years. It is my feeling that it would serve all purposes, the naturalist and the public, and the lumber industry, to preserve part in virgin stand and allow the remainder to be managed in the manner the lumber industry does so well, to provide sustained yields of a valuable lumber.

Establishing a Redwood Park does not preclude lumbering. Preserving a unique and unparalleled scenic masterpiece is not antithetical to the interests of the lumber industry.

You have all heard of the Cedars of Lebanon. I am told that a bare remnant is left. In fact, this storied grove of trees existed mostly intact well into this century. Now the remaining virgin forest is measured by individual trees, some of which are a thousand years old. The visitor today is not struck by the beauty of the individual trees in their unique majesty, but rather is appalled at the short-sightedness of the men who allowed all but this pitiful remnant to be cut and used. I propose that, when the administration's proposal for a park reaches this House, we find a way to enact it quickly, lest we be judged in the same manner the stewards of the Cedars of Lebanon are now judged.

TRAILS

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

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has addressed our attention to the problem of restoring the quality of our environment. It was a disturbing message. I admire his courage in detailing, in such graphic form, our society's "sins of omission."

We did not consciously set out to destroy our environment, but rather like Topsy, it "jest growed that way." But

whatever the reason, it is time we faced our obligations squarely and set about righting the wrongs we have visited on what most of us consider the most beautiful piece of real estate in the world.

I was particularly impressed with the President's reference to the establishment of a nationwide system of trails. A visit to the C. & O. Canal on Sunday illustrates the universal appeal a pleasant surrounding and a path have for our citizens.

There is no reason why we cannot encourage this type of facility throughout the country. By the turn of this century it is estimated that 85 percent of our people will live in cities as opposed to 65 percent now. As the cities grow the land that is available will be put to some use. Part of that land should be reserved for just such simple pleasures as the weekend stroll. It would have been a tragic waste of good real estate had the C. & O. Canal been filled in and converted to residential or industrial use. But throughout this country this is exactly what is happening to other lands within or adjacent to our great cities. No one is consciously planning its destruction and removal as a recreational asset, it is just happening because there has been no thought given to this type of use. This certainly is a sin of omission.

We can stimulate local communities to provide facilities for the stroller, the walker and the hiker. They should be located near him.

A nationwide system of trails will stimulate local communities to provide their own systems.

A program to encourage the establishment of trails and hiking paths need not be an expensive one. The land and water conservation fund will surely encourage development but mostly it requires that government provide the vision and the leadership by judicious designation of areas already in the public ownership. By making such a designation of suitable areas the Federal Government can stimulate the development of a trails system which will meet the needs of both the urban dweller and the serious outdoorsman. Wyoming is pleased to recognize this national need and to help fulfill it, Mr. Speaker.

BENNETT CITES NEED TO CHANGE SYSTEM OF ELECTING PRESIDENT

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, since 1959 I have introduced and supported legislation to change the system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. I am gratified that there is a renewed interest in this major constitutional problem and I am hopeful that positive action will take place in the 89th Congress.

I am today reintroducing legislation first introduced by me on the opening day of the 87th Congress dealing with this important subject.

The stalwart resistance they have shown and are showing cannot help but be a source of inspiration to others suffering under the same yoke.

And especially is it an inspiration to those of us living under a flag of liberty.

By observances such as this you are reminding yourselves and free men everywhere that human bondage has not yet been wiped from the face of the earth and that much needs yet to be done.

The way may well be long and hard for all of us.

Freedom was never easily won. It is never easily held.

Four times since I was a young man in the uniform of World War I, my country has come to the defense of freedom.

We are in such a conflict today, and we must be prepared for whatever else may be demanded of us in the months and years to come.

As we look ahead, it might be well to recall the words of the late John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Speaking at the congressional inquiry into the incorporation of the Baltic States by the U.S.S.R. 13 years ago, Secretary Dulles said this:

"What of the future? First of all, let us never lose hope that there is a future."

"I recall," he said, "I was looking in my Bible yesterday—some of the earliest history recorded in the books of the Old Testament. The nations there mentioned are such as Israel, Arabia, Egypt, and Lebanon. How many times have these nations of many thousands of years ago been submerged, to rise again?"

"The Baltic peoples," Secretary Dulles continued, "in the face of every imposition, retain their will to be free and maintain their steadfast opposition to Soviet despotism. Terrorism has been prolonged now for 13 years. Many of their courageous and noble representatives have been executed, deported, or driven into exile. But their martyrdom keeps patriotism alive."

Then Secretary Dulles said this:

"Some may say that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that despotism of the Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, country, and who have a sense of personal dignity."

"The Soviet system which seeks to expunge the distinctive characteristics of nation, creed, and individuality must itself change or be doomed ultimately to collapse. The time of collapse depends largely on whether the peoples who remain free produce spiritual, intellectual, and material richness; and whether we have a faith that can penetrate any Iron Curtain; and we must be sure that captive peoples know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and above all, we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which would confirm their captivity."

Let me say now for myself: As Majority Leader in the U.S. House of Representatives at the time Mr. Dulles made that statement, I shared those sentiments with him.

I still hold to them.

We would be guilty of wishful thinking if we believed the collapse of the Soviet Union is imminent.

But there is a growing evidence that all is not well with the Red conspiracy.

Cracks are beginning to show in the communist front.

Mr. Castro, who not so long ago was welcoming the Red Chinese to his shores and boasting of his alliance with them, now accuses them of bad faith.

Red China, in turn, is increasingly belligerent toward Russia, accusing the U.S.S.R. of all sorts of things, while the Kremlin casts an increasingly wary eye at the intentions of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung.

Apparently there has been a falling out among thieves.

This is the weakness of gangsters, whether they are gangster lords of the numbers games or gangster nations.

They rule only through terror and violence. There is no sense of honor within their own ranks.

And there is room for only one at the top on the world of dictators.

I learned with gratification that the recently completed Ecumenical Council in the Vatican consecrated two Lithuanian bishops. This, it seems to me, is a significant development for Lithuanians here and abroad.

And I read with a great deal of interest that Communist masters are becoming increasingly concerned about the generation of young Lithuanians.

As I understand it, they are becoming a touchy problem.

It seems they just are not conforming the way they are supposed to.

They refuse to be brainwashed.

We hear there are commotions when Communist Party or governmental decisions have been published and when the campaign to explain them and enforce them is underway.

In other words, a lot of Lithuanians just are not buying this business of government from the top down.

Thus is history repeating itself in this brave country.

Because through the ages, whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, the people of Lithuania have remained faithful to their culture, their history and their church.

Every year in the House of Representatives many Members arise to join with you in the observance of the anniversary of your Independence Day.

And I find one theme running through the remarks by my colleagues on this occasion—a universal respect for the character of the Lithuanian people.

Today, as I am sure you know, the largest Lithuanian community beyond the borders of your native land is here in America, with more than a million of your countrymen having been welcomed to our shores.

Here you are giving full measure of your energies and talents to help us produce that spiritual, intellectual and material richness that will speed the end of bondage for all freedom-loving people.

One thing the Communists either refuse to believe or just do not understand: that "Truth, crushed to earth shall rise again."

There is solid evidence that truth is rising again in Lithuania in spite of all Soviet efforts to keep it down.

Our task here in this great land of freedom and opportunity, of blessings and bounty, is to make sure the people of Lithuania know they have a powerful and faithful friend who has not forgotten and will not forget their hopes and aspirations.

Thank you for inviting me to take part in this significant occasion.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IS YEAR-ROUND PROBLEM

(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, the boxcar shortage at harvesttime has grown into a year-round problem, and I have

to mention the fact of this situation in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have asked the distinguished chairman of that committee to request a rule on the Senate-passed bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional rate-setting powers that would lead to an adequate supply of boxcars in all parts of the Nation. This is the bill for which hearings were held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last fall, in which many of our colleagues, including myself, spoke in support of passage.

The Interstate Commerce Commission tells me that the boxcar shortage has been in existence in varying degrees of severity for 17 years, and that the Commission would be in an excellent position to remedy the situation if the House joins the Senate in passing this bill giving the ICC the authority to establish reasonable per diem rental rates on boxcars.

The House Committee completed the hearings on this bill last year, and all that now needs to be done is for the committee to request a hearing from the Rules Committee so that the bill can reach the House floor for action. I hope this is done without delay, so an end can be put to the deplorable situation that sees the Nation's boxcar supply decreased by over 2,000 cars a month. With mounting international problems and plans to increase food shipments to needy nations, the United States cannot afford to have a further deterioration in the railway freight system.

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

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

WHEELING NEWS-REGISTER AND CHARLESTON GAZETTE PUBLISH FORTHRIGHT VIETNAM EDITORIALS

(Mr. MOORE (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. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern in my State about our involvement in Vietnam. Two prominent Democratic newspapers in West Virginia have published forthright editorials reflecting this concern. They are the Wheeling News-Register and the Charleston Gazette.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read these penetrating editorials I include them in my remarks.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3585

cent of the voting-age population went to the polls in the November 1964 election. The election specified by the voting rights law as the test was a presidential election. This usually attracts in some parts of the country a large percentage of voters, but just the opposite may happen in other parts. In the South, for example, where the Democratic party has been dominant for many years and the party for which the State's electoral votes will usually be cast has for a long time been a foregone conclusion, many citizens feel their vote would be superfluous.

Yet the law says that in any State where a literacy "test or device" existed and the turnout was less than 50 percent in the 1964 presidential election, either statewide or in a subdivision, Federal voting examiners may be appointed and the tests suspended, while the State is penalized for a period of 5 years. The Supreme Court is now dealing with the constitutionality of these provisions, and in the recent arguments before the Court some of the Justices questioned the basis for the 50-percent rule.

The New York City election is a conspicuous illustration of how inconclusive or irrelevant the 50-percent yardstick can prove to be.

**REV. DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP,
CHAPLAIN**

(Mr. CLANCY (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. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned last night of the death of our beloved chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. In these troubled times we all leaned heavily on his spiritual guidance and inspiration. The prayers he offered at the opening of our daily sessions were filled with wisdom and deep concern for our Nation.

Dr. Braskamp was a most conscientious and devoted servant of mankind. His own great personal integrity, his loyalty and dedication have been an inspiration to all of us. I believe it is the universal sentiment of the House that he has endowed us with a spiritual enrichment that we shall long remember. He gave us renewed strength and courage in difficult times.

For 40 years Dr. Braskamp served as pastor of churches in the Washington area and then in 1950 assumed his duties with the U.S. House of Representatives as its first full-time Chaplain. We were fortunate indeed to have the benefit of the ministrations of a man of his caliber, and I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his everlasting memory.

(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. 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.]

**REDEDICATION TO THE CAUSE OF
LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE**

(Mr. HALLECK (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. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent pleasure to be invited to speak at an observance of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day.

The program, held in Beverly Shores, Ind., was sponsored by the American-Lithuanian Club of Beverly Shores and featured a colorful presentation of Lithuanian folk songs and dances, with participants wearing native costumes.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the observations I made on that occasion, Sunday, February 13:

ADDRESS BY Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK

In one sense I am happy to be with you today. Happy, particularly to meet with you, to enjoy your friendly hospitality and to take part in the observance of a historic occasion.

On the other hand, apart from the feeling of fellowship, we cannot really rejoice that the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence must be celebrated "in exile," so to speak. We would all rather, very much rather, that the situation might be otherwise—that we could be celebrating a continuation of Lithuania's independence and membership in the world's family of free nations.

But I can say, honestly and sincerely, that I am proud to be here.

I am flattered that you have asked me to be with you on this ceremony of rededication to the cause of Lithuania's independence.

In a larger sense what you are doing here today is rededicating yourselves to the cause of freedom for all mankind.

You are demonstrating your opposition to tyranny in whatever form.

Certainly nobody knows better the meaning of the words "freedom" and "tyranny" than the Lithuanian people.

Throughout their difficult history they have had to take up arms against invading armies.

To the people of your gallant nation, tyranny is not just a word found in speeches. It is a real and terrible experience.

By the same token, to the Lithuanian people freedom is not something to be taken for granted, like the air we breathe.

Freedom is something for which they have for centuries fought and died.

Let's review a little history.

Forty-eight years ago, almost to the day, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed its independence. This marked the survival of this country, with its long history and rich traditions, in spite of more than a century in the hands of the Russian czars.

Reborn in the midst of World War I, Lithuania was able to assert her independence only after Soviet troops, which had moved into her territory, had been driven out with Allied help.

On July 20, 1920, in a treaty with Lithuania, the Soviet Government declared "the right of all nations to free self-determination" and, on this basis, recognized "the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state."

The Soviet Government further renounced for all time "all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

During the two decades of Lithuanian independence which followed, the Soviet Government reiterated these pledges in other

agreements with the Lithuanian Government.

As late as October 1939, while forcing Lithuania to sign a "mutual assistance pact," the U.S.S.R. claimed to guarantee Lithuania's independence.

By that time, as we now know, the Soviets had already reached secret agreements with Nazi Germany under which the Baltic States were to fall within the Soviet sphere of influence.

Thus Lithuania, as so many times before, had again become a pawn on the chessboard of European power politics.

By the summer of 1940 Lithuania had been occupied by Soviet troops and, after rigged elections during July of that year, the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

And, as we all know, "incorporated" means that Lithuania was declared to be an integral part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is not merely a satellite country, but has been totally swallowed up, with not even the pretense of a separate nation.

Thus did the Communists betray their earlier promise to recognize the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state. It was typical of Soviet treachery.

Everyone recognized that the claim of self-determination was pure fiction—an insult to the intelligence of all loyal Lithuanians.

The United States was quick to denounce this illegal act and has consistently refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R.

And in spite of the walls behind which the Soviet Union seeks to hide it, we know that the Lithuanian people have not accepted the denial of their independence.

I recall that some years back, a committee of the House of Representatives exposed the Soviet use of deportation, persecution, and economic exploitation in an effort to consolidate its control of Lithuania.

But none of these actions has destroyed the enduring will of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence. In short, the U.S.S.R. has been unable to either "Russianize" or "Sovietize" the Lithuanian people. I know that you are not surprised at this.

Nor do I think that anyone who knows the character of the Lithuanian people is surprised that a nation which has produced such great champions of liberty as Mindaugas and Vytautas the Great—and which got the sweet taste of freedom under President Smetona—refuses to forget its own history.

We are not surprised that a people as vigorously independent as the Lithuanians refuses to submit to forced "collectivization."

Nor are we surprised that such a deeply religious people refuses to renounce God.

And we are not surprised that a people with such a rich and distinct ethnic and cultural background and tradition refuses stoutly to even pretend to be "Slavic."

In a word, the free world is not surprised at the courage of the Lithuanian people now struggling under the stifling hand of communism, or at their determination to one day regain the independence they have temporarily lost.

For history has demonstrated, time and again, that Lithuania is a nation with a fighting heart.

But I have an idea I know who is surprised: the rulers in the Kremlin.

Because they have failed to destroy the Lithuanian nation as a distinct people.

For that is exactly what the Red regime has tried to do.

But all of the well-known Communist techniques—from use of outright force and terror to sly propaganda and "re-education"—have not succeeded in subverting the Lithuanian character or in destroying the Lithuanians' sense of identity and love of freedom.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3587

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register,
Feb. 21, 1966]

WHERE THE REAL DANGER LIES

In arguing for the administration's stand in Vietnam, Secretary of State Dean Rusk constantly seeks to draw a parallel between Vietnam and the war against Hitler, thus arousing all the complex emotions bound up with World War II and its aftermath.

Yet any analogy between an international war precipitated by a dictator's career of brazen territorial conquest, and the consequences of a social revolution arising from the ashes of colonialism, is utterly false.

There has been aggression in Vietnam, we admit. But the essential facts are that an indigenous national revolution began there during the Japanese occupation, that under Communist leadership the revolution swept away French colonial rule, that to fill the vacuum an international agreement was reached at Geneva providing for military neutralization and self-determination for all of Vietnam, and that the United States then set out to upset the Geneva pacts by establishing a military satellite in South Vietnam.

North Vietnam's response, first by supplying and training guerrillas and then by sending in its own troops, was certainly aggressive, but it was above all a response. To equate it with Hitler's aggressions across national frontiers is a spurious debating tactic and nothing more. Were the two situations comparable, the United States would have no trouble winning support and sympathy from the overwhelming majority of U.N. members, as we did in resisting a genuine case of internationally indicated aggression in Korea. Support and sympathy in the U.N. on Vietnam is something we conspicuously do not enjoy.

As long as Mr. Rusk and others high in the administration insist on distorting and misrepresenting the true facts of this situation the greater the chances of an even wider war at the expense of thousands of American lives.

If we will stop confusing the containment of China with the containment of communism, we will understand that the best barrier to Chinese national ambitions is the indigenous nationalism of southeast Asia—which Ho Chi Minh represents in Hanoi whether we like it or not, and which a neutralized coalition regime could represent in Saigon.

Some fear that if we left it to the Vietnamese to make their own choice the two Vietnams might later be reunified under Communist control. This is not at all certain. Yet even a Communist Vietnam, truly expressive of popular aspirations and militarily neutralized under Russian, American, and perhaps U.N. guarantees, could stabilize the area far better than an open-ended American military commitment which generates its own instability. The issue is not one of ideology, but native, anticolonial revolution.

The real danger in the administration's blind position with Vietnam is the generalizing of this particular adventure into a doctrine of counterrevolutionary responsibility. To say that we have a duty to wage a war of antiliberation wherever the Communists choose to wage a war of liberation is to fulfill their own prophecy for them. America has in fact no obligation to police the world against social uprisings, and could not do so if it tried. Whatever the outcome in southeast Asia, let us avoid being trapped by Marxist dogma into accepting a role the Marxists invent for us.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette,
Feb. 22, 1966]

VIETNAM RAISES QUESTION OF WHO'S BEING CONTAINED

Assuming even that South Vietnam's Government is prepared to initiate the desirable and necessary reforms outlined by President

Johnson at Honolulu, no one should get the idea that the war will suddenly terminate.

To begin with, Laos received, under the Kennedy administration, more aid per capita than any other country. Yet, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, in his recent book makes clear, "Laos simply did not have the national or social structure to absorb the remorseless flood of American bounty." South Vietnam, of course, is considerably worse off than Laos ever was.

And in the second place, the assumption that Marshal Ky's privileged regime is anxious to spread the wealth around ranks on a par with the assumption West Virginia's Board of Public Works is panting to support executive budget and short ballot amendments. By this time Americans should have realized the vested elite, home or abroad, never surrenders prerogatives and powers voluntarily.

"There are" said the New York Times, about a week ago, "no shortcuts out of the Vietnamese morass."

Indeed, if there were, the world may rest assured President Johnson long ago would have discovered them and acted upon them. The President, whose political antenna, in any event, is as sensitive as any man's, is well aware of the divisive force the Vietnam war has become in our society and what that division can do to wreck consensus government.

To quote the Times again:

"The United States is in for a long, hard, more costly, and more dangerous war."

France found this out during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Unwilling to learn from France's bitter lesson, apparently the United States must suffer through a similar harsh experience.

Despite advice from every acknowledged Far Eastern expert, including General MacArthur, that the United States has no business getting bogged down in a land war on the Asian Continent, the United States is now in a full-scale land war on that continent and daily pouring additional American lives down a vast, bottomless maw.

The war is being pursued and carried out largely on the advice of diplomats and militarists who have consistently and unerringly erred in their predictions as to what was required to win the war and who have yet to admit they and their panaceas have been everlastingly wrong.

The eternal excuse for failure has been not enough. Not enough firepower was brought to bear, not enough bombs were dropped, not enough of the right targets were hit, not enough American troops were committed to South Vietnam's defense, not enough of our allies have wakened to the seriousness of the situation, not enough resolve has been demonstrated by the United States to convince Hanoi and the Vietcong of our purpose in Vietnam. Always not enough—never a doubt that no matter what is tried or how much is wagered in materiel and in manpower, the bet may not be enough to counter the stakes shoved in by the other side.

Thus, the United States has been gradually and steadily upping the ante.

In a brief 3 years its complement of troops has risen from about 25,000 to more than 200,000. Within 6 months thousands additional cannon fodder will have been transported across the Pacific by boat or air. In fact, the same brilliant tacticians who've recommended covering all bets are today cautiously proclaiming that some time during 1967 the United States will need and will have 600,000 youngsters fighting for the fatherland in Vietnam.

This is what our foreign policy of the last 18 years is leading to. This is the policy known as containment, conceived under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, continued under Secretary of State John Dulles, and still chugging along under Secretary of State

Dean Rusk. Somehow, isn't it time someone asked the question:

"Who's being contained—them or us?"

TVA BRIDGE ACT

(Mr. BROCK (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. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would amend the TVA Bridge Act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain highway and railroad bridges.

This amendment is necessary to give the authority to use appropriated funds to the TVA in order to raise, widen, or reconstruct bridges which have become obstructions to navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. There are several points where bridge alterations would permit more effective use of the waterway but especially important is the Tennessee State Highway 58 bridge over the Hiwasee River, near Charleston and Calhoun, Tenn. When this bridge was originally constructed there was little prospect of great water traffic. Now, however, the Hiwasee services a tremendous industrial complex, including a giant Bowers paper mill and an Olin Matheson plant. The TVA has deepened the present channel to accommodate present and potential traffic but the full benefits of this vital waterway cannot be fully realized until bottlenecks have been removed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Public Works Committee to favorably consider this important legislation.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

(Mr. SCHWEIKER (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. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the attention of the country was focused upon an incident that happened in Pennsylvania involving 19-year-old Tyrone Collins, who, while free on \$500 bail pending the trial of an assault charge in Mobile, Ala., moved to his new home in Pennsylvania in alleged violation of the conditions of his bail. Alabama bondsmen, without the aid of Pennsylvania law enforcement authorities, or any search or arrest warrant or any other judicial process, summarily removed Collins from his home in Norristown, Pa., by force during the middle of the night and, without the interposition of any judicial authority, removed him some 1,000 miles away to Alabama.

The country was shocked, not because it felt that Tyrone Collins should not have to stand trial on the charge levied against him by the authorities of the State of Alabama, but because of the procedures employed by the bondsmen to return Collins to Alabama. The decision of private citizens, motivated simply by a desire to protect their financial investment, using summary action and force to

abduct their quarry from the domain of the sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a distant part of the country, without any judicial sanction and consequently without any assurance of procedural due process, was more than most people believed tolerable. Yet, according to longstanding court decisions, what happened in the Collins case was not proscribed by the due process guarantees of the Constitution, nor by any other provision of Federal law.

The Collins incident brought to light a situation not generally known to the public: that at common law a bondsman possesses the power to take a bailee into custody summarily at any time and return him to the authorities who initially sanctioned his release, and that this power may be exercised even when the bailee has fled to another State or jurisdiction. Virtually no restriction is placed upon what the bondsman may do to effectuate this return. There need be no compliance with State arrest procedures, with procedures securing persons against unreasonable searches and seizures, or with any requirement that a person taken from one State to another without his consent be given a judicial hearing on the reasonableness of the removal. In short, the bondsman can act without the sanction of any State or Federal tribunal. This common law rule is still the law today.

Not only had the integrity and sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania been flaunted by what had happened, but it was also apparent that there had been, at least by modern standards, a violation of individual rights that in analogous circumstances could never legally occur. It was evident that this situation could no longer be tolerated. No longer could society condone a philosophy that regarded the bailee as nothing more than the bondsman's chattel—a mere piece of property that the bondsman-owner could abuse in any way without answering to the law for his actions.

The irony of the Collins situation was made all the more poignant by the fact that when the State officials request the return of a fugitive from justice who has taken refuge in another State, they comply with very strict procedures, specified by article IV, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which utilize the executive authority of the refuge or asylum State for taking the fugitive into custody. Only after the fugitive has been given a hearing in the asylum State by the authorities of that State, and it has been determined that he has left the jurisdiction of the demanding State in violation of law, can the fugitive be turned over to the authorities who seek his return to the State whence he originally fled. If a public official must go through this sort of procedure to get back a person who is already a convicted criminal, how strange it was, people thought, that a private person, owing no allegiance and no sense of public duty to any State authority, answerable to nothing but his own conscience, could ignore such procedures in seizing an individual who was not a criminal but simply an ac-

cused, presumed by the law to be innocent of the charges pending against him.

Recognizing that something should be done, I resolved to correct this state of affairs, so as to make bail bondsmen subject to minimum standards of procedural due process, as are State authorities in comparable situations.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill, which has also been introduced in the Senate by Senator TYRINGS and is being cosponsored by several of his colleagues, which will provide for the implementation of these minimum standards in cases such as that involving Tyrone Collins. In formulating the content of the bill, we were fortunate to have the counsel and advice of Mr. Ronald Goldfarb, a noted authority on bail problems, whose recent book, "Ransom," pointed out the need for reform in this area.

Simply stated, the main provisions of the bill I have introduced are these:

First, when a bondsman seeks the return to another jurisdiction of a person who has violated the conditions of his bail, the bondsman must apply to a judicial officer of the United States—either a Federal judge or a U.S. Commissioner—for a warrant authorizing the taking into custody of the fugitive bailee.

Second, if the bondsman is able to show probable cause that the person named in the warrant application has violated the terms and conditions of his bail, the judicial officer shall issue the warrant, and the person is to be brought promptly before the judicial officer for a hearing.

Third, at the hearing, the fugitive bailee is to be informed of the nature and purpose of the proceeding against him, of his right to retain counsel, of his right not to make a statement, and of the fact that any statement made by him may be used against him. He also is to be given reasonable opportunity to consult counsel.

Fourth, at the hearing the bondsman must establish that the identity of the alleged fugitive bailee is as he asserts, that the bondsman and the fugitive are in a bail relationship, and that the conditions of bail imposed to secure the fugitive's appearance in a future judicial proceeding have been broken.

Fifth, if the necessary showing is made at the hearing, the judicial officer is to issue a warrant for removal of the fugitive bailee, promptly and directly, to the appropriate authorities of the jurisdiction whence he has fled.

Sixth, violation of these procedures by the bondsman is made a Federal crime, punishable by a fine of up to \$5,000, or imprisonment of up to 2 years, or both.

It is my hope that this legislation will receive the prompt attention of both Houses of Congress and that hearings will be held at the earliest possible date.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort to remedy a long-standing and grievous flaw in the pattern of existing law.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec 27, 1965]

AN ALABAMA INVASION

We are glad that Tyrone Collins has been restored to his family in Norristown after a

harrowing experience with two Alabama bail bondsmen during the previous week. It was quite a Christmas story.

And it is to be assumed, of course, that with the proper recourse to proper legal procedures, he will yet answer whatever bona fide charges may be facing him in Mobile. In any event, it should be made clear that Pennsylvania is not in the business of being a refuge for persons wanted in out-of-State courts.

Nevertheless, the manner in which young Collins was virtually kidnaped from his home a week ago by the two bondsmen—in a manner too reminiscent of old-time bounty-hunters—was such an outrageous infringement of the laws and procedures of this Commonwealth that it should not be forgotten or brushed aside.

Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania in whose district the highly illegal "grab" was made, has interested himself rightly in this case since the start and is intent not only on investigation but corrective legislation, if it is needed, in Congress. In view of the appearance of an armed invasion of this sovereign State by citizens of Alabama, which the Collins case presents, it is evident that some very specific legislation may be required.

In Alabama bail bondsmen may not need warrants in "hot pursuit" of their quarry, but in Pennsylvania they do. We expect visiting bondsmen—or law officials, for that matter—to abide by this Commonwealth's rules of procedure when they are in this jurisdiction. It does not seem much to ask—but if it requires Federal law to make the point, then let us have such a law on the books.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Dec. 29, 1965]

THE COLLINS CASE LESSON

A rap on the door on a Sunday night. Men bursting in to snap handcuffs on a suspect—men with the effrontery to demand money from a mother, "if you want this boy to eat." Then a trip of hundreds of miles to put a bail bond jumper named Tyrone Collins back in Alabama.

Such tactics are repellant to Pennsylvanians' sense of fair play. They sound too much like the gestapo, or the Soviet secret police. Therefore there was instant indignation in this part of the country when Tyrone Collins was grabbed at his Norristown home by representatives of a Mobile bonding firm. Not only the NAACP was outraged; thousands of Pennsylvanians felt the same, including a Congressman, a Governor, an attorney general.

The charge on which young Collins presumably skipped bond was serious enough—knifing a fellow high school student. It developed that this was not the only charge against him. He had racked up two counts of driving without a license since his return to Norristown. But though it began to look as if Collins was not the ideal teenager, the idea of bail bondsmen breaking and entering, without a warrant, still was repugnant. Surprisingly enough, some legal experts dug into their books and read them to say that the bondsmen were legally right.

There is, therefore, a lesson in the case of Tyrone Collins, though perhaps not what it first seemed to be. The point is that America's laws on return of bail skippers are primitive and need statutory correction. Certainly, no felon ought to be given refuge merely because he crosses a State line; but a man on bail is not yet tried, and therefore is presumed to be innocent. An orderly, legal procedure ought to be necessary before he can be dragged out of a home at night. The Collins case makes the need for revised laws evident.

to be determined by the service Secretary on a case-by-case basis, taking into account professional training requirements for doctors and availability of beds in civilian hospitals in the area. (The Rivers subcommittee had recommended 10 to 20 percent of new beds for retirees and I understand this is what the Surgeons General prefer.)

At age 65, retirees who are eligible for social security medical care would be transferred to that program. Those not eligible under social security would continue in the military retiree program.

In provisions not related to retirees, the bill also provides outpatient care to active duty dependents and long-term care for retarded children of military personnel. Both are new benefits, and both are extremely worthwhile.

The program would cost about \$120 million in fiscal year 1968, its first full year of operation, and could be expected to rise gradually to an annual cost of about \$190 million.

Now, of course, I don't want to prejudice the legislation before our subcommittee has had a chance to consider it. But it has some obviously attractive features. Some retiree beds would continue to be programed in military facilities. Retirees would get a program of care in civilian facilities for the first time, and those who live far from a military hospital would no longer be denied this important benefit.

Some of the other provisions are going to take careful study. The social security medical care supplemental program has some features, such as nursing care, which are not available under the Dependent Medicare Act. These may prove desirable to military retirees. On the other hand, we are going to have to take a close look at cost to see the individual is not charged more at a time in life when he is least able to pay.

The provision for higher charges for those with less than 30 years service is also going to need close scrutiny. With so many laws designed to encourage retirement before 30 years, there may be serious questions of equity as well as problems in administering the provision.

Speaking personally, I cannot approve the section which establishes higher priority of availability of medical facilities for 30-year retirees than those with less than 30 years. I can justify a reduced deductible payment for the 30-year retiree because he has contributed of himself for a longer period. But as long as we have laws which allow retirement at less than 30 years, I cannot discriminate against any retiree on the basis of availability of hospital facilities. When a retiree is sick, a hospital bed should be available—period—whether he served 20 years or 40.

The Department of Defense has created discrimination against some retirees with its ill-advised recomputation system—let's not create another type of discrimination.

But these are details to be worked out. The important thing is to have a bill the executive branch supports that we can shape into acceptable legislation.

Admittedly, this bill is quite different from the legislation I first introduced on the subject which was based on a program proposed by the Fleet Reserve Association. But, as I indicated, that was meant to be a catalyst. Frankly, I am not so concerned with the method as with the principle. We never get everything that all of us want in any one bill. But what is important is to provide for all of our retirees an assured program of care, one that cannot wither away because of administrative neglect.

We are in a time when the Government is making an enormous effort to improve the health of all citizens. Most of you will probably be quite surprised to hear that our annual Government expenditure for health programs of all types is in the neighborhood of \$7 billion. In the face of that

gigantic national commitment, it is simply unthinkable that we would let lapse the medical benefits of military retirees that have been provided for over 100 years.

Finally, and most important of all, we must reinsert in the hearts of all our retirees faith in their Government's promises, faith that when their Government pledges them a benefit it will never be taken away.

The moral obligation of the Government to keep its word to individual military men is more important than any amount of dollars involved. I believe that during the recomputation fight and I believe it now.

And this time, I think we are going to win.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

(Mr. SHRIVER (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. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits paid under the Social Security Act.

My bill would provide an automatic 3 percent increase in benefits whenever the Consumer Price Index reflects a similar increase in the cost of living. I am advocating these cost-of-living adjustments to social security payments because cost studies by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicate that this method, alone, among all the proposals for reasonable improvements in benefits can be accomplished without further increase in social security taxes.

The actuarial studies show that the growth of the economy would provide the necessary revenues to provide cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, the most effective action we could take to protect the earning power of those living on fixed incomes would be to stop Government-stimulated inflation which reduces the value of their dollars. Unfortunately, the administration has not demonstrated any inclination to hold-the-line on deficit spending. We, therefore, should make a strong effort to protect older Americans from the loss of income because of factors beyond their control.

From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security benefits, recipients suffered a 7 percent loss in buying power. The bill I have introduced would prevent such loss of purchasing power in the future.

There are other changes which should be considered in the present social security system. One of these is a bill which I introduced during the first session of the 89th Congress. It is H.R. 7340, a proposal to pay 100 percent of primary benefit to widows under the Social Security Act. I urge that consideration be given to this legislation at an early date.

CELEBRATE GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ON SUNDAY PRECEDING AND CELEBRATE FREEDOM WEEK

(Mr. ELLSWORTH (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. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annual proclamations designating the Sunday of each year immediately preceding February 22—the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington—as Freedom Sunday, and to designate the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs, as Freedom Week.

For some years, Freedom Week has been celebrated by the members of Sertoma International. This is an organization of business, professional and agricultural men who have come together in bonds of personal friendship—united in dedication to service of their communities. Sertoma, which has over 450 clubs throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico, derives its name from the organization's slogan, "Service to Mankind."

Many Sertoma Clubs in the State of Kansas have visited schools this week, distributing to each student a copy of our Declaration of Independence. Certainly it is right and proper that America's young people be instilled with a sense of national heritage.

It is also proper that all Americans everywhere be given the opportunity to celebrate a week each year as a tribute to this same national freedom heritage.

SHORTAGES IN VIETNAM

(Mr. LATTA (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. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the ever-lengthening list of shortages being suffered by our fighting men in Vietnam is, in my opinion, a national disgrace and this Congress should investigate them forthwith. I believe these critical shortages can no longer be swept under the rug and ignored by this Congress. They have now become common knowledge to the parents of our servicemen serving in Vietnam and they are demanding to know why these shortages exist when we have been spending approximately one-half of our Nation's total budget for defense and related items. When one considers the staggering expenditures of the Department of Defense over the past couple of years, our fighting men in Vietnam should be the best equipped soldiers ever sent into battle. Instead, reports indicate that they are not only unbelievably ill equipped, but are improperly fed. It has been reported that until recently, an estimated 70 percent of our troops in Vietnam were eating C-rations as a steady diet because of food shortages and the shortage of food-storage facilities.

Soldiers from my district are writing home, as I am sure they are from every Congressman's district, asking their families to mail them such essentials as jungle boots, fatigues, underwear, socks, and so forth. The New York Times of Monday, February 21, 1966, verified the needs of our fighting men when it revealed:

Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks, and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for naming our next nuclear aircraft carrier after one of America's great naval figures, the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

I believe that Admiral Nimitz' career symbolizes our U.S. Navy. He was tough, adroit, well schooled in Navy tactics, every bit a leader of men of which our Nation can justly be proud. His job, after we were attacked in 1941, was to take a crippled Navy to sea, to stand off numerically greater forces, and to rebuild our might on the seas.

His epic battles in the Pacific brought the aircraft carrier into prominence, and proved that it could be a devastating instrument of war. The submarine was also brought into the Pacific sea war, and proved itself deadly.

No one can adequately measure the gratitude that our Nation has for the courageous and skillful leadership Admiral Nimitz gave our Pacific fleet when the chips were down. He had vision, daring, and an uncommon sense of strategy and planning.

Two decades after World War II we are again in perilous times. Our dependency upon the aircraft carrier increases as the danger of another large-scale conflict grows. It is only appropriate that we bestow upon our next nuclear carrier, the latest development in our nuclear Navy, the name of the man who made the aircraft carrier a potent and formidable element in sea warfare.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, who admire and respect the late Admiral Nimitz, will join with me in this effort.

HOME FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

(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, tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Works will open hearings on a bill introduced last Monday by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for the erection of a \$750,000 home for the Vice President of the United States.

In the light of the speed with which the committee is acting on this proposal there is apparently some emergency with which we are not aware. But, paradoxically, there is no emergency from the point of view of the administration with respect to furnishing proper housing for our servicemen.

Last September the Congress provided funds for military housing sorely needed. Some of our servicemen have been living in little more than barns, even in tents. Last December the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily shelved our appropriation for military housing. In testimony before our committee the Defense Department claimed that this unilateral action was taken because of other budget demands and that the expenditure would add to the inflationary pressures.

I concur in the desirability of furnishing proper housing for our Vice President. But why the rush?

And I should like to ask this question: Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President, admittedly needed, when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to furnish proper housing for our fighting men?

If proper housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflationary pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? First things first.

DISASTER STUDY NEEDED NOW

(Mr. MATHIAS 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. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, three times in recent months we have seen transportation tangled, communications snarled, commerce crippled, and Government stalled by regional disasters. It is ironic that this great Nation, while perfecting its defenses against enemy attack and sabotage, should remain so vulnerable to the whims of weather and the failures of any single public utility.

Northeastern commerce and industry have been gravely hurt by the transportation and communications breakdowns accompanying last November's blackout and the New York transit strike. During the blizzard last month, public services throughout the great Washington metropolitan area were virtually suspended, and the Federal Government alone lost \$10 million in salaries on a single snowbound day. Most serious, of course, have been the human tragedies caused by these periods of temporary paralysis.

We have ample proof that our present precautions against such occurrences are inadequate. We need, right now, a full national survey to discover what resources we do need and where they can be found, so that all levels of American government and all public utilities might be prepared to meet every conceivable emergency.

I am today introducing a bill authorizing and directing the Office of Emergency Planning to study this question, in cooperation with State and local governments, and to make a full report to Congress by December 1, 1966. In my judgment the OEP is best qualified to take such an inventory for three reasons: First, because national security is directly involved; second, because the OEP already has relevant information; and third, because the leadership of the Federal disaster agency is essential in preparing to meet emergencies which do not respect State and local lines.

Through the survey I propose, the OEP should be able to submit reasonable recommendations to Congress, and also encourage local and State governments to evaluate their own resources and prepare realistic contingency plans.

While we may never be able to forestall all blackouts, or anticipate all storms, we should be able to combat their crippling effects. The study proposed in my bill would help us mobilize our resources and meet the challenge

implicit in the following article, from the Washington Post of February 15:

MOSCOW CLEARS "IMPOSSIBLE" SNOW

Moscow, February 14.—Moscow turned out 2,000 snow-clearing machines today to attack what Tass called such an unprecedented snowfall that "even oldtimers cannot remember."

And, the Soviet news agency added, the machines "did the impossible: Transport services were not interrupted for a single minute." Tass said 27.5 inches of snow fell in "several hours."

THE TAX AND SPEND PHILOSOPHY

(Mr. NELSEN 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. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration today asks the House to raise taxes by the tune of \$6 billion by reimposing excise taxes on telephones and cars and by changing withholding tax collection methods. We are told these taxes are necessary to raise money to finance the war in Vietnam and to put the lid on inflation. We are told if we do not agree to these taxes, we will be deeper in debt.

I refuse to buy this line. This is not the only course open to Congress and this administration. The administration's Great Society budget is topheavy with domestic spending lard. There is no sound reason why it cannot be taken out to avoid this tax increase.

Cars and telephones are necessities. Why should users of these necessities be penalized when there are so many obvious areas where nonessential spending can be curtailed? The answer is that there is no more logic to this course than there is to cutting back existing, proved programs, like the school lunch and milk programs and the land-grant college programs, while at the same time moving to set up dozens of new, untried expensive programs.

The administration has ignored our constant warning that you cannot fight a major war of unpredictable costs while at the same time spending borrowed money at home harum-scarum.

It is time for Congress to insist that this administration start acting with fiscal responsibility. It is apparent the only way to insure that the spenders do so is to refuse to go along with their "tax and spend" philosophy which is damaging this Nation's economic foundations and sapping the strength of American taxpayers.

I therefore intend to vote no to this preposterous tax increase.

(Mrs. DWYER at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. DWYER'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.)

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3597

to protect our freedoms, our heritage, our integrity. A newspaper has been rightly called the conscience of the community. Columbus, I believe, is blessed with a good conscience. As long as your paper objectively and honestly reports the news, it will continue to be a good conscience and a strong link in the chain of democracy.

NASSER RETREATS FROM HIS PEACE PLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great disappointment that President Nasser, in a recent speech at the University of Cairo, rejuvenated his warlike stance vis-a-vis the Yemen. This recent speech by President Nasser, wherein he threatened to maintain his Yemen intervention, contrary to treaty provisions, contradicts the widely voiced optimism that has reigned for some months.

President Nasser is quoted in this morning's New York Times as having said:

If anyone thinks we have become tired because we have stayed in Yemen so long, let me say that we are a struggling nation, a fighting nation, a patient nation. We can stay in Yemen for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or even 5.

Thus it appears that the Jiddah agreement, which provided for a staged withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen, is threatened. Nasser excused his beligerence by pointing to the sale of American Patton tanks to Israel, and claiming that conservative, reactionary forces in the Middle East, goaded by Western powers, were bent upon countering his influence and even plotting against his life. These are charges which, due to lack of adequate, firsthand knowledge, I can neither substantiate or reject.

But in the first instance, I cannot understand how 200 Patton tanks added to Israel's defenses could possibly, in a serious way, undermine the security of Egypt, in view of that country's massive procurement of Communist arms.

I am inclined to believe that President Nasser is an inherently suspicious ruler, intemperate, and not to be trusted. Perhaps it is impossible to find the opposite in the Middle East, a region perpetually upset by extreme political shifts, personal feuds, and contradictory ambitions.

The truth is that it is foolish to expect, through aid commitments, that American policy can effectively influence the realities in the Arab world.

The Jiddah conference was an Arab initiative. It seemed that President Nasser had faced the hurtful consequences of his intervention, and had concluded that nothing useful could be gained by continuing a war which showed little prospect of political advantage or military victory.

This was the opinion expressed to me by many people.

I must say, however, that this tenuous supposition hardly justified the renewed aid agreement with the United Arab Republic, which was undertaken during the congressional recess and in spite of

clearly understood congressional sentiment. The Jiddah accord spurred the optimists onward.

As I review recent history, I have come to doubt the wisdom of buying influence, particularly in an area of unique instability of constantly shifting loyalties.

Under the present circumstances, the United States is not justified under any pretext to render agricultural assistance to Egypt, when such assistance merely facilitates foreign intervention. Unless the United Arab Republic fulfills its treaty obligations with respect to the Yemen, we should not be expected to honor an aid commitment which the recipient can use to underwrite its hostile exertions.

Past American attempts to curb Nasser's obsession with foreign troublemaking have repeatedly failed. Officially, we have been setting unreal expectations. I cannot agree with the State Department that we are, in consequence of our generosity, gaining any so-called leverage over the course of events. In any case, these are not, in substance, for us to determine. It is contradictory to assist a developing nation which expends its meager resources on external adventure, intrigue, and excessive arms procurement.

The United Arab Republic has been spending millions of dollars to support its Yemini venture. Additional millions have gone to arms purchases, for the stated reason of contending with the so-called Israeli threat, but actually used as an instrument to bolster the power and prestige of Nasser's Egypt as against real and potential Arab rivals. It does not seem to me that this is a particularly promising field for the projection of American influence and, indeed, our mingling in this uncertainty may actually damage our cause. I thoroughly agree that it is in our national interest to support a balance of power in this troubled area, especially in view of Israel's threatened existence. But I doubt earnestly that this can be accomplished through periodic efforts to court the favor of inconsistent personalities. In any case, we invariably wind up in a very ambiguous, and often embarrassing, position.

If honest self-help is the new look in our foreign aid program, then perhaps we should take a longer view of Egypt.

President Nasser's recent threat to break the Jiddah agreement underlines the insurmountable contingencies with which, by force of our policy, we are faced with in the Middle East. It is an anxious warning to all who would place their trust too quickly and none too wisely.

I must add, Mr. Speaker, that it is particularly curious, and most discouraging, that Nasser's words came on the eve of Mr. Anwar el Sadat's good-will visit to this country. I fail to see what can be won through recourse to bluster and threats to the peace, lacking both validity and commonsense.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Clerk I am not recorded on this last vote. I was in the Chamber at the time the vote was being taken. If I had been recorded, I would have voted "yea" on the bill, H.R. 12752.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, among the many statements which appeared on George Washington's Birthday, there was one which particularly caught my attention because it shows what history still has to teach us.

In the New York Journal American an editorial quotes these words of our first President at the time of the Revolution:

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

As the Journal American pointed out, those deeply concerned words could just as well have been spoken by President Johnson today.

We have nearly 200,000 American servicemen in Vietnam. Within recent days, the parents, the wives, and the children of these men—more than half a million of our citizens—have been treated to television programs, and a few newspaper headlines which seem to imply that our boys in Vietnam do not have the support of American public.

We are engaged with an enemy who does not believe that American public opinion will ultimately turn against our efforts in Vietnam and make it impossible for us to continue. This is a delusion, but one which the events of the last few days have undoubtedly strengthened.

Those who sincerely seek peace in Vietnam must be made aware of the fact that every newspaper headline and every televised speech which feeds the delusion of doubt in Hanoi and Peiping serves only to prolong the conflict. It is time to tell our soldiers and our enemy, alike, that the American public overwhelmingly supports our objectives in Vietnam. Furthermore, they support overwhelmingly the policies which President Johnson is pursuing to accomplish those objectives. Let us look at the facts.

On "Meet the Press" last Sunday, White House aid McGeorge Bundy—who has been the key national security adviser to both President Kennedy and President Johnson—pointed out that the President has been acting in Vietnam with the greatest of restraint. He cited as evidence that perhaps 10 percent of the public actually would like the President to go farther.

I have examined several recent opinion polls on this matter, and I find that the figures are even higher. Roughly one-third of the country believes the President should take much stronger military action than he himself has as yet found necessary.

For example, in December of last year according to the Harris poll, fully 33 percent of the American people believed that we should carry the ground war into

North Vietnam. Some 39 percent believe that we should step up the bombing in North Vietnam at the very time when the President called for a suspension of the bombings to let the world see who was sincere, and who was insincere, about the desire for peace in southeast Asia.

Again, in January according to the Iowa poll, 36 percent of all Americans thought that we should bomb Hanoi and the other large cities of North Vietnam.

According to the Gallup poll, 31 percent advocated bombing the big cities of North Vietnam. As recently as this month, a Mutual Broadcasting poll reported 33.6 percent of Americans as saying that we should go all out and do whatever is necessary to defeat Hanoi.

At the same time, these same polls show that only a handful of Americans would favor a complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. The Harris poll puts the number at 9 percent; the Iowa poll puts it at 15 percent.

It is obvious from these and all the other polls that the policies our Government is now pursuing in Vietnam represent what the overwhelming majority of our citizens believe should be done.

President Johnson has said that we intend to stay. He has also said that we intend to do no more than is absolutely necessary to bring the other side to the conference table. This is a positive program which contains our best hope for peace, not only in Vietnam but throughout southeast Asia. The President's critics, as I have shown, represent no significant portion of U.S. public opinion, nor do they offer any sensible, workable alternative whatsoever.

The voices of dissent will continue. The timid, the uncertain, and the bewildered will continue to be heard. They were heard during our Revolution, but in history, their echo becomes dimmer with every passing year. What is remembered now is the determination, the wisdom, and the restraint of the leader who brought us safely through.

I would like to assure the President that, in my opinion, history is going to repeat itself.

I fully expect that at some future time, a Member of this great body will rise to quote from an editorial concerning President Johnson in Vietnam similar to the Journal American editorial about President Washington which I hold in my hand, and which I now insert in the RECORD:

[From the New York Journal-American,
Feb. 22, 1966]

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 peaceniks 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.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States sent to Congress on February 10 a message in which he outlined his proposals to open up a new war of great importance to all Americans—a war against hunger. Let me quote for you the opening sentences of this message.

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter. These are the essentials of peace and progress. But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled. When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth. I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger. There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

With these inspiring words, President Johnson submitted his new proposed Food for Freedom Act to the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Populations are exploding today. Every nation in the world recognizes this. Yet, tragically, some of the most underdeveloped countries are girding their production to industry often to the manufacture of implements of war. But food for peace will mean just what it says if the President's proposal is approved—only nations that gear their own efforts to increased agricultural output will receive maximum aid from the United States. The key to the new program is self-help. Also, references to friendly nations would be deleted, taking food for peace out of the political sphere. The whole emphasis will be on giving agricultural aid to those countries which help themselves.

The second innovation in the President's proposal is his intent to eliminate the requirement that food aid be out of our own surplus. No longer would food allotments be based on mere availability in our storage bins, but the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to ac-

quire food for world needs as they arise. This approach would be of tremendous benefit to the American taxpayer as well, because we would be spending less money to stockpile and store commodities. It would be a boon to the American farmer. For example, the President is asking for an increase of 10 percent in rice acreage in 1966. He is asking for permission to buy dairy products for distribution abroad, as well as at home. He is requesting an increase in soybean production this year, a supplement to earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. And finally, the President states that he is prepared to divert some of our 60 million acres now in conservation use if necessary in "the critical race between food and population."

A third major change in the President's program is a shift from acceptance of local currency in foreign countries to a dollar credit sale. This will be an orderly transition to be completed within 5 years, as the attempt will be to establish a pattern of loans comparable to present development loans. The thrust is to move out of local currency to the point where we will have a demand on the dollar resources of the countries involved. As a practical matter, most countries receiving aid would not be able to meet dollar commitments readily, nor would they be forced to do so, but this change would give us a claim on dollars on a long-term basis.

Summed up briefly then, the President's proposal will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program, eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid, emphasize the development of markets for American farm products, authorize greater food aid shipments over current rates, emphasize the building of cash markets and shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies, continue the financing of the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation, increase emphasis on combating malnutrition, continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs, and provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

Hearings have already begun in the House Agriculture Committee on the overall problem of world hunger. I am following the progress of these hearings closely, for I am deeply concerned with the problem of hunger in the world. While in India last year, I got a firsthand look at the suffering and misery that most Americans cannot possibly understand still grips much of the world. I am in total accord with the President when he says:

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

I believe this to be a task worthy of Americans. It calls upon us to give the best of ourselves, to stretch forth the hand of brotherhood to all who are in need. I am convinced that we cannot remain apathetic to the accelerating seriousness of the problem of world

the president of one of the oldest and, by reason of his association with it, one of the leading hospitals of our country.

Blessed with the insight of leadership, he chose wisely in his selection of people of similar purpose, energy, and concern for others. He brought Rhode Island Hospital to the forefront of excellence in its avowed functions of quality patient care, education, and research to benefit the people of the Providence Plantations and the entire State.

He developed new concepts of care for an institution that has provided a century of service to the sick and injured. He and Rhode Island Hospital together have been in the vanguard of progress for meeting the health needs of our State.

Before Congress passed legislation to help stimulate local financing of facilities for student nurses, Rhode Island Hospital—recognizing the need to attract more qualified young women to this important profession—constructed a nursing arts building and a senior student nurses dormitory, appropriately named the Gerry House.

Before Congress undertook to support Mr. Johnson's present master plan for advancing the Nation's health, Rhode Island Hospital faced the problem of its responsibility to the people of Rhode Island and is at this moment in process of developing plans for a large, 12-story building solely dedicated to the care of the ambulatory patient. This ambulatory patient center will meet the increasing need for health care at the most economical levels of construction expense and cost to the patient.

Such are two examples of long-range planning which only the most progressive of our country's medical centers are providing. By reason of leadership such as Mr. Gerry's, such hospitals demonstrate an understanding of Mr. Johnson's theme, which he expressed recently in these words:

It is imperative that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for the fulfillment of all our aspirations.

Louis Cardell Gerry, in an annual report to his hospital's corporation a few years ago, voiced a similar concern:

We have indeed come far. What a comfort it would be to be able to stop climbing, seat ourselves comfortably and view our accomplishments. Such, however, is not desirable; it is not even possible. We have come far, it is true, and although it sounds paradoxical we have even farther to go than ever. As we progress in one area, several more areas are opened up. We are, in the truest sense of the word, in an expanding universe.

MCNAMARA'S CONTRADICTIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I imagine, I am receiving an increasing number of letters from the district I represent concerning the war in Vietnam.

I am well aware that this is a theater of operations 8,000 miles from our shores

in an area of the world where newly created nations abound and this, to some degree, contributes to the confusion that exists over the entire aspect of the war there.

But an even greater contribution to the confusion and, in my opinion, the single most significant factor causing the controversy over our policy and actions there, is the record of contradictory statements for which Secretary McNamara is responsible.

I believe as well that, because we have withheld the truth from the people and camouflaged what the situation was in Vietnam a year ago, that we cannot now show the people how much better the situation is today. To do so would prove beyond question that we did not tell the truth a year ago.

I am a great believer, Mr. Speaker, in "the record," that chronicle of events made famous by Al Smith when he first said, "Let's look at the record."

It is quite fashionable these days for officials of the Government to make one statement one day and then deny it the following day or else say something quite different and hope that no one will remember what they said the first time. This is a dangerous and deplorable habit; particularly deplorable when it is practiced by the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary McNamara's statements on the war in Vietnam make a fascinating collection of confusion and contradiction which would be amusing if the subject matter were not so grave. I think it will serve an enlightening purpose if all his statements are put together in one place in the Record so future historians can study it.

Let us begin with a statement he made on March 22, 1962. At that time, returning from a conference in the Pacific, McNamara told newsmen that South Vietnam had taken the offensive.

Less than 2 months later, while in Saigon, McNamara told newsmen "there is no plan for introducing American combat troops in South Vietnam." This was on May 9, 1962.

Two days later, on May 11, 1962, McNamara said he was "tremendously encouraged."

A White House policy statement dated October 2, 1963, contains this statement:

Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965.

Secretary McNamara, in Honolulu on November 20, 1963, announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before the end of that year, 1963. The following month, Secretary McNamara changed his mind. He said in Saigon on December 21, 1963, that we would not go ahead with troop withdrawal plans.

Another month went by before the Secretary delivered another pronouncement that should be made a part of the Record. After the fall of Diem, in which he, himself, undoubtedly had a part, McNamara said:

The new government * * * has considerably more support than its predecessor, and the military revolutionary committee is beginning to take action to intensify military

operations and to improve civil administration.

Everything was coming up roses according to the Secretary when he testified here on the Hill a month later, on January 27, 1964. At that time he said that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam should be withdrawn before 1965 was over. He said he did not believe the United States "should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam."

The Secretary continued to see the situation there through rose-colored glasses 2 months later. Back from his fourth trip to Saigon, he reported that the Khanh regime had "produced a sound central plan for the prosecution of the war" and that the situation "can be significantly improved in the coming months."

Nine days later, the Secretary's opinion had taken a turn of 180 degrees. On March 26, 1964, he said:

The situation in South Vietnam has unquestionably worsened, at least since last fall.

He said also that the situation was "not hopeless, but not particularly optimistic."

Three days later, however, things took another turn for the better. On March 29, 1964, McNamara said:

The training personnel we have assigned there will come back as their training mission is completed. Perhaps some can return this year; some next.

The truth of the matter came from his own statement a month later when, on April 24, 1964, he told newsmen that U.S. strength in the Vietnam area was on the rise. He said:

I don't want to predict what the totals will be at the end of this year or at the end of 1965.

On that same day, the Secretary came up with a real prize in this statement:

I don't object to its being called McNamara's war. I think it is a very important war and I am pleased to be identified with it.

Back in Saigon for another look-see, the Secretary was very pleased with what he saw. He said:

Excellent progress. The plans we laid out in March, if they are consistently followed up, will work effectively.

This was on May 13, 1964. Back in Washington the next day, May 14, 1964, he said that "certain additional U.S. personnel will be needed in Vietnam." Let us mercifully draw the curtains to denote the passage of 24 hours.

On May 15, testifying again here on the Hill, the Secretary was reported to have been "gloomy" and to have said that the anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

Oh, "what a difference a day makes," as the songwriter says.

On August 5, 1964, the Secretary reported U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam and reported "energizing" additional Army, Marine, Air Force, and antisubmarine units.

If there is one point in this recount of a thoroughly shoddy situation when it can be said that the custard pie had hit the fan, it was on November 26, 1964,

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3611

ulation of the United States, particularly the aged and the aging, in protecting, maintaining, and improving their health."

Mr. Speaker, from this premise we propose for the first time to provide Federal assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease; to provide assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers; and to provide assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation.

I do not propose to read this bill aloud to you here, but its purpose is to encourage and assist, through grants, in the planning, establishment, and operation of regional health and community protection centers, each of which will provide health appraisal and disease detection services, on a periodic basis, to any adult who requests such services, if he has attained age 50 and resides within the geographic area served by the centers.

These health protection centers would provide a series of basic tests for the detection of abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastro-intestinal, genito-urinary, and musculo-skeletal systems as well as defects in metabolism and organs of special sense.

Specific diseases or conditions to be tested might include hypertension, various forms of cancer, rheumatoid arthritis, respiratory insufficiency, diabetes, kidney disease, obesity, and hearing and vision impairment.

The tests would be administered by technicians, nurses, and medical specialists using automated or semiautomated equipment which has already been proven to give swift, accurate, and reliable results. The results of these tests, along with data provided by the person undergoing the health appraisal, would be fed into a computer. It is estimated that the battery of tests could be administered within 2½ hours.

The results of the tests, summarized by the computer, would be referred to the private physician of the person taking them. In cases where the persons either did not have a private physician or was medically indigent, the tests would be referred to a physician in accordance with local practice.

The adult health protection centers are intended to provide an efficient means for the detection of abnormalities or indications of disease—but not to replace full examinations. Their purpose is to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic data and to place promptly under a physician's care a person with indications of disease conditions.

The health protection centers would conduct training programs in the operation of technical disease detection procedures and would research and develop new disease detection tests and equipment. Additional grants to the centers would be authorized for operational research and for the establishment of internships to give on-the-job training to physicians, nurses, and technical personnel. The centers would also conduct

community education programs on preventive health care.

Finally, a 12-man Advisory Council on Adult Health Protection would be established to advise the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in the administration of this program. This Council will include men who are leaders in the fields of medicine, public health, public welfare, or representatives of national organizations concerned with the interests of the aging. And it shall include one or more national leaders known for their dedication to the national interest and the welfare of the Nation's citizens.

The basic idea behind the act, put simply, is this: to launch a genuine, nationwide preventive medicine campaign. By making these testing services available to any person age 50 or above, on a voluntary basis, we will encourage men and women approaching retirement to take regular health examinations and we will facilitate the giving of full examinations by practicing physicians.

Mr. Speaker, the long-range answer to the health problems of the aging is in early identification and control of disease and prevention of illness and disability.

Now, ideally, we would achieve this goal by having periodic health examinations for everyone. Realistically, of course, we know that there are not enough physicians to accomplish a program of this scale.

Fortunately, a way has been found out of this dilemma.

What we are proposing in this act is to take the proven automated testing techniques from an unusual project in California—called Kaiser Permanente—and adapt them for demonstration on a communitywide basis in other areas of the country.

Assisted by a grant from the Division of Chronic Diseases, Public Health Service, the Kaiser Foundation health plan in Oakland has developed a multitest laboratory that is immensely accurate and remarkably economical.

Some 40,000 Kaiser-Permanente health plan beneficiaries are participating in this pilot health program. Their experience will now become the basis for this first nationwide preventive medicine effort, so far as the chronic diseases are concerned—just as, once upon a time, a preventive medicine effort had to be launched against the infectious diseases.

May this new effort be as successful as that campaign proved to be.

Once again I want to repeat what I said at Cranston last fall.

I know well that, hearing this proposal, many voices will cry out—cry out as they did against medicare, and as they did against the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program, and as they cried out against most of the other far-sighted public health bills passed by the 89th Congress.

But I say to them, as I said in this House last year, when asked where "this kind of business" will end: that I, for one, intend to keep going and going until we take adequate care of as many people as we possibly can who so badly need better health services, no matter how long it takes.

I promised, in my "Living Care" speech, to introduce legislation to help the elderly. This bill I introduce today is the first piece of such legislation I intend to introduce in this 2d session of the 89th Congress. It is a vital piece of legislation, for only by preventive care can we hope to reduce the staggering load of suffering borne by the elderly in our midst.

As most of you know, I have concerned myself with the problems of the aged for the past decade. In 1956 I supported the President in establishing a Federal Council on Aging, and in 1959 I introduced legislation calling for the White House Conference on Aging that was held in 1961.

In 1963 I introduced the Older Americans Act which finally passed in 1965. I am happy to say that the Aging Administration that it created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now a going concern.

I am proud of this record and of these successes. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that I believe that the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966 will be the most important single piece of legislation concerning the aging and the aged that I have ever introduced into this House.

LOUIS CARDELL GERRY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 the House of Representatives lost a constituent, a taxpayer, a business leader, a Republican, a gentleman, a friend of the people and, I am both proud and personally grieved to say, a fellow Rhode Islander and a friend.

Mr. Louis Cardell Gerry, of Providence, R.I., died on February 5 at the age of 81 after a career as business executive and financier, after nearly two decades as president of Rhode Island Hospital, after a lifetime of service to his fellow man.

He was a director of a score of corporations, a trustee of Brown University, a former chairman of the Providence chapter of the American Red Cross, a 33d degree Mason, a recipient of the first Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce annual Roger Williams Award for outstanding service to the community.

Over a long period of time he was associated with the Rhode Island Community Chests. He served the State without compensation as racing and athletics administrator under the former Gov. William H. Vanderbilt, during which time he was the author of a modernized set of racing rules for the State. During World War II he served with the United War Fund, was vice chairman of the Rhode Island Salvage Commission, a member of the committee of Veterans' Information Center, and both during the war and afterward was a member of the First Army Advisory Committee.

The man of whom I speak did not hold public office, though he was a devoted public servant; a private citizen who exemplified enlightened and perceptive support of sound legislation; a friend of Governors and Members of Congress. Particularly, to me, he was a source of inspiration in his chosen avocation as

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3613

when Secretary McNamara told newsmen they should not interview General Taylor because in his words:

It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression the situation is going to hell.

Bear with me, Mr. Speaker. I know that this recounting stretches the credibility to the snapping point, but there are three more "pronouncements" I would like to include.

On February 18, 1965, buoyed up by heaven knows what, the Secretary of Defense said:

The past year has also brought some encouraging developments.

Visiting in Saigon for the sixth time, the Secretary assayed the situation and delivered himself of this:

We are no longer losing. It will be a long war.

One more quotation, Mr. Speaker, and I will rest my case. In December of 1965, Mr. McNamara said, when he returned from his seventh trip, that he was "surprised" at the intensity of the war.

I wish I could, like Shakespeare, leave him to heaven, but I cannot. This man, this computerized genius, is at the helm of our ship of war and this dreary record of his faltering, misunderstanding of the situation and the foe we face in Vietnam is a cause for alarm.

If the Secretary had had confidence in the American people and had told them the truth about the situation in Vietnam each time I have recorded his statements, there would not now be the division, the controversy, and the confusion which exists in the minds of many.

I hope this recording serves a useful purpose in setting his record straight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows, to:

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for February 24 and 25, on account of official business.

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), on account of death of close friend.

Mr. DYAL, for Thursday, Friday, and Monday; February 24, 25, and 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 1 hour, on February 28; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, today, on two different subjects; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) to extend his remarks during the debate on H.R. 12752 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. LAIRD in two instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. SPRINGER in two instances.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. MOORE in two instances.

Mr. BROCK in three instances.

Mr. KING of New York in five instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in three instances.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. MATHIAS in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOELLER.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. MOSS in six instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in three instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in four instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in four instances.

Mr. GILLIGAN in two instances.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. CAREY in two instances.

Mr. VIVIAN.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. RACE.

Mr. IRWIN in six instances.

Mr. POWELL in six instances.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. COOLEY in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

DEATH OF REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] is recognized.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was with a great deal of sadness that I am called upon today to announce to you the sudden death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Braskamp was born in Alton, Iowa, a small farm community in my district of northwest Iowa.

Since coming to the Congress last year, I was most pleased and proud to have had a series of opportunities to reminisce with our Chaplain about the heritage we both shared. Through this association, I developed a strong sense of respect and admiration for Reverend Braskamp. He typified the personal elements so necessary to the stature of the honored position he held for 16 years. It is significant to recall that the position of Chaplain of the House of Representatives assures us that our daily deliberations begin with thoughts of our Creator—and the burden of such a responsibility was fully carried by the man whose memory we honor today. The toll of time which placed him among my elders never suffered him to be anything but enthusiastically concerned with his duty to God and this honored body.

My predecessor, the Honorable Charles B. Hoeven, resides in the same community of the birthplace of Reverend Braskamp. There was a great friendship and affection between these gentlemen, and it has been a source of real pride over these many years to the citizens of Alton to have a native-born son serve in as high a position as Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I join with all of the Members of the House of Representatives extending to the immediate family our deepest sympathies.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply grieved by the loss of our beloved Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp. Only a few days ago he walked with us and among us in this chamber, and tonight he walks with angels.

This man of God, this noble character, has been our spiritual adviser and mentor for 16 years.

His was the voice of the servant of the Lord, adjourning us to maintain the added dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers often reflected the mood and tempo of the House—its crises, its defeats, its victories. In every case he reminded us that these things shall all pass away, but the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever. His messages were essentially messages of hope—as it the Christian philosophy itself.

Therefore, while we sorrow at his passing, we are comforted by the knowledge that our friend and spiritual shepherd, has gone to the just reward that surely awaits him.

This distinguished churchman served his Presbyterian congregation for 40 years and was the dean of Presbyterian ministers in Washington, D.C. He was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, comprising Presbyterian Churches in Washington, Baltimore, and New Castle, Del. His outstanding leadership in sending church aid to the people of Holland during the war caused Queen Wilhelmina to knight him in the Order of Orange Nassau.

Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of service in the House were the capstone of a long and effective career. His interest in politics and government dated back to the days when he enrolled at Princeton specifically to have the opportunity to hear the lectures of its then President, Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Braskamp was originally an Iowan and earlier had attended Grinnell College.

As the House knows, Reverend Braskamp was a learned theologian and philosopher, notwithstanding his love of baseball and his boyhood desire to become a major league player. His scholarship did not prevent his enjoying simple, human things. His humanity was the quality which made him our friend and confidante, as well as our official pastor. We shall greatly miss him; we can never repay our debt to him.

Mrs. Albert and I extend his children and all his loved ones our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, all of us in this Chamber have lost a good friend and wise counselor. We have served during his chaplaincy have been strengthened spiritually and religiously by his daily prayer and by the messages which he gave at the opening of each session.

I was particularly fortunate to become well acquainted with him. We were both graduates of the University of Michigan, and would reminisce on many, many occasions about Ann Arbor and our attendance at the university.

Although Dr. Braskamp was a man of God, he was an individual who had a broad interest in all facets of life and a deep appreciation for all people. His daily prayers while we were in session reflected this interest in and concern for his fellow men.

I can speak for those of us on this side and say without hesitation or qualification that this Chamber and its Members were better, each and every day, because we had as the Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. We will miss him, and we all extend to his family our very deepest condolences. Dr. Braskamp has left an indelible impression on the House of Representatives.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to concur in the beautiful expres-

sions made here this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, by the distinguished majority leader, and by the distinguished minority leader in the tributes they have paid to our late Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp. It was my privilege to have been closely associated with Dr. Braskamp. I saw him almost every day. His office was very close to mine.

Invariably he was a man of good cheer and good spirit, optimistic by nature. He loved his fellowmen. He loved this House of Representatives. He loved our country, and he loved his church and his God. As those who have spoken previously to me have said, all of us in this body are better off because of his years of service here.

He lived a beautiful life. He was saddened with the passing of his wife a few years ago. We used to talk about that. But he was a man of great courage and great faith.

Mr. Speaker, the House has lost a dear friend in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, our Chaplain for more than 15 years. A kind and gentle man was Dr. Braskamp, and we in this House are finer men—we are of stronger faith—because he dwelt among us for so many years.

When I think of Dr. Braskamp, I think of those words which he lived by, from the Book of Joshua, chapter I, verse 9, when the Lord said to 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.

I think that describes the beautiful, inspiring mind of the man who served us so well and so faithfully for so many years.

Dr. Braskamp was born to humble beginnings, but through his own inspiration, intelligence, and hard work, he earned his first degree from the University of Michigan, while working at odd jobs on the campus. His academic record was so superior that he was awarded a scholarship to the Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut. From there, he transferred to the Princeton Theological Seminary where he earned both a bachelor's degree in theology and a master's degree in philosophy. He came to us, Mr. Speaker, as acting chaplain for 3 years, and then in 1950, he was elected Chaplain.

A man of wisdom, of kindness and of noble spirit was the Reverend Braskamp, and we shall all miss him. Mr. Speaker, it is the spirit a man leaves behind for which he is most remembered, and Dr. Braskamp was a noble servant of our Lord, who gave of himself unselfishly for his fellow man. His soul now lies with God, where he will receive eternal love. We thank our Lord that Dr. Braskamp ministered to us for so many years.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this House has suffered a deep loss in the death of its Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. He brought into

this Chamber daily a quiet radiance of certainty: that life is continuous; that what we do here is part and parcel of the long trek man is making out of unconscious perfection to perfected consciousness. To him the ancients expressed his deep belief that "never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never, end and beginning are dreams—birthless and changeless and deathless remains the spirit forever, dead though the house of it seems."

He exhorted us daily to be true to the best that is in us—true to the principle of integrity, honor, and loyalty upon which this great country that he loved so deeply was founded.

I am sure all who knew him rejoice that he has stepped across the threshold so quietly, so gently—may the Infinite bless and keep him now and always.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the very distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp has come as a painful shock to the membership of the House of Representatives. In his 16 years of ministering to the spiritual needs of the Members, of opening our daily sessions with a simple, earnest prayer, and of friendly talk with individual Members and informal groups, Dr. Braskamp had gathered to himself a host of warm friends. Characteristically, his daily opening prayer, by which Dr. Braskamp's name became familiar to many whose needs or inclinations lead them to consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was brief, to the point, and marked by both a strong religious feeling and a logical commonsense. Since 1958, he had prefaced his prayer of each day with a Scripture text, an admirable custom which I hope his successors may keep up. His strongly held Presbyterianism was not allowed to narrow the scope of his ministry in the House of Representatives, and both his prayers and his Scripture selections were always made in such a way as to hearten and encourage each Member of the House, whatever his particular faith or denomination might be. Those of no creed, or of faiths widely differing from his own, were alike responsive to Dr. Braskamp's human and spiritual warmth, to his evident sincerity, and to his moral force.

Dr. Braskamp came to the House of Representatives as Chaplain after a career of 40 years' service to Presbyterian congregations in Washington, D.C. He had first come to Washington as a young man, in 1911, immediately after his graduation, with degrees both in theology and in philosophy, from Princeton Theological Seminary and Princeton's Graduate School of Philosophy. At first he was assistant pastor of the Church of the Covenant, which is now the National Presbyterian Church, and then was called to the pastorate of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church. He took the lead in the merging of the Gurley congregation with that of the Gunton-Temple Church, and in building the present

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3653

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and its 1965 amendments have given us new tools to help attack the pollution that fouls the air we breathe.

We have begun to counter air pollution by increasing the tempo of effort at all levels of government.

In less than 2 years Federal financial assistance has stimulated a 50-percent increase in the air pollution budgets of States and local governments. Federal standards for the control of automobile exhausts will apply to the 1968 models. The Federal interstate abatement program will significantly supplement State and local efforts to deal with air pollution.

I am heartened by the progress we are making. But I am mindful that we have only begun our work. I am forwarding to the Congress proposals to improve and increase Federal research, financing, and technical assistance to help States and local governments take the measures needed to control air pollution.

POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

The Federal Government is rightly expected to provide an example to the Nation in pollution control. We cannot make new demands on State and local governments or on private industry without putting the Federal house in order. We will take the necessary steps this year to insure that Federal activities do not contribute to the deterioration of our water and air.

Last November I signed an Executive order requiring that all new Federal installations include adequate water pollution control systems. Agencies are required to submit long-range plans to bring existing installations up to the high level of pollution control required of new facilities. These plans are to be submitted by July 1 of this year. We are providing the funds necessary to implement them.

I also intend to issue an Executive order dealing with air pollution from Federal activities. The potential dangers of air pollution have only recently been realized. The technical and economic difficulties in conserving the purity of our air are, if anything, greater than in protecting our water resources. Nevertheless, I intend to see that the necessary steps are taken to curtail emissions from Federal installations.

HUMAN RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

New projects and new technology are of little value without skilled people dedicated to putting them to effective use.

I propose to enlist the services of those in industry and the universities.

I propose to attract skilled administrators and scientists to the challenges of full-time occupations in pollution control.

Critical skills are in short supply in all public pollution control operations. We need to train scientists and social scientists in these activities, and to demonstrate the advantages of Government service as a lifetime occupation. I propose to establish traineeships, fellowships, and an internship program in Federal pollution control activities. The participants will be in residence in Fed-

eral pollution control programs throughout the country.

IMPACT ON OUR CITIES

The pollution control programs I have recommended will benefit all Americans.

But nowhere will the impact be greater than on our cities.

These steps can clean the air that is today blighted by smoke and chemicals.

These steps can bring to growing urban centers abundant supplies of pure water to sustain today's prosperity and to satisfy tomorrow's needs.

These steps can enrich the daily life of the city dweller and his children by restoring surrounding waterways to their unspoiled natural beauty. For we know that ugliness is degrading and costly, but that beauty can revive the human spirit and enlarge the imagination.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

In no area of resource management are the problems more complex—or more important—than those involving our Nation's water supplies. The water shortage in the Northeastern United States is a dramatic reminder that we must take every possible step to improve the management of our precious water resources.

I propose the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems—from methods to conserve and augment existing water supplies to the application of modern technology, such as desalting, to provide more usable water for our cities, our industries, and our farms.

This Commission will be composed of the very best minds in the country. It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry.

SAVING OUR FORESTS

Since the century's beginning the National Government has labored to preserve the sublime legacy that is the American forest.

Time after time public intervention has prevented the destruction of irreplaceable forest lands.

Our national park and forest systems are America's principal trustee in the vital task of conservation. That task cannot be accomplished in a single stroke. It requires patient determination and careful planning to secure for our people the beauty that is justly theirs. It merits careful planning.

I propose that we plan now to complete our national park system by 1972—the 100th anniversary of Yellowstone, the world's first national park.

Substantial progress has been made during the last 4 years. Yet many scenic masterpieces remain unprotected and deserve early inclusion in the national park system.

A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

I propose the creation of a Redwood National Park in northern California.

It is possible to reclaim a river like the Potomac from the carelessness of man.

But we cannot restore—once it is lost—the majesty of a forest whose trees soared upward 2,000 years ago. The Secretary of the Interior—after exhaustive consultations with preservationists, officials of the State of California, lumbermen, and others—has completed a study of the desirability of establishing a park of international significance.

I have reviewed his recommendations, and am submitting to the Congress legislation to establish such a park. This will be costly. But it is my recommendation that we move swiftly to save an area of immense significance before it is too late.

OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION PROPOSALS

Other major outdoor recreation proposals which should be approved in 1966 are:

1. Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.
2. Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.
3. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.
4. Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.
5. Great Basin National Park, Nev.
6. Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.
7. Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.
8. Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

For a region which now has no national park, I recommend the study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area along New England's largest river, in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

I propose the early completion of studies and planning for two new parks—the Apostle Isles Seashore along Lake Superior and North Cascades in Washington State.

NATIONWIDE TRAIL SYSTEM

In my budget, I recommended legislation to extend Federal support to the Appalachian Trail, and to encourage the development of hiking trails accessible to the people throughout the country.

I am submitting legislation to foster the development by Federal, State, and local agencies of a nationwide system of trails and give special emphasis to the location of trails near metropolitan areas.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

WILD RIVER SYSTEM

I am encouraged by the response to my proposal for a national wild rivers system, and I urge the Congress to complete this pioneering conservation legislation this year.

COSTS OF LAND ACQUISITION

The spiraling cost of land acquisitions by the Federal Government, particularly for water resource and recreational purposes, is a matter of increasing concern.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3655

Mr. MORSE. I wish to comment on two points the Senator has made.

First of all, I wish the Senator to know that I agree with him on the desirability of a vote this week. I want him to know also that I shall not agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on it, because I believe that if we hold sessions for a reasonable number of hours each day, we will get a vote on it this week.

Some of us are busily engaged in preparing what we consider to be a very basic statement of policy on the part of those of us who disagree with the escalated war policy which we think is inherent in the pending bill. As far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I would join in any objection to a filibuster on this bill. But I have not heard anyone talking about a debate that could possibly be characterized as a filibuster.

However, some of us have an honest, sincere belief that the pending measure raises such vital questions of policy in the field of American foreign relations that we feel we should not vote on it until certain statements on that policy have been made. We think each Senator should have the right of discussing the pending measure on its merits without any time limitation being imposed upon him.

I would be the most surprised man in the Senate if we did not reach a vote on the bill before the week is over. I think we should vote on it before the week is over; but only after the regular course of debate has taken place.

As to the comment the Senator from Louisiana has made that he thinks the point of view of some of us may be aiding and abetting the enemy, that, of course, he is privileged to discuss, and we shall reply.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say that as far as I am concerned, my position is well known.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My position is well known, and I am proud to speak for a State that is united almost to a man behind our national policy. While I have received some criticism, I have received a great amount of applause as well from such States as New York and California.

Mr. President, as far as Louisiana is concerned, my mail runs 99-plus percent in favor of the position I take, that we should give those men in Vietnam all the help they need, and that, having committed ourselves, we should not renege on those commitments. I say further, Mr. President, that in Louisiana—and I was there last weekend—and also in Arkansas and Texas I have yet to find a single person who expresses any disagreement with the firmness that this Nation proposes to show in resisting aggression in southeast Asia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished acting ma-

jority leader. I have prepared a short statement, which I may as well present to the Senate at this time.

Yesterday, we observed the birth anniversary of George Washington. He was our first Commander in Chief. He was made general and Commander in Chief of the united Colonies on June 15, 1775.

In that capacity, he had his problems with the Continental Congress in securing supplies, weapons, pay, and other necessities for his army.

Those experiences were a factor in making the President the Commander in Chief when the Constitution was written.

Now, 191 years later, a similar problem confronts us.

The Commander in Chief, based on estimates which have been prepared and supported by our field commanders in Vietnam, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the Budget Bureau has presented a request for \$4.8 billion for aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other items.

The request has been carefully processed by the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. They heard 11 witnesses. From 16 to 24 Senators were present at all of those hearings.

The bill which the committee reported is not a policy measure. It is a bill to authorize funds for needed equipment and research.

After it was reported to the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on another measure. It triggered a broad discussion of our policy in and toward Vietnam.

In and out of committee, on and off the Senate floor, a diversity of views and viewpoints have been freely expressed—to withdraw, to pause longer, to escalate, to de-escalate, to limit the struggle.

And all this time, the request for weapons and equipment languishes. Virtually no speeches have been directed to the measure before us.

There have been allegations and fulminations that "we are spread dangerously thin" and that "shortages appear" but the request of the Commander in Chief for authority and funds to procure weapons and supplies reposes in the Senate without action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Until this authorization is approved, no money can be appropriated. If the Commander in Chief because of urgent necessity should obligate funds without this authority, the Congress would be the first to castigate him.

The time for more talk on this pending measure is past. The time for action is here and now.

The well-being of more than 200,000 American troops, 12,000 miles from home, is involved.

The continued and successful prosecution of the present struggle is at stake. To delay further action on the pending

request means that Congress must accept responsibility for failure to act.

It has been said that in the 10-year struggle of the French with the Vietnam, that the war was lost not at Dienbienphu but in Paris. I trust it may never be recorded that if we fail in our objectives, that the failure occurred not at Danang, or in the highlands of Vietnam, but in Washington.

To seek cloture on a measure involving our national security, our pledges to Vietnam, and our obligations under the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization would be absolutely incredible. The impact of such action on troop morale could scarcely be measured. Its impact on world reaction could scarcely be evaluated.

The time has come to close the debate and act. I believe I speak for the vast majority of the Republican minority when I say we are ready to act now and approve the request which is before us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois read the statement which he read a few minutes ago with regard to the situation which confronts the Senate in regard to the pending business. Many of us do not agree with the conclusion he has reached that there is no basic policy question involved in the pending bill. That is where we find an honest difference of opinion among Senators, because some of us think the pending bill does involve a basic policy question. It involves the foreign policy vis-a-vis the United States and Asia. That is the policy issue involved in the pending bill. I say it should be discussed in some detail in the discussion of the bill.

I simply wanted to file this caveat of disagreement with what the Senator from Illinois had to say, to at least show the public that there is a difference of opinion with regard to the policy and that it is involved in the pending bill.

In view of even what the Secretary of Defense has said, I will show in remarks on the floor that we are drawing close to a potential escalation of the war which will result in the killing of thousands of American boys whose lives should not be sacrificed. The bill involves the decision of the President of the United States to escalate the war. We think it involves a policy question and we think we ought to discuss that policy question in this authorization bill.

I do not question the sincerity of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who have already said they do not see a policy question involved. It comes to a question of a time limit. I have already announced, and I now announce, that if we devote ourselves to a discussion of the bill on the floor, and if we do nothing but discuss the bill, we will get to a vote by the end of the week.

The Senator from Illinois calls the attention of the public to the allegation that any prolonged discussion of the bill somehow, in some way, is letting down the boys in this area. We do not accept that. We think, because of the policy issue involved, this issue should be deter-

mined in order to seek to protect the boys in southeast Asia, because some of us believe that if we follow the policy which can be followed under the bill we are going to sacrifice unjustifiably many boys who ought to be saved. That involves a policy question.

So far as the time element is concerned, there is already delivered material of war to the boys in southeast Asia that cannot even get unloaded and we cannot get the ships in now.

I have not heard a scintilla of evidence that there is being denied to our boys over there anything in the way they need for the conduct of the war on its present scale. If that were the case, we would be unanimous in wanting to take whatever steps were necessary to see that they will get whatever materiel, to the maximum extent necessary, for their protection.

I do not think there is any basis for creating the fear in this country that a discussion of basic foreign policy in the Senate for a week is going to jeopardize our boys in that area. If that were the case, we would wonder why those boys had not been given that protection long before this.

My judgment is that if we discuss this bill, with our differences of opinion, and have a full discussion, we will get to a vote on it by the end of the week. My friend, the Senator from Illinois, said he thought cloture would be a mistake because of the effect it would have not only on our American boys overseas, but on others as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYNINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. He is quite right when he says that we ought to get to the issues in the pending bill and vote on it. I believe we ought to do it. I believe we can do it if we discuss this bill fully. I think we could get to a vote by the end of the week.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I want to commend the Senator when he says that after reasonable debate we should be able to vote sometime this week. His attitude is encouraging.

Second, he said he has no evidence that our boys over there are in actual need. Fortunately, they are getting material there for their needs, but if there is much more of a delay, there is going to be a critical need for some items.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, I do not think we should continue the present policy. There is a great difference between the question of supplying our boys and the question of whether we should continue the present policy. It is the policy we are discussing. As I am going to urge in my remarks, if we continue this policy, we are headed for an escalated war that will end up in a war with China.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for this

discussion be extended 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think there is division of opinion on supplying what the boys need, as the Senator from Oregon has said, but there is a need for debate on the President's policy. Therefore, when I make my address, I shall discuss the policy. I think the debate on the question of policy is good for the country.

I hope that we do see it through. There is nothing to stop the Senate from having night sessions.

I have a speech to make. It will not take more than 35 or 40 minutes. I understand that others wish to speak also. Let us give everybody an opportunity to speak and still vote on Friday.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the senior Senator from New York that this is the issue before us.

I believe there is a policy issue here as to whether or not there is going to be a reassessment of the position of August 1964. I believe that a vote on this measure does exactly that.

That is why I am going to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the resolution of August 1964.

Do not forget that it provides a rescission clause. I believe the time has come to place restrictions on the President and not give him *carte blanche* authority that the resolution of 1964 gave him.

I refuse to believe there have only been two of us who would have voted against it in August 1964. There are other Senators who believe as Senator GRUENING and I believe and continue to believe.

At that time we had 20,000 soldiers there. There are 200,000 men there now. The figure could go to 400,000, 600,000, or 800,000. If we get into a war with China, it may go to 3 million in 36 months after the war breaks out.

I think the time has come to place a restriction on the Commander in Chief and not give him *carte blanche* authority. I am going to offer that as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to finish this and then yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYNINGS in the chair). The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the President got a power of attorney limited by the situation which we have there, notwithstanding his words. I believe this vote approves his policy to the date covered by the appropriation, which covers 400,000 personnel.

Therefore, I and others will reserve the right to vote against the appropriation if the President is unwise enough in persisting in not joining with us in connection with the resolution of August 1964.

I agree with the Senator that there is a replacement clause. I shall vote no,

but I reserve the right to vote yes tomorrow if the President persists in not joining us in this decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New York, the former attorney general of his State whose legal advice I follow frequently—but not on this occasion—a power of attorney can be given, but one can subsequently fire the attorney.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise in the Chamber at the end of this discussion.

In answer to a direct question as to whether or not this money was needed promptly and whether this bill should be passed promptly to help our military effort in Vietnam, the director of the AID program, Mr. Bell, said, in his opinion, it should be passed, the sooner the better.

Inasmuch as this is a supplement to the 1966 appropriation, and in the interests of the men who are now fighting on the front in South Vietnam, I hope the Senate will pass this bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, quite briefly on this subject, and as one who handled the appropriation bill last year, and urged that more money be put in at the time for the war in Vietnam, I can state as a fact, knowing the background of these needs, that this money is needed now; that the critical date is fast approaching when failure of it will cause actual delay in providing the hardware of fighting a war, including helicopters, 2.75 rockets, and items of that kind.

There is no question about the critical timing, and it is necessary to pass this bill as soon as we can.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for his willingness to dispose of it with dispatch this week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the presence of the acting majority leader and the Democratic whip—and I have postponed making this request until he was in the Chamber—I ask unanimous consent that certain communications, editorials, and newspaper stories dealing with my position in regard to the war in Asia be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hope that it will not be necessary to object—I note that the Senator has, from time to time, placed in the RECORD in support of his position great numbers of communications. I understand that in some instances it has taken up as much as 40 pages of fine print in the RECORD.

Mr. President, let me say, as a Senator from Louisiana, that I would imagine the majority of those communications—perhaps all of them—support the position of the Senator from Oregon, a position which is contrary to the one this Nation is taking today on the subject of the war in Vietnam.

I do not wish the RECORD to give the impression that the people of this Nation are not behind their President, are not behind their Government, or that they are not in support of our young men fighting in Vietnam.

I, for example, have many thousands of communications and letters supporting the position of President, the posi-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3657

tion of the Government, and the position I have taken in regard to this matter.

I do not object to the Senator's placing certain selective matter in the RECORD which supports his position. I would hope that the Senator is not seeking to place in the RECORD all correspondence in support of his position, because it would seem to me it would only be fair for those of us who take the opposite position in the matter to place an equal amount of correspondence in the RECORD. The question would then become to what extent should we burden the RECORD with more of the same.

In other words, there is no doubt in my mind that some of the letters I receive—and some of these letters come from the State of Oregon, and other States—that there are people who support his position. There is also no doubt whatever that many people do not. Likewise, in the State of Louisiana, let me say that the mail I receive is very nearly unanimous. As of this date, it might very well be unanimous in support of my position. I would hope that we could work out some rules of procedure by which we would be able to give both sides an equal opportunity to load the RECORD with correspondence in support of both positions.

Let me ask the Senator from Oregon whether this is all the mail he receives, or only certain selected samples which he believes most adequately support his position?

Mr. MORSE. I will be glad to tell the Senator, if he will allow me to respond.

Mr. President, since last Friday, my office tells me that we have received over 15,000 pieces of mail. In fact, we have a group of volunteers over there today opening up the mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last count shows well over 90 percent in support of my position. The reason I have from time to time put communications, pro and con, in the RECORD, is as follows:

There are those who seek to give the impression that the Senator from Oregon is a lonely voice in the wilderness in this country in connection with his opposition to the war in South Vietnam. I am satisfied that there are millions of Americans who share my point of view, and they are going to be heard from in increasing numbers in the months ahead.

Mr. President, look at what those of us opposed to this war are up against. So far as the media of information in this country are concerned, the President has only to raise a little finger and he is on television for as long as he wishes to be. The top officials of the Government have only to let it be known that they wish to make a statement, and the statement is reproduced throughout the press of the country.

Now, Mr. President, it takes a great deal of immodesty—and I plead guilty; it takes a lot of nerve—and I plead guilty; in fact, some would say a lot of

brass to walk onto the floor of the Senate and ask unanimous consent to have these communications placed in the RECORD. But, I owe a great deal to those citizens who have sent them to me.

Mr. President, there are forces in this country who feel they are not being heard, that they are not being given an opportunity to present their points of view. I am even having difficulty in the Committee on Foreign Relations, thus far, getting certain witnesses that I believe should come forward in a public hearing to testify on the basic policy questions involved. For, whether we know it or not, we have come to a crossroads in American history. Mr. President, if you and I could come back to the world 35 or 50 years from today, we would then be reading about the historic debates of these days in the Senate. But none of us can even guess or prophesy in what direction this great Republic is going to go.

It is for each Senator, in my judgment, to exercise his own judgment as to how best to represent the people of his sovereign State. It happens to be my judgment that I owe it to the many people who have communicated with me—and I do not begin to place all their communications in the RECORD, but I wish my friend from Louisiana to know that I believe it is a fair sampling—that I want those who are protesting to have an opportunity, through this medium, to be heard throughout the country.

The Senator from Louisiana knows that there are a variety of parliamentary ways in which we can get the same material into the RECORD. I think, however, that in the interests of time we should insert this material in the RECORD, and let the Senator who inserts it assume the responsibility for inserting it. I want the Senator to know that I have been very careful, that I have given the strictest of instructions to my staff that no communication shall be placed in the RECORD which in any way would reflect on anyone or violate any of the rules of the Senate.

As part of this historic debate, there should be placed in the RECORD the material that I ask to be inserted. It is up to the Senator from Louisiana and every other Senator to decide what they wish or do not wish to insert in the RECORD. The Senator from Louisiana is within his parliamentary rights to object. But, Mr. President, if I cannot get these communications inserted, I shall get them into the RECORD by reading them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not propose to deny the Senator his right to put this information in the RECORD. I merely say that I have never known any time in the history of this great country, in my study of history, when American boys who are fighting in a battle in support of the Nation's position, both in terms of its solemn treaty commitments and an act of Congress authorizing that our troops be sent there, when a Senator has so much seized upon the opportunity—particularly to fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to seek to appear before the American people and urge that this Nation was going to lose in its courage, its determination to

see through an international commitment which it has made. I am not going to object to putting this matter in the RECORD. I merely say, that to the Senator from Louisiana, the impression would be given that these communications speak for a majority of the American people. They do not speak for 1 percent of the people of Louisiana. They do not speak for 1 percent of the people of Texas, to the best of my knowledge, and I doubt that they speak for a substantial percentage of the people of any State which touches the great State of Louisiana, which I have the honor to represent in the Senate.

It does seem fair to me that if there are going to be a great number of communications placed into the RECORD by any one Senator, every Senator should have the same opportunity, and I have some doubts as to the great burden that will be imposed on the printer.

If each of us has 15,000 letters, we might be asked why we did not print the rest of them when we put some of them into the RECORD.

I simply urge that we have some rule of fairplay as to what extent we are going to burden the RECORD.

I have many letters supporting this Government that I would like to put into the RECORD. I would like to have letters from Americans whom I regard as patriots put in the RECORD, because I suspect that many of those letters that are printed may not be exactly loyal Americans.

I know there are some heart-touching letters I have received from American citizens who realize this has been a great sacrifice to them. Many of them have paid a great price in the loss of loved ones and personal sacrifices, but nevertheless they support the commitment of the United States.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that those of us who oppose what we consider the great folly of preceding administrations, particularly this one, in involving ourselves militarily in Vietnam feel that we should not be sending our boys to fight and die in South Vietnam because the defense of South Vietnam is not essential to the defense of our Nation. Nothing that happens in Vietnam affects our national security. We invited ourselves in. We are fighting there for people who do not fight effectively for themselves. We have had very little support from our allies, with whom we have pleaded for it. The report of the hearings released by the Armed Services Committee on the pending authorization bill, makes it apparent that we are going it practically alone, except for a few token contributions that we have had to work hard to get and that came in late.

Those of us who oppose this participation in an Asian civil war do not yield to anyone in our patriotism. It is our desire to see that we do not embark on a course which cannot be successful, in achieving the ends we allege we seek, that is too costly in lives and treasure in

3658

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

an area which I do not think is worth the life of one American boy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are there because of a commitment we had in the protocol to the southeast Asia Defense Treaty, which permitted us to resist aggression in the very area of South Vietnam.

I rather resent the Senator's saying that the people of South Vietnam are not willing to fight for their country against the threat of communism. Let us understand this. There have been several governments there. Some of those governments were not as popular as some of us would like them to have been, but not one of them has been as unpopular as is communism.

More than 1 million people left North Vietnam with nothing more than they could carry with them, after having worked a lifetime to accumulate certain property and goods, in order to go to South Vietnam to try to escape communism, not knowing what kind of government they were going to have in South Vietnam.

When they did get there, they did all they could to uphold an anti-Communist government to try to save themselves from communism. Little mayors, little aldermen, little chiefs of communities have been slaughtered by the Communists. Nevertheless, they continue to oppose communism—50,000 people have been killed by the Communists because they did not want to live under communism and support communism; 45,000 men of the South Vietnamese Army have made the supreme sacrifice in fighting on the field of battle, not counting the hundreds of thousands of those who have been injured fighting for their country.

If one considers the sacrifice these people have made in fighting not to be under the Communists, as General Taylor has said, to compare the number to this country, we would have to multiply that number by 20. If we compared those sacrifices to the population of the United States, it would amount to 1,800,000 people in this country—mayors and other little town leaders, who would have had their heads chopped off. The South Vietnamese continue valiantly. There are 20 South Vietnamese units compared to 5 American units on the field of battle today. So those South Vietnamese are fighting bravely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We did not decide to send troops into South Vietnam until North Vietnam did. South Vietnam made it clear that its people did not want to be overwhelmed by aggression from the Communists. We saw that they were going to need help. So when the Government of North Vietnam marched its troops in there, we sent our troops in, in accordance with our treaty commitment. People should look long and hard at the fact that we are living up to our commitment.

South Vietnam is a nation which has paid much to stand up against communism, and yet we hear on the floor of the Senate that the people of South Vietnam are not fighting. The South Vietnamese have paid a greater price in relative terms than this country has ever paid in any war it has engaged in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that certain matters be printed in the RECORD?

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

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand in the Vietnam war. Americans should have more representation like yours.

MILTON LUBEN.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views make sense to us on Vietnam. Please continue.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT MISHELL.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In full support and appreciation for your courageous leadership on Vietnam issue.

ROBERT and MARGARET CASE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous stand regarding Vietnam. Your publicizing the issue urgently needed.

WALTER BODLANDER.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue open debate. No support for Vietnam war. Admire your courage.

Mrs. RUTH SCHWARTZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The 60 members of our Democratic Club and the great majority of mothers at our nursery school are solidly behind you. We are for cessation of bombing, recognition of NLF, no further escalation. We are absolutely against blank check appropriation for war. We think recent CDC resolution on Vietnam very significant of public feeling. Many middle-of-road Democrats locally go along with this position. Thank you and good luck.

Mrs. STEPHANIE FEDERAMN,
President, Los Felix Silverlake Democratic Club.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to do your utmost to stop the useless slaughter of Vietnamese and American men.

IRENE DAO.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for open hearings. We must oppose increased appropriation and insist on negotiations.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD L. POSNER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courage. Please continue.

MORTON KLEINMAN, M.D.

SAUSALITO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations.

GERTRUDE and ALEXANDER SAXTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I share Vietnam views on full disclosure, including Galbraith report.

JOHN H. GOODWORTH.

GREENVILLE, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep fighting in courage and patriotism. You and GROENING among the great of American history.

ELEANOR E. SAWYER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with you.

KAREN HUMPHREY.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Your courage and convictions are admirable, realistic, and humane. You, and the members of our Government who oppose further expenditures for the escalation of the Vietnam war are neither puppets nor politicians, you are true statesmen. There are thousand like me, who are backing you every inch of the way. Our democracy and our culture belong to us, as Americans. We cannot foist or project our way of life to satisfy the few who may profit from an empty victory, while sacrificing our boys, and children and little babies of both sides. Thank you for being concerned about the dignity of man.

Very sincerely,

JEAN W. KAUFMAN.

MOUNT DORA, FLA.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Now is the time for the free nations of the world to actively demonstrate their true desire for freedom. Now is the time for us to reevaluate the extent of unity we may anticipate from our foreign aid policies. Every nation of the free world should be represented with military aid in Vietnam. This is a struggle of the free world over communism and should be represented as such thus eliminating the United States as prin-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3659

cial protector. Nations receiving our foreign aid should discontinue shipments to nations jeopardizing the peace of the world. Our minority population will not enable us to stop communistic infiltrations and uprisings throughout the world as a sole trustee for peace. Now is the time for our people to support and commend Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE for their valiant convictions in our behalf as well as union leaders' recommendation curtailing shipments to North Vietnam.

ALFRED P. BERRY.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse your views on Vietnam and foreign policy, also your courage and loyalty.

Mr. and Mrs. H. W. McCLEARY.

MORRO BAY, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your stand opposing Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. DAN RICH.

DENVER, COLO.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your continued efforts for peace in Vietnam, especially recommendation for Vietcong participation.

PEACE WORKERS.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you for speaking up for all Americans.

LORRAINE and BURT WOMACK.

CRYSTAL LAKE, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate what you have done in informing citizens of this Republic what is going on in our Government. Our sincere gratitude. Keep up the good work.

GEORGE D. LYNCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone. There are many of us that support you. I spent 5 years in the Pacific, so therefore I support you entirely.

NORMAN B. PRINCE.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your courageous stand. You are so right.

Dr. and Mrs. DONALD S. SEARLE.

KINGS POINT, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous efforts on behalf of sanity are truly remarkable. God give you the strength to continue.

Mr. and Mrs. EISNER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were great at the Senate hearings. Keep up your efforts.

Sincerely,

LUCILLE BOSS.

RIVER FOREST, ILL.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good fight. Since we don't care to wage a sincere war, we should stop this faucet dripping blood. The draft should be replaced by an American system of well-paid and honored volunteers.

Mrs. PAUL HARVEY.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your views on our involvement in Vietnam and would wish that more Members of Congress had your understanding of the situation.

GEORGE and AGUSTA LIPPMANN.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your gifted effort to publicize the truth about Vietnam.

WILLIAM B. NALL and CHARLOTTE NALL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel that you represent the very best in American politics. We urge you to continue your courageous efforts to bring the truth to the American people.

Your longtime admirers,

PAT RYAN.
HELENE MROKOWSKI.
MARY LOU LANGAN.
JACK ZOBEL.
PETER ZOBEL.
JUDY SMALE.STOCKTON, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position on Vietnam and hope you escalate your efforts informing the public.

LEONARD and BARBARA FASS.

DETROIT, MICH., February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support KENNEDY's proposal. Negotiate with Vietcong. We applaud your efforts to stop Viet war.

Mrs. E. KALISH.

BUFFALO, N.Y., February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You and Senator FULBRIGHT are to be congratulated for your insight and patriotic work. Please accept my profound respect for your stand.

R. C. TRAVIS.

LAKEWOOD, N.J., February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand on Vietnam. Urge you to continue to fight for curtailment of U.S. involvement.

JEROME and BEATRICE SCHURGIN.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Finally your voice is being heard. Please continue your courageous efforts to bring about a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

DAVID HUNTER.

REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

No nation has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of any other nation with the whole world apprehensive of our conduct. Let us pray that the other side does not have another reckless man. Stand your ground, Senator.

FRANK MORRIS.

MASPETH, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on the Vietnam policies for a peaceful solution.

ROSARIO LAVEIDI.

LITTLE NECK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full support for your stand on Vietnam. Please continue to speak for those who are opposed to our involvement in Vietnam.

LESTER REHADS.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the Long Island committee to end the Vietnam war gratefully applaud now as always your forthright stand against American Vietnam policy. We feel there is sufficient ferment in Congress for many Senators to express their concern in a concrete way. Therefore, we hope your amendment, even though fully justified, will not be worded so strongly as to scare off the votes of FULBRIGHT, KENNEDY, CLARK, etc., in which case, Johnson would announce another mandate in his favor. We suggest wording which is palatable to enough Senators so that Johnson will have no victory in Congress.

Yours with deep respect,

DAVID BLUM.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly approve your Vietnam investigation. Wish you were my Senator.

JIM KINNEY.

MARINETTE, WIS.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you very much for your stand on the Vietnam question.

Sincerely,

Mrs. AUGUST HALLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to thank you because you told the truth. And I will not let my boy fight Vietnam. Let them fight their own war.

Mrs. DOROTHY LOVINGS.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

3660

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

War obsolete. We also, unless Vietnam war stopped. Fight against ignorance admirable. Keep pressure on.

DORIS W. and ERIC G. CHANNON.

LEVITTOWN, PA.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

C. EELMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Hooray for guts, decency, rationality. Up peace, down war for peoples of world. Hooray, MORSE.

BEATRICE FOGIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Am firm admirer your dignified approach in persuading people to goodness, reason, tolerance, debate.

GERALD PAUL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

Splendid work. Please continue to oppose war in Vietnam. All want peace.

MAINE M. SULLIGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Investigating Committee on Vietnam, Washington, D.C.:

Be assured that the great majority of Americans are behind you. True patriotism as you know is humanity, strength, and sanity.

SARAH BROWN.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly and warmly support your position that we have been misguided by the administration in the conduct of Vietnamese war. Please continue vital hearings until the balance of the Senate awakens to their duty as well.

I. H. POLLACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your position. This is a cruel and senseless war. Keep fighting.

Gratefully,

Mr. and Mrs. ALBERT AIZUSS.

CHEHALIS, WASH.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your concern to prevent escalation of Vietnam war. Extensive military personnel increase and North Vietnam bombing undoubtedly pressures China toward aggressive defensive action. Escalation will be disastrous.

Appreciatively,

W. CLYDE BEECHER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A copy of following telegram sent to President Johnson. Rusk's statement that we must teach Communists that they cannot win in Vietnam is reminiscent of nothing so much as the Nazis on the occasion of invading Poland. In the name of this country and a democratic foreign policy, stop it.

JAMES and KATHERINE GALLAGHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courage, honesty, and consistent effort to end the immoral and inhumane war in Vietnam gives us some hope. We agree a vote should be taken, but there must be insistence that our Congressmen truly represent the people's will for peace.

RUTH SEALIT and EVELYN HYMAN.

CRYSTAL LAKE, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate what you have done in informing citizens of this Republic what is going on in our Government. Our sincere gratitude. Keep up the good work.

E. G. HARRIS.

ALBANY, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your long fight to end American involvement in Vietnam. Don't get discouraged.

Mr. and Mrs. F. H. HUGHES.

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your position at hearings. Keep up the good work.

JAMES MCBRIDE,
JACK DASCHBACH.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam stand for American decency. Wish we could help more.

NATHAN ADLER.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve and support open letter on Vietnam New York Times of Sunday February 13, 1966.

ARTHUR H. VAUGHAN,
AUDREY J. VAUGHAN.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the Vietnam war. Your gentlemanly but firm debate with General Taylor was well stated. Hope the leaders of our country will heed your advice. Continued health and good luck to you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HYMAN KIRSNER
and Family.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations Senator MORSE. Our family is grateful to you. We fear the backward element of the South, the Birchers and the extreme right have taken over foreign policy of our country. We suggest the character of General Ky in all its monstrosity be given publicity. Best wishes and thanks.

The KANE FAMILY.

MANHASSET, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding Vietnam this is the first time you've been right and I approve.

P. DANIEL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on American policy in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson's return to the theory that any acts are justified if they are anti-Communist is irresponsibility which jeopardizes the entire world.

WILLIAM C. PAULSEN,
MARI G. PAULSEN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

If we cannot investigate State and CIA, we are going Fascist.

C. MACAR.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

As an Oregon resident of less than 2 months I am pleased and proud to find myself represented by you. As a Johnson supporter in the last election I find myself in full support of your position on Vietnam. There are more people who support you and your position than even you realize.

H. FREDERICK WESTON.

MONMOUTH, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on magnificent fight in Senate hearing on the war in Vietnam. The statement that million more Americans will support the President and Rusk is false. We want our boys home with us; to be free of the dreadful fear of nuclear warfare with any nation.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD A. HEWELL.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are with you all the way. Billions of people are counting on you to speak for us.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. THURSTON HUNT.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are doing a remarkable job in the hearings before Foreign Relations Committee. You are speaking for our family and dozens of others we have spoken with. You have our unqualified support.

ARTHUR and BETTY FAST.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3661

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your efforts to keep American public informed on Vietnam war are sincerely appreciated. Do not become discouraged. We support your action in the Senate hearings.

Mrs. PAUL RAMONOWSKI,
Mrs. FRANK J. LATLER,
Mrs. B. E. HAFNER,
C. J. STACEY,
DORIS CURTIS.

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous, intelligent Vietnam position and urge continued open debate in the Senate.

Ruth Kelsey, Jean Levine, Maxine Roz, Mafalda Yurkewicz, Phillip Greene, Judy Greene, Sally Lineweaver, John R. Lineweaver, Elizabeth Barkell, Richard Barkell, Stephanie Elind, John Lowry, Muriel Kanter, James McKay, B. J. Zukas, Sam R. Raskin, Mildred Raskin, Elayne Sellman, Theodore Salzman, Nanette Salzman, Adam Raskin, Henry Lowry, Louis Kanter.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, debate General Taylor. Disaster if we do not pull out in time. Thank you.

LUIS VAZQUEZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your stand on Vietnam, yours being one of the few voices of sanity now heard in Washington.

SEBERN FERRY.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work.

ROBERT VENTURI.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work.

VANNA VENTURI.

NAVARRE, OHIO,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. America is behind you. The next President of the United States will be the man that brings our boys back from this useless murdering in Vietnam.

DAVID COLUCY.

CORTLAND, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your analysis and commend your stand during the hearings.

WILLIAM AND JUDITH GRIFFEN.

WESTBURY, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please communicate to the President that I share your wise sentiments concerning Viet conflict.

Dr. and Mrs. JULIAN G. KIRCHICK.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you subject Vietnam. MORSE will be included in future "profiles" incurred.

WILLIAM R. KITTAY.

SAN PABLO, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree 100 percent with your stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. DONALD KAY.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations continued struggle world peace.

JUNE HUGHES.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Your leadership in opposition to current policy in Vietnam is in the highest tradition of our country's ideals.

Dr. and Mrs. CHARNEY and Family.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge more public hearings exploration constructive proposals from University International Relation Centers and Ambassador Goldberg.

RUTH MILLER THOMPSON.

RUTHERFORD, N.J.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good show sir. Carry on for the sake of the Nation.

A. GIANCOTT, M.D.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your courage and your defense of decent principles and of America. Bravo Senator MORSE.

TED GODFREY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Myself, my family, and a great many of my friends are in complete sympathy with what you are trying to do. You are saying what definitely needs to be said.

GEORGE B. HOOVER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your courageous fight against administration policy in Vietnam.

JOSEPH and MARJORIE GROELL.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo, bravo, bravo, your stand on Americas Vietnam policy is the worlds last hope.

Gratefully,

LUCIA POYER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We deplore Rusks cynical testimony on Vietnam and support your opposition to the war.

Mr. and Mrs. WM. MICHAEL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Nations hope for peace lies in your continued courageous quest for same Vietnam policy.

MARC KAMINSKY.
Miss RITA CAHN.

UTICA, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your concern, urge accepting World Council of Churches 10-point program for Vietnam peace ending wars brutality.

Dr. and Mrs. H. ROBERT GEMMER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate and support your position Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. E. C. LEWIS.

THOUSAND OAKS, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree stop killing Americans unconstitutionally. Civil wars aren't within treaty commitments. Negotiate don't escalate.

Mr. and Mrs. C. B. HENRICHSEN.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I concur with your convictions regarding the potential of the Vietnam situation. Please persist in your efforts.

DONALD W. JOHNSON.

CHATSWORTH, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hearts and hopes with you on Vietnam issue. How can we support you?

Mr. and Mrs. ROLAND F. BRYAN.

NEW HYDE PARK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your position taken at the recent Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Hope it will help toward bringing about successful negotiations and peace in Vietnam. Wiring the President to give full consideration to your suggestions.

ROBERT, KAREN, LAURIE, BETTY, and FRANK PHILLIPS.

February 23, 1966

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your courageous stand on Vietnam is in the finest traditions of the U.S. Senate. Please feel free to call upon us for financial support in any campaign you choose to undertake.

Dr. and Mrs. RAYMOND OJA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud you on your brave stand in the fight for peace. Talking at the conference table on the Vietnam issue is the only mature position we can take. Thank you for your efforts and good luck.

NATALIE GHENT.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our own family and the entire Nation owes you an inestimable debt of gratitude for exposing the facts about our frightening march into war and ultimate annihilation.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR BASSIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, we agree with your sound position on Vietnam situation, please continue open debate so that American public can be aware of what is happening. You have the backing of many intelligent substantial citizens.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT TRACHINGER.

SYOSSET, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud again your Vietnam stand, strongly support repeal Tonkin Resolution and negative appropriation vote.

Mr. and Mrs. E. R. STABLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

After listening again to you and Senator FULBRIGHT want to give you more than wholehearted support. Am a member of SANE, local protest group against war. Writing to Senator JAVITS re supporting you. What additional help can the little people give?

Sincerely,

MRS. EVELYN P. MARKS.

BOSTON, MASS.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your position re Vietnam debate. Anxious to lend support where needed. Please advise.

LAWRENCE M. WHITE.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you for your forthright stand in letting the people know about the utter futility of present administration policies in escalating the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. STUART L. TUCKEY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: Your searching questions and enlightening remarks at committee hearings on Vietnam gives one hope for speedy and lasting world peace. Won't have to worry about population explosion if war continues much longer. Our young men can serve our country much better than killing and being killed. Urge you to continue public hearings in hope administration will change present policy.

AARON and YETTA SONNTAG.

STUDIO CITY, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to continue your fight for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam and for your continued efforts for a world at peace.

Pearl and Jack Ayeroff, Yetta and Royal Judd, S. Airoff, Dorothy and M. Newman, Carl and May Levin, Eve and Borrx Siminowsky, Helen Erlich, Al and Rea Silver, John and Martha Yeiskal, Esther Werner, and Roslyn Schuldenfrei.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous testimony.

SETSU OKUBO.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your continuing informed and courageous stand on Vietnam.

PHYLLIS C. KORMAN.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Command courageous vital exploration Vietnam issue. Urge Sergeant Duncan, February Ramparts magazine, as committee witness.

L. D. MEEKER.

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue Vietnam criticism. KENNEDY deserves your support, recognizing NLF as genuine South Vietnamese political force.

MISS BARBARA JEAN BENG.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The continuing use of U.S. Forces to resolve political issues in Vietnam runs counter to a belief warmly embraced by me; namely self-determination. I urge you to consider again proposals made by Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, and KENNEDY aimed at bringing this senseless carnage to a speedy conclusion.

CHARLES MCGUIRE.

FORT WAYNE, IND.,
February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for so loyally and sincerely defending the rights of the American people.

Please do not let the Senate hearings on television die. They offer so much hope. We want to listen and have a grave and great responsibility to know what's going on.

Mr. and Mrs. JACK B. SCHRECK.

FERNDALE, MICH.,
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate and support your views on the Vietnam situation. Many thanks for your outspoken, courageous stand.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. DECOOK.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your concern on the Vietnam situation. Keep up the good work.

L. ARMSTRONG.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I have been following the various discussions on the Vietnam issue in which you were involved and see you finally have woke up some of your colleagues to the dangers our country is facing and how it has come about.

I am enclosing several clippings I took from the morning paper which coincides with my feelings and many of the folks in this area. There are some of our Congressmen that need enlightening on these issues. AL ULLMAN who usually is right has caught the bug somehow and should be educated to the truth of what is really going on. Hatfield may beat DUNCAN too if DUNCAN does not see the issues in their true light.

As I see it we are wasting not only the flower of our manhood but resources as well in a war that never should have been.

Do hope you will keep in good health and retain your perspective on these issues. I remain,

Your very good friend,

W. A. RENTSCHLER.

PREACHING AND PRACTICE

To the EDITOR:

We Americans, leaders of materialism and technology and supposed subscribers of Christianity and democracy, must make it hard for foreigners to understand and follow.

Being seriously threatened with a modern ideology, we use medieval methods to combat it (slapping at mosquitoes, when threatened, instead of halting their spread by sterilizing their breeding areas). Communism only thrives under conditions that would make Christians and freedom lovers hang their heads in shame (economic, political, and social exploitation, ignorance, filth, disease, poverty, etc.). We spend billions monthly to halt its onrush, but only thousands to eliminate the breeding grounds, with missionary work, economic, and technical aid. We allow our moneyed interests to spread throughout the world to satisfy their lust for gain by exploitation of natural and human resources, protected by their influence in foreign governments. We retard production of food and economic progress in a starving world. We give aid to status quo governments. Americans abroad display economic and social superiority.

Are these masses fighting for communism by their civil action at the ballot box or battlefield, or are they trying to give their existence meaning? Will guns and our boys' lives kill an ideology, or strengthen the cause of the suppressed? Have these monthly billions and lives reversed communism the last 20 years? Could we be imperfect in the execution of a perfect faith? Have we un-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3663

devaluated this threat? Have we sent our boys to the wrong frontline, armed with wrong weapons?

HOWARD WILDFANG.

ILLEGITIMATE WAR

To the Editor:

The founders of the United States of America expected the Nation to make war, when necessary, in an open and above-board manner. They expected it to declare its intention openly after due debate of the reasons, to state them clearly and name the enemies specifically.

They intended making war to be solely a legislative prerogative. In article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, they provided that "the Congress" shall declare war. They did not mention the Executive in the connection.

The records of the debates in the Constitutional Convention reveal that the framers definitely intended the President not to have power to declare war. He was to be able to use the Armed Forces and other resources of the country to "repel sudden attacks," but was not to be able to wage aggressive war to serve his purposes alone as sovereigns had done since time immemorial.

Nevertheless, the United States is deeply involved today in a war Congress did not declare and has not openly debated; a war for uncertain reasons, indefinite objectives, and against insufficiently identified enemies.

It would be difficult if not impossible to determine who got the Nation into the war in Vietnam, when, and how. Also futile, except for the purposes of historians, President Johnson has recognized it as "really war," issued orders to escalate it, then deescalate it, now escalate it again, resulting in "confusion worse confounded."

The illegitimacy of the thing is being ignored generally, and perhaps it may well be so now. But what of the future? Is the United States committed to the principle that the President and his aids, particularly the aids, may make war a la Vietnam whenever and wherever they see fit to do so? Shall the Congress forfeit its rights and duties through neglect? Shall the Constitution be amended by ignoring provisions which interfere with the plans of the executive department?

In short, shall the switch from democracy to autocracy or hog-wild bureaucracy now taking place in Washington, D.C., be allowed to continue?

SILVANUS KINGSLEY.

A CHEAPER WAY

To the Editor:

The sudden and dramatic move of President Johnson to export the Great Society even to South Vietnam has its sides to look at too. After the great idea possessed L.B.J. he ordered Vice President HUMPHREY to Vietnam to fill in the menu, and let the Viets know what to expect. That was quite an order, but probably HUBERT's imagination is fertile enough to come through abundantly. Whether it will be two wheelbarrows in every garage, or two motorcycles, we should know shortly.

There is little that I or any reader can do about this arbitrary decision to export our wealth, except possibly to turn on the TV to take our minds off the subject. But then we will be confronted with government commercials imploring us not to travel abroad, but to stay home and lessen the dollar drain.

But if there has got to be a program like this, maybe we are aiming it in the wrong direction. Perhaps it would be better to offer the Great Society program to North Vietnam if they would agree to quit fighting. It could be cheaper in the long haul.

If we follow the pattern of all 20th century wars, we will tear the country up, and after hostilities, start in rebuilding it for them.

Why wouldn't it be better to start in improving before destruction? Being as L.B.J. is using some of my money to pay for his big plans, I take the liberty to make this suggestion.

R. F. COOK.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I greatly appreciate your vigorous opposition to our national policy in Vietnam. We believe that the present policy not only is lacking support among most nations but can well bring shame and possible defeat. We are urging public debate upon the floor of the Senate to bring out facts in Vietnam.

Will you please do all in your power to make this possible? Also, please keep up your opposition. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LUTHER MAX WILLS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 12, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your talk at the Senate debate.

I feel so thankful we have a liberal minded Senator with so much courage and understanding.

I am also encouraged that you have more in your camp as time goes on. Also the signing of the protest letter to President Johnson of January 21 by 76 Representatives was a step forward.

Would you please send me a copy of the Aiken-Mansfield report on their recent visit to Vietnam? I would like to add that this should be made available to all U.S. citizens. Could you reveal to the public the facts as to how Thailand has become a military dependent of the American Treasury as you referred to in your speech?

Your camp is growing, let us keep on. If the time is not too short perhaps we will win.

Respectfully,

ALICE HEDGPETH.

HERMISTON, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Although I am not a member of your party, I feel compelled to express my appreciation to you for your expression of protest against our involvement in Vietnam. How thankful we are for the voices of protest at this time and for those dedicated to peace.

Seeing and hearing the interrogations last week by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a great experience. Restored, to a great extent, our faith in our elected representatives, especially from the several who obviously put principle above party.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. L. LARIVE.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE

DEAR SIR: I must say I have come to think a great deal more of you in the past year as the senior Senator of Oregon.

I have not gone along with you on all matters, but I do say you are on the right track on the Korean war and I support your thinking.

Also you are right on the giveaway of U.S. dollars which is draining our Nation to a point where we will need help should we be attacked.

I appreciate your forthrightness in these matters and my support is yours so long as you keep working for the good of our great Nation.

Respectfully,

HARLAN H. HARRIS.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE
Senate Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Am dropping this short note to let you know you are doing the job well and we are back of you every inch.

We pray we can stop this giving to everyone else, there is a limit as to what good old America (as we use to know it) can and should do.

We have three grandsons in service now and for what, they don't know and neither do we.

I knew you personally when in Eugene, you are well acquainted with my brother Cy Slocum, he is a different person now we thank God for it.

Senator MORSE keep up the good work we are backing you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. HARLAN H. HARRIS.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to express our unequivocal support for your policies relative to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

With thanks and our best wishes we are,
Sincerely yours,

W. L. MAHONEY.
Mrs. W. L. MAHONEY.
STEVEN J. MAHONEY.PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I am writing to express my thanks for your efforts in the Vietnam situation. I hope you will keep it up as we certainly do need your help and the help of all those that want peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DOROTHY McCUNE.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please continue your courageous fight to try to find a solution to the Vietnam situation.

Your actions the last few days have given renewed hope to a great number of we Americans that our country can be saved from total war.

I have disagreed with a number of your views but you have my full support for your actions in this regard.

Our Constitution clearly states only Congress can declare war. Yet in the past 20 years, the spirit of this safeguard has been disregarded by changing the name of war.

As a concerned citizen, I wonder why an amendment can't be added to our Constitution that only Congress can commit any drafted troops to battle on any foreign soil?

We are supposed to be a democracy and the elected representatives of the people are supposed to be the very basis of our Government to control any one who has desires to be a ruler of our country.

With the new terms of "policing," "protecting," etc., now being used, do you believe a constitutional amendment would return this balance of power to our elected Congress?

Please continue your brave fight for the future of our country.

Respectfully,

BEATRICE BENNETT.

3664

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing on behalf of both my husband and myself to applaud your eloquent and courageous stand against our policy in Vietnam. Everything you say rings true and is factual. As to the American people not standing for it—I don't know. I am amazed at the apathy and lack of concern shown. It is true that it is up to them, but you of Congress are better informed and are the real guardians of the people. "Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do," is as true today as it was 2,000 years ago. A letter to the editor in today's paper, signed by H. Guy Goodscoll, states that the speeches, "delivered on the steps of the Pioneer Post Office, were read from manuscripts. They were academic and unimpressive. Most of the applause was from the demonstrators themselves." I was there, and I thought the speeches were excellent, factual, and plausible. There were a number of spectators standing opposite who could be seen clapping their hands. Peace seems to be boring and unexciting. The human animal is indeed an enigma. I can say for sure that the arguments advanced by the hawks sound anything but academic.

I feel that President Johnson has usurped his authority to an extent to warrant impeachment. His judgment certainly has not been to the advantage of the people of this country. He flagrantly betrayed the people who voted for him, and that includes both of us. Along with poor advice, he was offered very good advice by many knowledgeable people. Many writers and commentators were counseling withdrawal before it was too late. The Saturday Review and the Nation were full of such counsel. We have acted like a tyrant and a bully and if we don't mend our ways we will suffer the lot of the tyrant and bully.

Perhaps we could take Ky and the rest of his ilk and set them up in a fortification (enclave) on the coast similar to that of Chiang on Formosa. If 600,000 of these "dedicated South Vietnamese troops, fighting for freedom" can't defend this position, then who are the people, and who are we helping to defend what? Sidney Hook says that "Democracy is the will of the majority of the people, be it communism or whatever." If the majority are Vietcong, it is their country.

All moral aspects aside, and speaking strictly as business people and taxpayers, it seems asinine to pour billions of dollars into a country for development and reform while we are simultaneously spending billions to blast it to bits. I can only say that in my estimation you cannot bomb ideology nor can you buy it, which seems to be the latest strategy of our President. If he is acting in an intelligent manner, I fail to see it. At any rate, I hope the scales will fall off enough Congressmen's eyes to enable them to see the frightening picture and do something to get us out of this hellish Asiatic morass.

You are espousing what is now an unpopular cause, but it is not the first time that you have done so, and it is certainly more popular than it was a year ago. We express our heartfelt gratitude to you for the fight you are making in the cause of peace, certainly including a revision of our entire foreign policy. You are right, and I wish that you were our President.

Sincerely,
Mrs. HOWARD W. HARRIS.

CAVE JUNCTION,
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I am with you all of the way, and I sure get a great kick out of watching you on TV. Looks to me, when

you get going, that you are just beginning to fight Johnson and his war.

Stick with it. This is going to end just as you said it would with Johnson the most discredited President we have ever had. It is my opinion that nothing but complete power will satisfy him.

I am a Democrat; always voted Democrat, but now shall vote my first Republican vote for Hatfield on account of his views on account of his views on war being the same as yours and unless ROBERT KENNEDY runs for next President, I'll bet I vote for a Republican President. I've had enough.

Keep up your good fight. I might get to vote for you next for President. But I wouldn't wish that on you.

Best wishes,
Mrs. PANSY HALLOCK
(The woman miner of the Siskiyou).

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sirs: In your present popularity explosion (and probably at any other time) the best I can expect for my letter is that your secretary's secretary's secretary will file it among the stuff you may read someday when, like all human beings, you might need a little extra praise.

History will, of course, remember you for your statesmanship and so will I but particularly for the satisfying end of that last televised day of the committee hearings when Rusk and I watched, without fully comprehending the implications, as you peeled yourself a willow switch. Suddenly you pounced and were warning up the Secretary's pink bottom. Rusk had some reason to hope, with the administration's typical contempt for other people's intelligence, that having reached the end of the last day and having been able to sidestep completely the Midwest Senator who took up the same question (while prudently attributing it to a female constituent) he had reason to hope that he would escape completely having to explain the phenomenon of five or six men in our Government having all the wisdom and virtue and courage in the entire world. Your timing was perfect for bursting that balloon. It well may be that you and our WAYNE MORSE can someday take credit for having saved humanity. At one time, such a statement would have been pure rhetoric; now, as every thinking person knows, it can be stark reality.

Thank you, Senator, for giving us the thrill of a lifetime.

Respectfully,
Mrs. B. MOORE SAVAGE.
TROUTDALE, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After much reading and soul searching I find myself agreeing more and more with your opinions and your stand concerning the Vietnam situation.

To me, the issue has been a paradox. It has been most difficult to weed out the facts from the emotional overtones and contradictions emanating from the State Department, the press, and from private citizens—influential and otherwise.

The copy of your recent speech in the Senate—"The State of War in Vietnam"—which I recently received from your office has verified the conclusions I too have reached.

I sincerely hope that before all humanity goes down en masse before the gales of nuclear destruction we will have reached, as nations, that level of maturity so desperately needed for survival—a maturity embodied in

international law and respect, out of need if for nothing else, on the part of all nations (not just theirs, but ours) for this legal system.

Please carry on.
Sincerely yours,

LOIS P. ROSS.

AGNESS, OREG.,
February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of the State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful that there are men like Senator J. W. Fulbright and you, having the courage to express the gravity of the situation in Vietnam relative to the world. Men like you endure abuse because you dare seeing the facts realistically, this against the general trend of keeping in line with the executive branch of our Government.

With great interest I followed the Foreign Relations Committee's hearings and am only glad that we live in a democracy where this is possible. I only hope that enough Americans learned the facts and will realize that we are heading for a general war, unless we change our course of action.

You are well informed and see the global perspective of our involvement in southeast Asia. I do not need to reiterate our position in this world of today. However, what frightens me is that in the year 1966, we, as human beings, as civilized people, resort to war as an extension of diplomacy; where discussions fail, arms take over with all its horrible consequences. Seemingly we never learn and only men like you can enlighten the people here and abroad that this is wrong.

We are now in an impasse. We hear that since 1947 over \$800 billion was spent on armament in our country alone. We came to accept the slaughter of our youths and have pride in killing the youth of other nations. Where are we going; have we learned nothing from history?

We hear of escalation—of eventual confrontation with China, with Russia. If this ever comes about, we all know there will be no winners, only losers, there will be no honor involved; we will set back civilization for centuries, if not forever.

Looking at the world today, there are more authoritarian governments than democracies, and even democracy is interpreted differently in different countries with different backgrounds. So, why do we interfere in a (basically) civil war in Vietnam. It is said to stop communism, aggression. Which communism, which aggression? At the same time our President and Secretary of State mention this, they say that neither China, nor Russia dares to get involved in Vietnam. This is rather illogical. Further, it is conceded that Russia and China have ideological differences, which, in my opinion only results of Russia coming of age and prosperous, more liberal, and more realistic whereas China still burdens from past humiliation and European enslavement. Given time and opportunity (U.N.) China will become eventually less belligerent and more moderate, but we must convince the Chinese, as we did the Russians, that we are sincere and have no obscure motives.

North and South Vietnam, for that matter Laos and Cambodia, were until 1954 Indochina, a French colony. This is the crux of the matter. From the Vietnamese people's point of view, we are continuing the French colonial policy of imposing our (Western) will upon them. We profess to have limited goals, such as free elections. Free elections do not impress a people who were colonized, occupied by Japanese, then occupied by the French again, with British and American assistance. Free elections do not mean much to a people who never had an

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3665

election period. What does make sense to them is to be free—free from interference of the Western powers, under any form of self-government, whether good or bad. The worse domestic government is better than the best—foreign imposed—one.

I experienced the same situation in occupied Holland during the war, later in the Dutch Indies. These peoples were rather crawling before walking on their own, than having "goodies" under foreign domination. Democracy as we know it, is not, at this time, possible in Vietnam, as it is not possible in so many countries. We must realize this and not always compare them with ourselves. What they do have in common with us as human beings is that they wish to be free. Therefore, we must change our policy according to reality.

The 17th parallel was a dividing line, imposed by the British, in order to avoid bloodshed and to create a "cooling off" period giving the French an opportunity to withdraw behind this parallel, a Vietnamese collaborator sanctuary, as Canada became the sanctuary for those who collaborated with the British during our Revolutionary War.

Feelings are high now. We, being the strongest nation in the world, can afford, without losing face to be realistic and civilized and show the Vietnamese, as well as the world, that we are a peace-loving people.

We escalated within a short time from 15,000 advisers in Vietnam, to an Army of presently 205,000 men. In addition, we were told, another approximately 100,000 men are involved in various ways, including Navy and Air Force. When we had 15,000 men there, our casualties were relatively low. With escalation, casualties increased. I understand South Vietnam has presently 650,000 men in arms. I cannot see where the safety of the remainder of our forces would be in jeopardy if we, as a gesture of good will, as proof of our good intentions, withdrew 45,000 men. If the North Vietnamese would respond with drawing, we gradually could reduce our forces while in the meantime we created a climate where all parties concerned could be persuaded to come to the conference table. The Vietcong, now fighting (in their view) a war of liberation, should be included in discussions. Then we can indeed talk free elections, which seems the entire purpose of our boys dying there. This would be in accord with our contention that we seek an honorable solution.

I believe that this way we could convince the Chinese, the Russians, for that matter, our allies in Western Europe, that we really have no obscure reasons for being there and that we will leave Vietnamese soil soon thereafter. The alternatives are obvious. A global, atomic war, perhaps extermination of the human race. Is this what we offer our children?

Dear Senator, I apologize for taking so much of your valuable time, but trust this letter will have some merits for you to explore. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

TED BLOKKER.

HALFINAY, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

U.S. SENATOR OF OREGON.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We do hope you may find time to read this letter, for we want you to know, we are in back of your stand on the Vietnam crisis 100 percent and we thank God that Oregon's Senator was one of the two Senators in the Nation, that had the will and honesty to the people to vote against giving the President the power of a dictator to lead their country into a war. A war that could last for 20 years.

Now this same President cannot and is not honestly seeking a peaceful settlement of this war, not when he seeks and takes the advice of men like McNamara, Dean Rusk, and General Taylor. Men that cannot

or will not let the American people know just what they are doing. After all we are the ones that have to pay with our boys and money.

Our President just returned from Honolulu. He promised the Vietnamese everything in the book and to continue the slaughter of our school kids, for that is all they are.

He tells us to build more schools, for what?

The girls say they can get along fine with what schools we have, and if this means disregard for the Constitution of United States is not stopped, the only boys we will have left are the ones with a jail record. In fact that's about all we have left now in Baker County.

Senator, I want you to know the draft board of Baker County is taking boys in their freshman year out of college at mid-term. These boys have good grades.

It is so bad that Mr. Lyle Johnson, registrar at E.O. College also a member of the draft board resigned from the draft board and publicly stated that the unfairness was his reason for his resignation.

Where is this going to end?

Sincerely,

'PERCY LAIRD.

MRS. PERCY LAIRD.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for your persistent stand on the Vietnam issue and urge that you continue your course through the rougher waters ahead.

I fear that this Nation has committed itself to a most regrettable course. We are now caught in a war both unjust and immoral and one in which the people of Vietnam, the women and children, suffer the greatest.

My hope is that the posture of this Nation can return once again to the one of peace-maker and our only hope now is that your voice and that of others continue to be heard as part of the conscience of these United States.

In peace,

JOSEPH M. ERCEG.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want you to know that I am thankful that we have an American Senator such as yourself who has the courage to protest the Vietnam mess.

When did America assume the self-appointed role of world ruler and cure-all for every country's ills, to the drain and detriment of our wonderful country?

This is a critical time, in my opinion, as at the rate we are now going, it will soon be that all dissenters will be suppressed and branded as un-American and unpatriotic. Then everyone will be afraid to express themselves. Thanks again for caring.

Sincerely,

KEN REINER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to inform you that I fully support your stand on the undeclared war in Vietnam. I feel it is the responsibility of the Congress to commit this country to war if such action is necessary. I urge you to continue your effort to lead the President back to the constitutional path.

In addition, I would like to say that the televised Senate hearings now going on are a great public service. Prior to these hearings one could only obtain the facts through the written press and I am highly skeptical of much that is printed in these media.

Facts can be slanted or altered to suit the writer. I prefer to see it with my own eyes and form my own opinion.

I will close with a word about myself. I am not a bearded beatnik, instead I am a Republican and I tend to lean toward the conservative. I am discharged from the Marines after 4 years of active duty and consider myself much more patriotic than the average person. It is for this reason that I do not want the Constitution of the United States to be so flagrantly violated by the President. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT L. DEAN.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this means to express my admiration for your attitude and stand on our foreign relations policies. That our circumvention of the U.N. is ridiculous and the waste of our resources in foreign lands scandalous should be apparent to any thinking person. Apathy, ignorance, or both on the part of our American public can be the only reason I can think of being responsible for same.

I respect your thinking in every respect and may God grant you the power to persevere.

If I, as a thinking American citizen, can support you in any way other than my vote I would consider it an honor.

Sincerely,

R. E. HOWARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 9, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading your speech in the Senate on Wednesday, May 5, 1965, "The Undeclared War in Vietnam." I have also read, listened, and watched as much as possible in connection with your views on this and other points of the U.S. foreign policy.

May I say, even though I am not yet a U.S. citizen, that in my modest opinion you have a correct appraisal of the dangers of the present situation. More to the point, let me assure you of my admiration for your continued courage and devotion to the interest of the country as you understand it.

In a recent TV debate you appealed to the American people to make themselves heard where it counts: in the ballot box. It is my earnest hope that in the not-too-distant future I may be able to support you precisely in that place. In the meantime I shall be grateful for the continued mailing of information as your office has been doing in the past.

Yours sincerely,

ANTONIO COLÁS.

ALBANY, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for all you are doing to try and put an end to this awful war that we should have no part of.

Also thank you for the TV coverage of the Senate investigation hearings. Everyone in this country should hear and see them. Our papers here including the Oregonian do not cover them enough. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. H. D. BLAKELY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter to express my thanks that we have a Senator from Oregon that has the courage to stand up and fight for his convictions concerning our policy in Vietnam. Your views are shared by a great many Oregonians and your record

3666

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

has proved that you will not be dictated to by any man.

So thanks again to a great Senator from Oregon who is writing a brand new chapter in "Profiles in Courage."

Sincerely,

HOWARD McCAMMEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 9, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senior from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened and watched TV yesterday over channel 8, and heard the very fine interview of our Senators with Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired, as he advised Senators to investigate our United States-Asian policy.

It was a wonderfully dignified and informative session and you, Senator MORSE, were magnificent. I, too, wonder when we will return to constitutional government. I'm concerned about the power being displayed by our top leaders in the administration.

Also the Oregonian this morning had President Johnson's big plans regarding Vietnam, "Powermen" and easing needs of Vietnam's woes before we even have the Communists out of South Vietnam. I had to look on page 10 to find a very small article about the important meeting with the Foreign Relations Committee. Why? It must really be true that our press is being controlled as the FCC is trying to control all radio mediums.

We are at war. Why shouldn't we let Congress make the decision to declare war so all the people will know where we stand.

I have a boy in the Air Force, and two more boys coming up.

Do all you can to let the people know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MILTON C. LOCKWOOD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to have you as my Senator. It is extremely difficult for me to decide whether the war in Vietnam is correct or not, but it doesn't take any insight to know that we are going about the process in an incorrect, immoral, and self-defeating manner. If we are going to have a war, we should declare it. If we are not going to have a war, we should not be fighting, at the level we are fighting.

It is your honest dissent which makes possible a discussion of the issues and out of this comes the strength of our Nation. Please accept my encouragement to keep up the hard work you are carrying on.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH CRAWSHAW, M.D.

ONTARIO, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Harris and myself have been listening to the Senate hearings on TV and you are to be commended on the way you have been speaking out on the situation at hand; and I'm sure the people of Oregon are justly proud we have such a Senator as you who has the courage to take a definite stand on these issues.

We ask God's blessings upon you; and we sincerely thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. E. K. HARRIS.

FEBRUARY 11, 1966.

Re Vietnam war:

I'm a registered Republican. But in national policies to me we are one. That is my political philosophy. Also, I am thoroughly disillusioned about the efficacies of

any war. In my era, we made the "world safe for democracy." Ha!

But I believe in the democratic processes. Hence this letter. Under our law, we have a voice through elected representatives only. When the administration makes war without bringing the issues to vote by our representatives, that administration is denying me, as a member of that society, my rights to be heard and infringing on my freedom. I can't understand our President who champions the cause of political freedoms to other distant countries, but denies the same privileges to his own people; what is more amazing is for one who professes to "come let's sit down and reason together" to conduct himself so. His commitments are first to the American people, and not to Vietnam.

I shall be forever grateful to the American press, television, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for bringing the Vietnam Crisis live before "our eyes and ears." This is a service of the highest good, at least to me, a common person, to help me to judge the situation, and to form a just decision.

I thank you and your colleagues for working so long and so hard to give us this service.

Sincerely yours,

MARIE TIGGELBERG.

LA GRANGE, OREG.

ONTARIO, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I have been watching the Senate Committee meetings on TV.

I wish to thank you for the courageous stand you have taken. I know every peace-loving citizen of Oregon appreciates the stand you have taken.

Your concern for our boys that bear the battle is heartening to the boys and parents that have known the heartbreak of war and war it is.

I know the people of Oregon can count on your support.

Yours truly,

SIBYL T. HENDRICKS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to make my support of your courageous position on Vietnam clear to you again at this time, this critical time of decision, when you often must be tempted to despair by the obduracy of the many leaders whom seem bent on destroying peace and the possibility of international cooperation.

You may count on my support in your further efforts to restore our national policy to sanity and legitimacy.

Sincerely,

ROLFE LA FERGE.

OREGON CITY, OREG.

February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God someone is beginning to speak up in regards to this problem of secrecy and half-truths in the State Department and other areas of Federal activity.

I am a staunch Democrat but something must be done soon to let the entire population know the facts. I'm sure we cannot continue with a policy of limited information—it's bound to backfire sooner or later—the good people of this country have to know or goody democracy.

Keep up the good work and more of it please. I think you are writing the next chapter in a "Profile of Courage." America needs the crusade of yours now. It is our only means of salvation. The people must be honestly and fully informed.

My prayers go with you. Let me know what else I can do to help you.

Cordially,

J. C. BOYLE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very much concerned with the escalation of this Vietnam war. I give you every support in your effort to stop it. I have listened to all the TV committee hearings. I feel our foreign policy should be changed.

Mrs. DOROTHY O'DELL.

SALEM OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We follow your activities in the newspapers, and hear you often on TV. We just wish to tell you that we admire your courage in being a dissenter under our present administration, that we think your opinions on the Vietnam war are correct, and that we are behind you 100 percent in whatever you do.

Our best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LLOYD DeGROOTE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 11, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your comments from time to time and most recently on television during committee investigations regarding our situation in Vietnam are most interesting and I wholeheartedly support them. As a veteran of World War II, I find it increasingly difficult to explain to my two oldest boys why they must, in all probability, eventually serve in a war in Vietnam.

I have long felt that it is the duty of every citizen of this country of ours to support his Government by whatever measure is necessary. This is the first time in my life that I have questioned the wisdom of the necessity of action outside the United States. I want you to know that I appreciate your willingness to stand up against the forces that have almost made it unpatriotic for those of us who have voiced opposition.

It does seem to me that there must be other ways to handle this situation without draining the lifeblood of our Nation's future through our young people.

Sincerely yours,

SEE STUART.

WINSTON, OREG.,

February 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you again for your stand on the war in South Vietnam.

Many people were shocked by the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam and the treatment of the South Vietnam people suspect of being in sympathy with the Vietcong.

From pictures in newspapers, I wonder if our troops are any less brutal than the Japanese were in World War II.

The thing that bothers so many people who voted for President Johnson in preference to Mr. Goldwater, is that Mr. Johnson has done exactly what Mr. Goldwater said he would do.

I cannot help but wonder if this feeling will not be reflected in the coming elections.

Here in Oregon, Mr. Hatfield has been critical of our Vietnam policy and as he is a very popular Governor, I am very much afraid the next Senator from Oregon will be Mr. Hatfield.

While no one can look into the future, it does seem to me that the chance of peace is a very slim one.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3667

Is it possible to take from the President the power to wage war without the consent of Congress?

Thank you again for your stand on South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. HULSE.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first letter I have ever written to Washington. Little people like myself are getting stirred up over Vietnam. Ordinarily we expect our Congressmen and Senators to run our Government properly.

Thank goodness you are awake and doing a good job. If we have made a mistake by getting into a war in Vietnam, let's correct the situation as quickly as possible. Everyone makes mistakes, and the United States is no exception, and I certainly feel we have no business fighting in Asia.

Again, I want to say thank you for taking the stand you have.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. D. GWYNN.

REDMOND, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate the stand our Senate delegation has taken regarding the Vietnam war, particularly that of Senator MORSE.

I trust this policy will be widely adopted and pursued and that we soon may win there decisively without expanding or extending the war, and that we may thereafter mop up the mess and bring our men and equipment home.

It is incredible and inexcusable that after what our men went through in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, we are starting through the combat all over again.

Trust that Senator MORSE will continue to be vociferous and effective.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. STRANAHAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your increasing support in peace efforts for the Vietnam issue. Your much appreciated report letters have given me (and others) a much greater understanding of the issue and your sincere efforts to settle it with ethics and honor.

I sincerely hope you will receive the honor of a Nobel Peace Prize for your dedication. More power to you.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. ROBINSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support you in your stand in the Vietnam war.

Sincerely,

E. J. HANGERUD.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on Vietnam makes me very proud to be an American and to be able to say you represent me. My

wife and I won't forget what you have done. But more has to be done.

I just saw photographs taken by Felix Greene and heard him talk at the University of Oregon. He presents conclusive proof the bombing of the north has destroyed hospitals, schools, nurseries, old people's homes; and it has strengthened the resolve of the north to fight harder. Can't you get him to testify before the committee? People don't know this kind of thing is going on. American boys are being taught how to torture and are being turned into brutal killers. Somebody has got to do something to stop this madness. Urge the President to stop bombing; negotiate a cease-fire; state our support for the Geneva agreements and our pledge to carry them out; and grant the Vietcong equal status with the Saigon government in negotiations. Thanks.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND B. PRATT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my humble thanks for your tireless effort to depress any accelerated action in Vietnam. We all hope and pray that you, with the help of some of the other Senators and Congressmen, that it will be possible for you to regain some of the powers which are being taken away from you. After the promises made in the islands, it looks pretty hopeless—but please keep trying.

We can't wait for election time to exercise our will against stepping up this so-called war. Something must be done before then to stop it, and I pray that you will be given the strength to carry on your battle against any acceleration of the situation. * * * and now the power that the executive branch seems to be taking away from Congress.

It appeared that Professor Kennan made a very deep impression with his answers to the many tiring questions, and we can only hope now that the Senators on this committee will band together and act to prevent us getting into war any deeper than we already are. It appears that your courage to speak out is giving a few of the rest of them a little courage also.

Gratefully yours,

AGNES D. HALL (Mrs. H. T.).

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will let you know that my family and a great majority of the people of Grants Pass, Oreg., are backing you and the committee.

I agree with the committee, the American people should be told the facts about what is going on in our Government.

Please don't let us down.

Yours truly,

WOODROW W. MORACE.

WINSTON, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful for your brave and bold stand on Vietnam.

We have overextended ourself all over the earth.

We have no right to be in Vietnam anymore than Chinese Armies have a right to be in Mexico.

The world is too big for us to rule alone.

Sincerely,

FRANK P. LIENING.

SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to ask for debate on Vietnam.

Yours truly,

CHESTER HORN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been negligent in not telling you before that I fully support your position on Vietnam in which I have been in accord for a long time.

I am gratified that several members of the Foreign Relations Committee to some extent are inclined to agree with your views and I wish to report that many of my friends, who in the past were definitely in favor of our entry in Vietnam, have changed their thinking to coincide with yours.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BRUSHOFF.

P.S.—I should like my name to be placed on your mailing list.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Let us commend you again for demanding that there be debate on the administration policy in Vietnam. Your almost lone voice is at last being joined by others. Our best hope, it seems to us, is to dampen down this conflict until the issues can be clarified and resolved in negotiation. As long as the President talks in vague generalities the other side will refuse to meet with us. Please continue to "hammer away." You are making yourself heard.

Yours respectfully,

RUTH and WALTER R. WARREN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your Vietnam position 100 percent. Your efforts to bring this undeclared war to the conference table are appreciated.

Thank you very much for what you are doing. The best of luck to you. May you be successful in your efforts.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BERG.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: We absolutely concur with the views expressed by former Ambassador Kennan and General Gavin before your Committee on Foreign Relations this week, and have written a card to President Johnson to that effect.

We've been desperately worried about the limb we've evidently got ourselves onto in Vietnam, and the collision course the administration seems bent on, to say nothing of the breakdown of checks and balances between the Congress and the President.

The public hearing and the TV coverage were a tremendous service to national sanity, and we're particularly grateful to Mr. Kennan for one of the most dynamic approaches to foreign policy we've ever heard.

As always, you make us proud of being Democrats and Oregonians. Thank you for all your months of being a voice in the wilderness regarding the Vietnam war. If you can think of anything useful we can do to impress it upon the administration, we'd appreciate hearing about it in the newsletter.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN BLUNT.

FEBRUARY 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to express my approval of your stand on the Vietnam war. Keep up your protests and perhaps even-

February 23, 1966

tually the American people will have foresight enough to see and understand that our people in Washington are leading us into a hopeless situation with a great sacrifice of American lives and money.

I still have not understood their explanation of our commitment. Who in Washington has the right to sacrifice our young Americans on Asian soil? Is this war continued in all its hopelessness for the benefit of our industrialists who are profiting from this war?

The Asian peoples are not of our culture, they do not think the same as we of the Western World and surely the President and his supporters with all our tax money to dole out freely aren't going to change their thinking.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELLEN ERICKSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

FEBRUARY 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm listening and you are superb.

No need to answer this note. Please use it as a statistic.

Yours truly,

Mrs. RUTH ASHFORD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am opposed to any further involvement in southeast Asia.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. REAM.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 26, 1966.Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Once again the people of Oregon have reasons to be proud of their contribution to the U.S. Senate. Your fearless, logical, and searching examination of the witnesses in the present hearing gives us confidence that there is still some reason left in the Nation. Together with the chairman of the committee you have made his hearing something new in the history of our country.

I am not sure that the majority of the people will support you, but I am sure that history will show that you have made one of the most significant contributions to democratic government. More power to you.

Sincerely,

FRED W. KNICKREHM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not qualified to be specific, but I want to say the course you are following in the current Vietnam dispute is in accord with my thinking. As I understand it, you are basing your argument on legal grounds—that we should respect the authority of our Constitution, the Charter of the United Nations, and international law. We have a fringe in our society of common law violators—and listening to the TV hearings this week it seems that some people in high places are prone to disregard some restrictions too.

In regard to the joint resolution of August 1964, I felt at the time that the administration was asking for a vote of confidence, to show the world that the country was behind the President in repelling attack. I had no thought, and suppose the idea was quite general, that this did not authorize massive military preparations. I believe

Secretary Rusk read the fine print at the hearing the other day attempting to show this authorized escalation, but I'm sure the Congress and the people did not interpret it so at the time. They thought of the resolution as a whole.

I feel you are doing a real service in arousing public opinion to an awareness of the extent of our involvement without full disclosure and debate. It is time for Congress to assume more control as one of the three major branches of Government and to base our actions on constitutional grounds.

With all good wishes,
Yours very truly,

FRED W. DOST.

YONCALLA, OREG.,
February 21, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been very interested in the foreign relations discussions and wish to commend you for the stand you are taking in opposition to the war in Vietnam. In our little town it seems that nearly every one is against the war. Continue to work for peace and better foreign relations.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT DICKEY.

BEND, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, my 88-year-old mother who is an active reader both in current affairs as well as my realm of extra medical magazines, my wife who is an avid reader of current literature especially in her efforts to obtain a community theater here in Bend, a very active person in League of Women Voters, A.A.U.W., and Community Theater, as well as currently making quite a study of water rights and utilization of water and last of all myself, an ophthalmologist, wish to express our appreciation of your sturdiness of character and forthrightness in the present hassle our country finds itself.

I have toyed with and mentioned it to you one night in an after-hour depression letter about leaving this home of ours for parts unknown in the fantasy of more freedom of living, expression, better representation in government, and other facets that the United States of America has in the past been our prerogative here. It looks as though that this is a stupid outlook. The best place to fight one's battle is on the home ground. That, Senator MORSE, is what you are doing. We congratulate you. We are happy that our Senate is no longer a "one man show" with the often stated "rubberstamp."

We just wish to thank you, Senator MORSE. No answer is necessary as you have plenty of other correspondence and time is short.

Very sincerely,

KENNETH H. OAKLEY, M.D.
JESSIE H. OAKLEY.
BETTY L. OAKLEY.PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have watched with great pride your dignified and responsible criticism of the administration policy in Vietnam, and wish you to know that I am in full agreement with you, and have so advised the President.

Respectfully,

Mrs. MILTON D. HYMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 20, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We watch the hearings with interest and some degree of hope. At least there is some honest searching and frank discussion of issues instead of parroting phrases like "Let's stop communism."

We realize you are tired, but encourage you to keep on with the good work.

Sincerely,

ESTHER C. RICHARDS.

ALBANY, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am so proud of the battle you are putting on for the continuance, or should I say, the return to the American tradition.

The applause you drew this morning during the General Taylor hearing was well-deserved and I joined in. When you get into a scrap you are 6 feet tall and as rugged as the forward wall of the Green Bay Packers.

Keep it up, I meet many people during the course of my day and feel them all out on the Vietnam situation; the sentiment is almost unanimous for your stand. Only the obvious sufferers from thyroid imbalance seem to oppose you.

My wife and two sons, aged 10 and 18, join me in hearty thanks for your battle which you now appear to be winning. May God continue to bless us with your service as our Senator.

Very respectfully,

HARRY SMITH.

COOS BAY, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot help but write and tell you that I was proud, very proud, to be a resident of the State of Oregon and an American this afternoon as I watched the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam.

I am of the generation which is sending its members over to that swamp-infested country, 8,000 miles away, to fight for something that the President says is right, and moral, and the American thing to do. I have tried to enlist in the Army, but could not get in because of allergies. I do feel that we should get this damned thing over. Whether this is accomplished by escalation to the point of all-out war, or by withdrawing from a theater where we evidently are neither needed or obligated to be.

I agree with your statement in regards to our being there under the auspices of the SEATO pact. The thing that angers me, is the fact that we are entered into a war and yet there has been no declaration of war, there has been no serious debate in the hallowed Halls of Congress, there has only been the word from the President that this is the thing to do. It is right. I cannot help but feel somewhat of a traitor when I sit here and doubt the word of the President of the United States of America. But I do feel that we as Americans have the right, I might even say the duty, to question each and every administration. For these are but mere men. Even though they are supposed to speak for the mass of Americans, there is always the possibility that they are not now directing this great country of ours in the direction that the bulk of the American people wish.

I am a Republican, but I am an American first, and then a Republican. I do believe that it is the obligation of all Americans to not accept blindly the word of the administration. And this is just what I am doing. I have many friends over there, and a couple have come home the hard way. When I

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3669

heard General Taylor say that the soldiers over in Vietnam would be greatly hurt if they were withdrawn without having won a favorable, I could not help but feel a bit questionable. No man who is in a war wants to go on fighting when he can see no appreciable victory. No man willing wants to kill other men. Sure, this often has to be done, but at times when his home, his family, his country are in danger. But is there such a situation now? No. So why should he feel so let down if his country calls him home? I imagine that he won't.

So I urge you to carry your fight to the American people, and I imagine that you will find that the mass of America is behind you in your feelings about the War in Vietnam. I salute you as an American and as an Oregonian. I say that I am behind you and proud to have you as my Senator.

Sincerely,

LARRY BRENNIMAN.

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a brief note to congratulate you for your courage and strength in standing up for what you feel is right. I'm a graduate student in journalism at the University of Oregon and have been here only 7 or 8 months, but I am proud to feel you are my representative in Congress. You are a U.S. Senator first, Senator from Oregon second, and that is all the difference in the world between yourself and your esteemed colleagues from the deep South.

Keep fighting—there are a good many here at the University who are with you 100 percent. Yours is a voice which will not be forgotten when they write the histories of those men who loved their country and did not want to see it dishonor itself.

Sincerely,

ROSS E. HELLER.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Keep the good work up. We are just two of the many who are in accord with you.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. LLOYD PARKER.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know how much so many people here appreciate your position on Vietnam. You have been absolutely right. As a professor of political science at the university, I can testify that the students and faculty follow your speeches carefully. While not enough of them have spoken out in your support, there are more and more who do so, and that at least is encouraging in these calamitous times.

I am proud of being an Oregonian every time you make a Senate speech on this question. Your courage gives strength to many others, and I believe you are one of the few national leaders who has the respect of the most informed and humane young people.

Thanks for sending us a copy of your recent speech on the Senate floor, that contains so much relevant background information that is so rarely considered. We will use it and pass it on.

Sincerely,

DANIEL GOLDRICH.

MEDFORD, OREG.,

February 17, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my gratitude for your courageous stand with regard to U.S. policy in Vietnam. I know that it is far from a comfortable position to oppose a national policy which often pro-

vides fuel for the passions of jingoists and others with chauvinistic tendencies. It is unfortunate in the extreme that you may be subject to accusations of being a "com-symp," a traitor, and such like foul and unjust vilifications. Such attacks only increase my admiration for you and others who take similar responsibility, if unpopular, positions.

While I realize that we are faced with problems of staggering complexity in southeast Asia, for which no easy solutions exist, and while I do not always agree with your thinking (though I usually do), I strongly feel that you are invaluable to the Nation as "gadfly" and counselor, and I can only hope that your stings and counsels do not go unheeded, for the good of our country and the world.

With you as my Senator, I am indeed proud to be an Oregonian.

Yours very truly,

STEPHEN R. BUNGUM.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I don't quite know how to begin this letter, or rather how to put down in words how I feel.

My son was home for a few days after his basic training. He left last night, rather early this morning for another camp. He will be stationed there for 16 weeks, then God knows where.

He left some notes on how to survive, in case he is sent over. It made me sick when I read them. Not 6 months ago, he was in Bible college studying for the ministry. Now he is taught how to kill or be killed. Is that why we send our boys to school? Just when they know what their goal in life is, it is snatched away? Maybe I sound like a nut but this is how I feel about all of this business.

I have another son home now, but it is a matter of time before he will be called. Which I hope will not happen, but no doubt it will. He also is in college.

But what I would like to know is why our boys have to go, when they haven't even had a chance to live. Is that why we have children? Just to have them leave, not of their own accord, but because they have to? How can they be the citizens of tomorrow, if there is no tomorrow for them?

Sincerely,

A SOLDIER'S MOTHER.

LA GRANDE, OREG.

SIR: Keep up the good work on the Viet situation.

Well done.

C. E. SMITH.

NICHOLAS SMITH.

Mr. and Mrs. BEN HIBB.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I, my wife, and my son (who served over a year in South Vietnam) heartily agree with you and Senator FULBRIGHT that this is an unnecessary and dangerous war and we should stop before we go too far.

Men who fight for right like you, are always in the minority.

We can see that Senator FULBRIGHT too is a man who is concerned, not only with the welfare of the United States but of the whole world.

Lots of luck.

Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD MOEN and SON, ROD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 12, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: I deeply appreciate seeing the Foreign Relations Committee hearings both days on TV channel 8. It was said by Sir Winston Churchill in World War II that "never did a nation, owe so much to a few" in reference to Britain's fighter squad-

dron, I would paraphrase that by saying "never did so many owe so much to any person as you."

I have believed as you that this foreign aid is all wrong. I have great fears that this war could end up in world war III.

We sure owe you a lot and I pray for your good health.

Respectfully,

D. W. SONNELAND.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.

DEAR SIR: Why are we not winning this so-called war in Vietnam? Why are the Vietcong able to ambush the South Vietnamese and our men so often? Is it because our own leaders don't have the cunning and skill to outwit them? Why don't we let Chiang Kai-shek's troops, who are well trained and eager to fight with us, do so? We are supposed to be the richest and strongest country in the world with the biggest fighting forces and yet this war is dragging on and on. Why? If we don't want to win, what are we fighting there for?

Last but not least, has this war been declared? If not, what are we doing there?

Yours truly,

W. M. BRINDLEY.

NEOTSU, OREG.,

February 18, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: I would like to compliment you on your stand in the present so-called war situation and pray that you will receive full backing. You are so very right both from a national and Christian attitude.

I am a Republican yet feel that our country's good exceeds our political support.

Thank you,

MRS. GEORGE F. KOLZOW.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been following the Senate Foreign Relations hearings closely and wish to commend you for your part in obtaining them and also for your most astute remarks during the hearings.

Thank you very much. Your courage and your integrity is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MRS. O. G. ROGERS.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending us your Senate speech of January 19.

We are against this war and agree that we should withdraw. We like the last paragraph of your speech particularly. We are surely great enough not to worry about saving face.

One thing I know. You can't make friends by killing people.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

JEAN H. SUTHERLAND.

FAIRVIEW, OREG.,

February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just wanted to let you know how much the public Senate Foreign Relations Committee has meant to us. Truthfully, I don't think many of the average Americans knew much more about the whole situation than the poor people of South Vietnam that we are supposed to be protecting.

After all, this is a land where we are supposed to have a voice in what goes on in our Government. Many of us are derelict, in not

3670

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

letting you people know how we feel on such subjects.

If we have made a definite commitment, then we must live up to it. However, I certainly can see no point in pouring in thousands upon thousands of more of our young men into a war that has never been termed a war. I'm in full agreement with you.

It seems a shame that when people disagree they are tagged with all sorts of unsavory names, but that seems to be the common thing these days.

One thing that has bothered me quite a bit, I haven't heard much said about it in the committee hearings either; if the South Vietnamese want us there, our form of government and all, why are they not as fanatical as the Vietcong?

Apparently, these Vietcong will go to any lengths to obtain their objectives, even to dying for them. True, I've read about many of the people of South Vietnam dying, but I have heard (or read, I should say) that it is all on their own land, so to speak. Yet, the Vietcong are always making daring raids, even on our own Embassy in Saigon, among other places. Does this sound like a people that really are eager for our form of government?

One of the witnesses, no, I beg your pardon, it was one of the Senators, stated when you talk to the people of the land you find how they really feel. Well, does anyone think it is the little people of the United States that say, "We want to go to war"?

Like you, I don't think we can just draw our troops out but I am very much opposed to escalating the whole thing. To me, it is illegal and should be settled by the United Nations, as you have often said.

There is nothing wrong with an honest disagreement, regardless of who it is with. They have tried to make any disagreement look like an aid to the enemy which is so far from the truth, really.

Thank you for taking the stand you have and may you continue to do so.

Sincerely yours,

BETTY BREWER.

EUGENE, CALIF.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please know that I endorse your legal and moral point of view toward the Vietnam situation.

Yours truly,

LENORAH B. PLATTS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As we reviewed the recent hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on our television today, it was apparent that our Government is leading us on a wrong path.

You, sir, as well as your distinguished colleague and chairman of the committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, stand out as giants among pygmies. Your courage, your logic and your determination to bring the truth to the American people is admirable.

We wish to express our sincere thanks for your truly American, humanitarian point of view. You have our full support on this most important matter to every citizen of this as well as every nation of the world.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE LAPIN.

PAISLEY, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MR. MORSE: Thank God we have a few men left in Congress of your caliber. You seem

to be the only one with any gumption left. Keep up the good work, the American people need more such leaders as yourself.

You can imagine how bitter we are over this war in Vietnam as our son is a freshman in college and now faces being drafted. His hope is to graduate and make a career of the Air Force as a pilot, but now it does not seem likely they will let him finish. In this great Nation where we stress education—why take these boys out of college? We need them educated for future leaders.

Twenty years ago when I attended college the boys were all called including my husband to fight the war to end war. This we did not mind but now to have the same thing happen to our son and to fight a war we have no business to be fighting makes us bitter indeed.

The U.N. should be forced to help in this war or be eliminated as an ineffective organization. Why should we fight the world's battles? After Vietnam there will be others. There is no end. I have yet to talk to one single person in favor of this war. Doesn't the will of the people mean anything or do we have a dictatorship?

Is this the means our President has for creating the Great Society. Kill off enough boys to eliminate unemployment. Make millionaires by all the profits connected with war. Yes, even for us cattle producers it is nice—more food to feed the Army—prices going up but rest assured we would rather have our boys home where they belong than all the profits in the world.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. P. E. BRATTAIN.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to inform you that I support your stand on the issue of Vietnam. I hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT will be able to accomplish that which will be toward the betterment of all.

Thank you and much luck,

Yours very truly,

DVA CONCEPTION.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the Vietnam debate you are saying what needs to be said, and saying it well.

The administration's pronouncements concerning our Asian tragedy have seemed to me to be hollow rationalizations for inept foreign policy management and military prostitution. If the issues were less serious, I would probably be merely embarrassed for the grotesque posture that this country has assumed—but, as it is, I'm dismayed.

I am a hell of a long way from being convinced that a constitutional democracy—a free society—is so anemic and vulnerable that it must apologize for the exercise of restraint and fear the scorn of those who admire brute force. Possibly I'm being overly cynical, but I wonder sometimes whether the commitment we are made so painfully aware of was with the people of Vietnam—or with the Military Establishment and its supporting industries.

We do not want to see an expansion of totalitarian Chinese influence; that is not the issue. But certainly there are alternatives to an aimless, unconstitutional war—a war which, oddly enough, is being waged with a motley group outside the main body we are actually trying to affect. The administration, and many of your colleagues, have not placed any great strain on their imagination in seeking less primitive and more effective

counters to the marriage between Russo-Chinese influence and socio-economic revolution. Somehow we must alienate that affection—and I think we can.

You have my unqualified endorsement in this matter, small measure though it is.

Sincerely,

DAN PEER.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to lend my support to the courageous and honorable stand that you have taken in the U.S. Senate regarding United States involvement in Vietnam. You and Senator FULBRIGHT have ably and eloquently stated the feelings of myself and so many of my friends.

By all means continue your stand, in the hopes that an impression may be made upon the administration. In this endeavor you have my heartfelt thanks and support.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN C. FANTEL.

BEND, OREG.,
February 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Regarding the stand you have taken against the war in Vietnam, I agree with your feelings wholeheartedly. Keep up the good work and get us out of there now.

Very truly yours,

D. W. ELLIOTT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It certainly is heartening to know that someone like you is steadfastly bringing the truth to the American people about Vietnam.

It seems reasonable to assume that millions of Americans voted for President Johnson because of their natural assumption that he would be more reluctant to escalate the conflict in Vietnam than Senator Goldwater. Do you feel that these Americans have much the same aversion to escalation now as they had then? It would seem so. I was wondering how much support the President actually has for his program of escalation.

Some time ago Mr. Walter Lippmann remarked that nothing would excite the admiration of people around the world as much as a policy of restraint on the part of the world's most powerful nation toward a weak nation such as North Vietnam. But perhaps our leaders feel that the real reasons which prompt their actions are too strong for them to exercise restraint. This would indicate an inherent weakness in our position. We are afraid of ideas.

All kindest regards.

NORDIN L. LARSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one of your constituents, I would like to express my support and admiration for the courageous stands which you have taken regarding several of the Johnson administration programs.

Although there are times when I disagree with what you say, I am extremely thankful that we have a man of your caliber in the Senate.

We remember you daily in our prayers, as we do all of our elected officials, that God might direct you in your important and formidable job.

Sincerely,

Rev. W. DOUGLAS THOMPSON.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3671

BURNS, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, have been viewing and listening to the hearings on TV of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Just wanted to send you our congratulations. We are with you, all the way. It is very refreshing to us and others to hear you mention the desires and needs of the American people. The hearings seem to us, to be very conspicuous in the lack or dismissal of this matter.

With our best wishes to you, and kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ANDREW J. SHULL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 17, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Believing as I do that we cannot successfully contain communism by force of arms, I am heartily with you in your stand on Vietnam. In this connection I am enclosing copy of a resolution that came to me from another of your constituents, and I should greatly value your opinion of this paper. In any event, I want you to know that there are those among us who take a vital interest in what you are doing and wish to assure you of our active support.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. M. W. LORENZ.

"RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE MEASURES FOR A PEACEFUL SOLUTION TO THE REVOLUTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

"Whereas the population of Vietnam is 80 percent rural; and

"Whereas most of these people live and work on land which they do not own; and

"Whereas the economic conditions under which they must live as tenants of large landowners are extremely oppressive and the social conditions resulting therefrom are untenable in their indignities inflicted upon these people: Be it therefore

Resolved, That our U.S. Government, and in particular our Department of State, be urged to bring all its influence to bear on the Saigon Government that a decent, practical, and pervasive land reform program be forthwith initiated. This, in the opinion of the petitioner, is the most effective way to end all warlike action in Vietnam, removing the cause thereof, and to secure for the people of these United States not only a tactical, but also a moral victory in southeast Asia."

What is offered here in support of this resolution, has been taken substantially from two publications, one published by our Department of State, the other by the U.S. Operations Mission to Vietnam; it is the terminal report by J. P. Gittinger of December 1959. According to the Department of State, later data on the subject are not available. However, the assumption that conditions after 1959 reverted to those prevailing when Diem came to power, were confirmed by Stephen G. Cary, associate national secretary of the American Friends Service Committee who spent 3 months recently in Vietnam, much of this time in the hamlets.

On page 50 of the Gittinger report we read:

"Traditionally, rents have been 50 percent of the crop for the land alone, with all labor, fertilizer, seeds, draft power, and equipment provided by the tenant or rented at extra cost. Tenants had no security of tenure. The tenants could be removed at the landlords' will as the result of sale, whim, or fancied insult.

"Twelve million people live in this Nation, 9 million of them in rural areas. * * * Approximately 5 million people live in tenant

No. 31—20

households, 3 million comprise landless laborer families, and the remaining 1 million live in owner-operated or landlord households."

And on page 51: "Tenants often own one-tenth or two-tenths of an acre, and may rent another half acre or acre."

On page 1 of the same report: "When the Diem government came to power * * * about 40 percent of the riceland areas was held by some 2,500 individuals—0.025 percent of the rural population."

This is a ratio of 25 landowners for every 100,000 population.

And now quoting from "The Land Problem in the Americas," by Lester D. Mallory, in the State Department Publication No. 7112, released in December 1960, page 15: "Land tenure in Taiwan (Formosa) which the Chiang Kai-shek government found on the island, was such that tenants paid as much as 60 to 70 percent of their main crops in annual rent, and they (likewise) had to buy their own seed, fertilizer, and other necessities."

It can be assumed that in crowded areas in South Vietnam rents are more likely approaching these figures of 60 to 70 percent of the crop than the conservative estimate of 50 percent given in the U.S. Operations Mission report.

From page 16 of the same Department of State publication, we learn that after an extensive land reform program carried through by Chiang in 1949 (and it should be added that this was done for political rather than humanitarian reasons, namely to break the resistance against the Chinese overlords by destroying large Taiwanese landownership, which was the backbone of the resistance), 75 percent of Taiwan's farmers now own all or part of the land they till; the land is being improved, better seed and more modern farm implements are being used, and the farmers are taking an active interest in community affairs and government.

The English publication "Land and Liberty" had this pertinent story in its November-December 1965 issue. It is on an experiment in an Indian village district which a band of young American and English Quakers undertook:

"In 1946 at the village district of Pifa in the Ganges delta, armed with an unusual amount of patience these young Quakers explained their plan to the peasants, fishermen and landlords, and met with general approval and consent. They organized a cooperative enterprise in cultivating the land and in marketing the produce. They set up day schools for the children, evening schools for adults, clinics, etc.

"Progress was slow but sure, there was advance along the whole line.

"Five years after the experiment began, Karl Eskelund, noted traveler and author, visited Pifa and found that the young Quakers had lost heart. At first, both the peasants and the fishermen earned more than ever before. The result was that the landlords raised their rents. The people began to lose courage. What was the use if for all their efforts they got no benefits? The landowners waxed fatter, the peasants and fishermen had no more than they had before. The experiment was soon ended. Perhaps, after all, the old methods were the best."

The patience of the native Asian peasants seems to be surpassed only by the naivete of our foreign aid missions.

Further support of the Saigon government should be conditioned on the prompt introduction of a decent, practical, and pervasive land reform program. This alternative to communism would give new hope to the oppressed toiling masses of the free southeast Asian countries, thus eliminating the cause for the widespread unrest there. An outline of such land reform is contained in the pamphlet, "Indian Village Economy,"

obtainable from Taxpayers Digest, Post Office Box 03066, Portland, Oreg., 97208. Single copies free, additional copies 10 cents each.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family and I wish to add our wholehearted support and praise of your courageous and honest stand on this issue of our involvement in Asia. Until we were able to watch the proceedings on television, our administration's policy by secrecy has been a source of anger and frustration. Such a policy causes a great loss of confidence in an administration that goes contrary to its pre-election promise.

The State of Oregon is extremely proud, and history books of the future will shout the name of its illustrious Senator to the far corners of the world.

With highest regards and heartfelt thanks.

Mr. and Mrs. LOUIS M. ALLARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just want to take this opportunity to commend you on your very able statements made at the recently televised Foreign Relations Committee hearings. As you must be aware, you have growing support from the humble citizens that you represent here in Oregon and speak for throughout this country. Thank God, we have a very factual news media in the national TV industry and we do not have to rely on the kept press that reports the news in this area.

On all sides I now hear from my fellow citizens after watching the debates on the Vietnam war, that you would never suspect that what is being reported in the Journal and Oregonian on your efforts to give Congress a chance to declare itself on this war, was the same thing that we see and hear on TV. Keep up the good work.

In fact Senator, I heard one fellow whom I know, never has supported you with his vote or anything else, unbend enough to speak with grudging admiration in this matter, "Morse is absolutely right on Vietnam issue but it too bad he is from Oregon." I asked why he spoke that way, and he lamely alibied, "Well I disagree with him on so many things, I sort of hoped I could keep it 100 percent."

So, Senator, in closing let me reassure you, that you are picking up more popular support on the Vietnam issue everyday and if the Congress doesn't hurry up and assert itself as the representative of the governed, many can hardly wait to a vote a change in the complexion of the Congress as it is now made up. You might apply that to the executive branch with a great deal of certainty.

Sincerely,

P. C. LEINWEBER.

THE GENEVA ACCORD

According to testimony rendered by Secretary of State Rusk in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building on February 18, 1966, the United States of America and South Vietnam were not signatories to this treaty. It thus appears that the responsibility for enforcement of the treaty is the business of the signators only. If North Vietnam was a signator to this treaty, then legally North Vietnam is entitled to enforce the treaty, which of course North Vietnam is legally doing in the best manner it knows how, and that regardless of its political views. In this sense, the United States and South Vietnam are the violators of that treaty.

ALBERT E. GALLIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

PORTLAND OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to have you as my Senator. You are gaining ground every day in your fight against this preposterous war in Vietnam. I will do all that I can to help you.

Yours very truly,

ROY W. MARVIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my appreciation to you for what you had to say in the hearings on Vietnam. I thought both you and Senator Fulbright were eloquent and what you had to say were the highlights of the hearings.

I think it was a great service to the American people to be able to listen in, for it is the right of the American people to make decisions if, indeed, we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. We cannot let it perish from this earth.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

Mrs. D. A. POWELL.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Even though we have restarted the bombing of North Vietnam, we, the eighth-grade Sunday school class of Trinity Lutheran Church of Astoria, hope that you will help the President find ways to bring peace in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Beth Rasmussen, Sue Howard, Susi Alao, Roberta Hagerup, Bonny Van Osdol, Carl Nyberg, Steve Larson, Jim Herold, Steven Leach, Dan Young, Eighth Graders of Trinity, Mrs. Bruce Pond, Teacher.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have the greatest respect for his opinion and for all those who do not agree with me on this vital issue. This may not be the time for lengthy discussion, but during the course of the debate I think I shall be able to demonstrate that the official pronouncements of our alleged commitment undertaken by President Eisenhower and by two other Presidents did not commit our Nation to send troops into southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I believe that this is an issue which is not exactly as it has been represented.

I do not challenge or question the integrity or the devotion or the honesty of anyone who disagrees with these views. However, there is far more to this issue than appears on the surface. No one detests communism or totalitarianism in any form more than I do.

Brought up in the tradition of freedom and in the practice of all the basic liberties—of speech and press and assembly and worship—we cannot but oppose the advance of communism.

However, Mr. President, we are not going about it in the right way, at the right time, and at the right place, to stop it.

That view is supported by a great number of sincere people, who feel as deeply as does the Senator from Louisiana and as I do.

It would be highly desirable for communism to vanish from the face of the earth, and that we could stop its advance. However, it is my opinion that we are not proceeding in the right way in southeast Asia to halt communism's advance.

I believe, as the debates go on, that the pertinent facts will be further elucidated.

I am hopeful that the discussion will prove valuable in informing the American people. They are entitled to know the pros and cons of the issues that are involved here, both the administration's policy and the modifications that have been proposed by various Senators, and I believe that the overdue debate we have been having has been helpful in enlightening public opinion.

I hope that out of it all will emerge a sounder foreign policy, under which we can get together and achieve the results that we all desire, and that is to get out of our military involvement in southeast Asia as honorably and as quickly as it is possible for us to get out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that the South Vietnamese people have an army in the field of 700,000 men. They are fighting for the defense and the independence and freedom of that country. Those troops are giving a very good account of themselves. I hope that we will hear no more of the argument that the South Vietnamese are not fighting.

Having listed the number of casualties that the army has suffered in fighting for the defense of its country against the Communist aggressive forces, I shall seek to make available for the RECORD the number of casualties that we estimate the Communists have suffered because of the courageous action in the field of this South Vietnamese Army.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1965, which, with the accompanying report; was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated February 9, 1966, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Lee C. White, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce. I report favorably sundry nominations in the Environmental Science Services Administration, and the Coast Guard. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask that these names be placed on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Clinton D. Upham, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Environmental Science Services Administration; and David Gershowitz, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Wing Yuen Wong, also known as Wing Yuen Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S. 2958. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of Little Rock, Ark., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando N. Pino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2960. A bill for the relief of Ilija Georgievski, Marika Georgievski, Mile Georgievski and Suzana Georgievski; and

S. 2961. A bill for the relief of Nishan Cadirci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2962. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request).

S. 2963. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916; and

S. 2964. A bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to permit the Commission to require the carriers in the offshore domestic trade to keep uniform accounts and permit Commission representatives to inspect the accounts and records of such carriers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 2965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit or deduction for certain political contributions made by individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement by him paying tribute to Mr. Aaron J. Racusin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Synopsis of Owen Roberts lecture delivered by Mr. Abba Eban on "Multilateral Diplomacy in the Nuclear Age."

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article written by the president of the Chicago Motor Club entitled "A 60th Anniversary Message From the President, a Proud Look Back—A Confident Look Ahead."

Statement by him on Estonian Independence Day.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, among the millions of words that have been spoken and written about Vietnam, occasionally a clear and lucid exposition breaks through the fog of confusion that has been generated in recent months.

This type of clarity is characteristic of a lead editorial in today's Washington Post, entitled "Speaking of Surrender."

This editorial states in part:

When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese.

The editorial closes as follows:

The power that is demanding a surrender in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the sole representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

If any Member of the Senate disagrees with the statements and conclusions in this editorial, I would hope that he would present, in the Record, the reasons for his disagreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Speaking of Surrender," be printed at this point in the Record.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1966]

SPEAKING OF SURRENDER

It is being widely argued by those who oppose the Government's policies in South Vietnam that we are making the surrender of North Vietnam a condition to negotiations. What the United States is asking of North Vietnam is the cessation of the aggression against South Vietnam—and that does not require any loss of territory, surrender of forces or impairment of sovereignty.

When North Vietnam insists that the United States recognize the National Liberation Front as the sole representative of the

people of South Vietnam, however, it itself is asking for a surrender—an unconditional surrender by the United States and the South Vietnamese. On January 24, Ho Chi Minh sent to 14 Communist countries and other interested parties the letter explicitly making this condition. He said:

"If the United States really wants peace, it must recognize the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam [the political arm of the Vietcong] as the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam and engage in negotiations with it."

It is remarkable that this language has not been recognized by everyone as the equivalent of a surrender ultimatum. The NLF, from the beginning, has been only an arm of North Vietnam. As an Australian Government study pointed out last summer: "The National Liberation Front for the liberation of South Vietnam was established as the instrumentality of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Lao Dong Party, itself the governing party of North Vietnam." New Zealand's white paper on Vietnam pointed out: "The Vietcong military and political apparatus in South Vietnam is an extension of an elaborate military and political structure in North Vietnam." It concludes that "North Vietnam has committed aggression against the Republic of Vietnam under the guise of a 'war of national liberation.'"

It cannot be denied that the NLF, directed from Hanoi, has been able to get numbers of South Vietnamese to join the Vietcong. But it is an organization conceived in Hanoi, as an arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, and as an instrument of the North Vietnam state. Were the United States to agree to recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam, it would be tantamount to recognizing the government of North Vietnam as the "sole" representative of South Vietnam. That, obviously, would be a total surrender.

One could look at such a capitulation in two ways. Those who say we have no stake in Asia and should never have intervened in South Vietnam, still would have to acknowledge that we did intervene and that we made clear commitments of our power by congressional enactment, by treaty and by the declaration of authorized officials. Capitulation of this kind would betray those commitments.

Those who admit we have a stake in Asia and an interest in containing communism there would have to acknowledge the infinite calamity of (in practical effect) surrendering in the field a force of 700,000 men willing to fight on our side in the continuing struggle against aggression in Asia. And that would be but the beginning of our losses. Many others now willing to fight with us, in the face of our withdrawal in South Vietnam, surely would make their accommodation with the forces of aggression on the Asian mainland.

The administration has been reproached for not mobilizing in Asia the sort of an international concert of powers we formed to contain Communist aggression in Europe. We ought to have more allies and more contributions from the allies we have. But we may be sure that whatever international help we now have, we would have less help and fewer allies from now on, in containing Communist aggression in Asia, if we withdrew from South Vietnam under conditions amounting to a surrender.

The power that is demanding a "surrender" in South Vietnam is North Vietnam, when it asks that we recognize the NLF as the "sole" representative of the South Vietnamese people. It is a surrender that would abandon American commitments now and imperil American ability, in the future, to continue any effective resistance to Communist aggression on the Asian mainland.

THE BIG MONEY BEHIND THE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Congress should be aware of the formidable and well-financed forces that are working behind the scenes to win enactment of the Dirksen 1-man 10-vote amendment.

Whitaker and Baxter, the tremendously successful political powerbrokers from California, are putting some impressive muscle into this fight.

They have hired such able and well-connected Democrats as Sam Brightman for a fat \$15,000, and a persuasive and attractive former Democratic staff official. Every Senator who has been here more than 2 or 3 years, knows and likes Rein Vander Zee—as well as others.

If money can do the job, it will be done. The Dirksen forces lost this fight 2 years ago, and again last year. But never—and I mean never—have they been nearly so well organized, so smartly or heavily financed as they now are, or as politically potent. This is going to be a tough hard fight. Those of us who oppose the Dirksen amendment must be prepared to recognize what a power juggernaut we are up against.

Paul Hope, in a recent article published in the Washington Star spelled out the dimensions of this struggle, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

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

DIRKSEN DRIVE PICKS UP HELPER

(By Paul Hope)

A well-heeled and professionally staffed campaign seems to be breathing some life into Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN's effort to lessen the effect of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling.

DIRKSEN is fighting for congressional approval of his constitutional amendment to let the people of each State decide whether they want one house of their legislatures to be apportioned on factors other than population. The Supreme Court has ruled that both the upper and lower houses of State legislatures have to be based as nearly as possible on population.

A Dirksen lieutenant claims the Senator is within three votes of having the two-thirds necessary to get the amendment through the Senate. Last year it failed by seven votes. It is expected to come up again next month.

DIRKSEN claims the Supreme Court ruling, which is throwing control of State legislatures to urban areas, is upsetting the system of checks and balances developed by the Nation's Founding Fathers. He calls the situation the "gravest constitutional issue ever to confront" representative government in the United States.

DIRKSEN's new effort to drum up grassroots and congressional support is being run by a team of professionals out of a five-room suite in a downtown Washington office building.

Those in charge will talk about almost anything but where the money is coming from to finance the operation. Such inquiries are directed to DIRKSEN's office and his office says it's coming from contributions.

It's obvious the campaign is well financed. In charge is Whitaker & Baxter, a San Francisco public relations firm whose services don't come cheap.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3681

live from the Third Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona (Tucson), a U.S. Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Arizona.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah (Salt Lake City), a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah.

Representative D. R. MATTHEWS, Democrat, of Florida (Gainesville), a U.S. Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Florida.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas (Austin), a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas.

JUNE 23, 1965

Dr. Frederick Seitz, Washington, D.C., president, National Academy of Sciences.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland (Havre de Grace), a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland.

Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York (New York City), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of New York.

Representative O. C. FISHER, Democrat, of Texas (San Angelo), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of Texas.

Robert C. Cook, Washington, D.C., president, Population Reference Bureau.

JUNE 29, 1965

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., Palo Alto, Calif., chairman of the 1959 Draper Committee which dealt with military and economic aspects of foreign aid.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Cambridge, Mass., special assistant for science and technology to former President Eisenhower and professor at Harvard.

Dr. John Rock, Brookline, Mass., distinguished Catholic gynecologist and author, a major contributor to the development of the oral contraceptive pill.

JULY 9, 1965

Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former president of Colombia and president of the editorial board of the Latin American magazine *Vision and Progreso*.

Ben H. Bagdikian, Washington, D.C., author of "In the Midst of Plenty: The Poor in America."

JULY 21, 1965

Hon. Kenneth Keating, New York City, national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, former Senator from New York State.

Hon. John Martin, Grand Rapids, Mich., State chairman of the Republican Party of Michigan, attorney.

Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett, Charlotte, N.C., U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

George J. Hecht, New York City, publisher of *Parents' magazine* and chairman of the American Parents Committee.

Gertrude S. Friedman, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., representing the Unitarian Universalist Association.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, JR., Democrat of Michigan (Detroit), a U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

JULY 28, 1965

Hon. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India.

John D. Rockefeller 3d, New York City, chairman of the board of the Population Council.

Dr. Frank Notestein, New York City, president of the Population Council and demographer.

Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, Washington, D.C., president of Resources for the Future, Inc.

AUGUST 10, 1965

Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Washington, D.C., Secretary of the Interior.

Senator PETER H. DOMINICK, Republican of Colorado (Englewood), a U.S. Senator from the State of Colorado.

Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, New York City, gynecologist and obstetrician, president of Planned Parenthood—World Population.

Dr. Ernest M. Solomon, Chicago, Ill., gynecologist and obstetrician, representing the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.

AUGUST 11, 1965

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Washington, D.C., President of Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Fred A. Schumacher, Washington, D.C., executive director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert B. Nelson, Washington, D.C., gynecologist and obstetrician, medical director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Murray Grant, Washington, D.C., Director of Public Health, District of Columbia Department of Health.

AUGUST 17, 1965

Hon. ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Medford, Oreg., a U.S. Representative from Oregon.¹

Dr. Andre Hellegers, Baltimore, Md., associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology, Johns Hopkins University Hospital.

AUGUST 18, 1965

Hon. Marriner Eccles, Salt Lake City, Utah, former Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Board.

Dr. Ernest Lyman Stebbins, Baltimore, Md., dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich., director, Center for Population Planning, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

AUGUST 24, 1965

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., Washington, D.C., director, Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values, Georgetown University Law Center.

Mrs. Birgitta Linner, Uppsala, Sweden, author, family counselor, and teacher.

Mrs. Gabrielle Edgcomb, Washington, D.C., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Mr. William B. Ball, Harrisburg, Pa., general counsel, Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee.

AUGUST 31, 1965

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Cody, Wyo., U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

Dr. Mary Calderone, New York City, executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS).

Henry Caulfield, Washington, D.C., director, Department of the Interior's resources program staff.

James V. Bennett, Kenwood Park, Md., former Director, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.

Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, Washington, D.C., director, automation project, National Education Association; and former dean of education, Syracuse University.

Harold W. Swank, Springfield, Ill., director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1965

Clifford C. Nelson, New York City, president, the American Assembly Columbia University.

Dr. Joseph Hall, Miami, Fla., superintendent, Dade County (Fla.) Schools.

¹ Unable to testify because of illness.

Mrs. Jane Roberts, Miami, Fla., chairman, Dade County (Fla.) Board of Education.

Frank Sloan, Miami, Fla., chief of planning and policy, Dade County (Fla.) Schools.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

Hon. JOHN BRADEMANS, South Bend, Ind., U.S. Representative from Third District of the State of Indiana.

Harold W. Swank, Springfield, Ill., director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Wallace Kuralt, Charlotte, N.C., director, Mecklenburg County Department of Public Welfare.

George Wyman, Albany, N.Y., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare; chairman, American Public Welfare Association Committee on Public Welfare Policy; former director, California State Department of Social Welfare.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1965

Oscar Harkavy, Ph. D., New York City, director, population program, the Ford Foundation.

Bernard Berelson, Ph. D., New York City, vice president, the Population Council.

Irene Tauber, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., senior research demographer, office of population research, Princeton University.

Dr. Jack Lippez, M.D., Buffalo (Kenmore), N.Y., inventor of Lippez Loop, an intrauterine device.

JANUARY 19, 1966

Dr. E. L. Tatum, New York City, N.Y., biologist, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology.

Dr. Dickenson W. Richards, Jr., New York City, N.Y., physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology.

Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, Woods Hole, physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch, New York City, N.Y., physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics.

JANUARY 26, 1966

Mrs. E. T. Chanlett, Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S. delegate to the Inter-American Commission of Women.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser, Chicago, Ill., director, Population Research and Training Center and Chicago Community Inventory, University of Chicago.

Dr. Luigi Mastroianni, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa., primate research with intrauterine devices.

Dr. Roger Lincoln Shinn, New York City, N.Y., professor of applied Christianity and dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; adjunct professor of religion, Columbia University.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mrs. Theodore F. Wallace, Shawnee Mission, former national president, United Church Women, National Council of Churches.

Mr. James MacCracken, New York City, N.Y., executive director, Church World Service Department, Division of Overseas Ministries, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States.

Dr. Raymond Ewell, Buffalo, N.Y., vice president for research, State University of New York, professor of chemistry and chemical engineering, consultant on research to AID, consultant on fertilizer industry for Government of India and for the United Nations.

Dean William E. Moran, Jr., Washington, D.C., Georgetown University School of Foreign Service; president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966

Mr. Richard W. Reuter, Washington, D.C., Assistant Secretary of State for Food for Peace, former executive director of CARE.

Mr. Edwin L. Harper, Fairfax, Va., guest scholar, the Brookings Institution Center for Advanced Study.

Eight people are in the Washington office. Their salaries alone would total in the neighborhood of \$10,000 a month.

Whitaker & Baxter have hired a lobbyist, John Flynn of a Washington law firm, who has listed his fee at \$15,000. Samuel C. Brightman, longtime public relations director for the Democratic National Committee, also has been hired as a part-time consultant.

Rent on the suite amounts to several hundred dollars a month. A massive national distribution of pamphlets and other propaganda is being undertaken, involving large printing and mailing costs.

Television tapes containing messages from Senators and House Members are being distributed free to stations around the country. However, part of that tab is being picked up by the Federal Government, since the tapes are made in Government facilities available to congressmen at minimal costs.

Coordinating the effort in DIRKSEN's office is a Senate employee, Clyde Flynn, Jr., minority counsel for the Senate subcommittee on constitutional amendments, on which DIRKSEN serves.

The top man in the downtown Washington office is Robert M. Smalley, who resigned last year as public relations director for the Republican National Committee to take a job with Whitaker & Baxter. During the 1964 presidential campaign Smalley was press aid to William E. Miller, the GOP vice-presidential candidate.

Another top man is Ernest Tupper, a former lobbyist for the American Can Co., who has a financial consulting business in Washington. Tupper worked for the DIRKSEN amendment last year for the National Commission for Constitutional Government but since efforts have been consolidated he moved over to the Whitaker & Baxter suite.

Another lobbyist for the amendment last year, Rein J. Vander Zee, former top assistant to Bobby Baker in the Senate Democratic leadership office, apparently is not involved in the operation this year.

Among groups supporting the DIRKSEN amendment are the American Farm Bureau Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Smalley says, however, that none of these groups has put up money to finance the Whitaker & Baxter operation.

Arrayed against the Dirksen forces are a host of organizations, many with powerful and well-financed lobbies in Washington. They include labor unions, civil rights groups, the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and the National Committee for Fair Representation. Their coordinator is Lawrence Speiser, Washington representative for the American Civil Liberties Union.

In typical Dirksenese, the Senator from Illinois, in announcing his grassroots drive last month, said his troops were "going forward to meet the infidels."

The leader of the anti-amendment forces, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, declared it was more as though DIRKSEN and his cohorts were "riding off to belabor a dead horse."

Speiser, who said his forces slacked off after the amendment was defeated last year, is taking no chances with DIRKSEN. He is starting to count his senatorial noses to see that some of them haven't got under the Dirksen tent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have a conviction on this subject and a deep feeling concerning it. We feel that this is probably one of the great constitutional crises of the last 100 years. Therefore, we prepare for battle. The trumpets do not give

forth an uncertain sound when we go to battle. Accordingly, we are organized. We are thoroughly organized. We do have outstanding committees in every State, including the State which the Senator from Wisconsin represents in part. We mean to do business.

I do not know that we can persuade my distinguished, affable, and lovable friend from Wisconsin. I trust that we can somehow educate him as to the error of his ways and have him become a repentant sinner and hit the sawdust trail down to the sinner's bench.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the able Senator from Illinois that I very much appreciate his remarks. I say that those of us who do not support the 1-man, 10-vote principle have not given up hope for the Senator from Illinois, that maybe he will listen to us this time and perhaps be persuaded.

Let me also say that, of course, this is a very important issue and the Senator from Illinois has well organized his forces.

There is no question that there is a formidable committee in my State of Wisconsin working for the 1-man, 10-vote principle, but I simply wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what is at stake on this issue, to disclose how much is being spent, and the fact that Whitaker & Baxter who have done an efficient job fighting to kill health legislation and other legislation designed to promote the common welfare are now employed in the battle against equal votes for all Americans.

They have an impressive office and staff working in Washington. Many Senators were not aware of this until recently.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wonder whether there has been filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives any statement of expenses and the source of the funds being used by the committee which the Senator has just been discussing with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The committee of which I am the chairman consist entirely of Members from the Senate and the other body. It is not for us to file the statement. Whitaker and Baxter will have registered any person required by law to do so and they will make their report in due course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will they make their quarterly report as required under the rules of the House of Representatives before this matter comes to a vote, so that the people of the United States and Members of the Senate can see the source of the funds which they receive for their lobbying expenses?

Mr. DIRKSEN. While the Senator raises that question, let me suggest to him that he go over and see brother George Meany and find out how much money they have been spending to resist our efforts, and then we will all work from a common pattern and lay it out where all the American people can see. I am delighted to do it, any old time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made a statement on the amount spent by our side. To the best of my knowledge, we have spent on our side approximately \$600, about \$500 of which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spent in giving lunches for various groups to apprise them of our strategy and what we are doing. I would be surprised if we spent as much as a thousand dollars. On the other hand, the other side simply dwarfs us in the vast amount it has available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is not spending Mr. Meany's money?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. Meany is not to my knowledge spending money on our cause. He is supporting us.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois says in his statement that a financial report of his committee will be made public and available.

Because of the tremendous effort which the committee is putting forth and which is also being put forth by a great number of lobbyists who are being hired for the specific purpose of perpetuating malapportionment, or supporting the Dirksen amendment, I believe that the American people are entitled to know where the funds are coming from and how this specific committee is operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is an educational committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, an educational committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are bringing light to the people, and they are beginning to see.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the distinguished Senator from Illinois use his influence to have the committee file its quarterly report, so that we may take a look at it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I should like to have the Senator from Maryland use his influence with the AFL-CIO, so that they will file their reports.

I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that they are more interested in killing our efforts than they were in connection with the 14(b) effort. Mr. Meany said, before the Industrial Union Council here in Washington, that he would rather see 14(b) run forever. I know where we are going. I know what the objective is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I have 3 more minutes?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, there are a great many organizations, including the League of Women Voters, who are supporting us. They are interested in the Dirksen amendment and also in other legislative proposals. There are organizations like the American Council of Churches, and many others, for example,

who are vitally interested. They maintain that they do file the reports that they are supposed to file, and they do it on a regular basis.

I am concerned with a specific committee, which is soliciting funds throughout the Nation to have a constitutional amendment adopted. It is fairly known that this organization is spending great sums of money and is hiring lobbyists.

We do not know where the money is coming from, or how much money is being spent in connection with this constitutional amendment proposal.

I believe that, in the public interest, the committee should file its quarterly report in time for Congress to learn where the money is coming from.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was a Member of Congress when the Anti-lobbying Act was passed. I helped to write it. I believe I know what the law is. I think I know what reports are required. We are law-abiding citizens, seeking to educate the people on the peril which faces the country. We know when the reports must be filed. And they will be filed in due course.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 17, the 14th consecutive annual Presidential prayer breakfast was held. The breakfast was attended by the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, members of the diplomatic corps, Governors of various States, and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Also there were present presidents of national and international labor unions, outstanding leaders in the field of industry and business, chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, and men of distinction from the courts, communications, and every other phase of our economic life.

We have found this event to be very meaningful, not only to those of us who gather at the breakfast, but also to millions of citizens across this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of the program and proceedings.

There being no objection, the program and the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE 14TH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST PROGRAM 8 a.m.

U.S. Navy Sea Chanters: "Sweet Hour of Prayer."

Presiding: The Honorable FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senate.

Invocation: Lt. Gen. M. H. SILVERTHORN, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

Old Testament reading: Mr. Justice Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Greetings from the House breakfast group: The Honorable ALBERT H. QUIE, Member of Congress.

Greetings from the Senate breakfast group: The Honorable JOHN STENNIS, U.S. Senate.

New Testament reading: The Honorable Henry C. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury.

Prayer for national leaders: Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

Message: Dr. Billy Graham, The President of the United States.

Benediction: Dr. Abraham Vereide.

Closing song: "America."

Senator CARLSON. The invocation will be given by Lt. Gen. M. H. Silverthorn, U.S. Marine Corps, retired.

General SILVERTHORN. May we remain standing, please, and bow our heads in prayer. Our Heavenly Father, we come before Thee this morning fully cognizant of our weaknesses and our shortcomings, but with thankful hearts for the many blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us and upon our country. Instill in us the desire to devote our bodies, our minds, and our spirits in sacrifice and devotion to Thee. Bless this assemblage with Thy Holy Spirit. Teach us the true meaning of Thy way, the truth and the life, so that we shall put aside self and strive for the fulfillment of Thy will. Help each one to realize his role in his own profession, his own family, and with those who look to him for leadership.

Our Father, we ask Thy blessing on all who serve their country, not counting the cost; on all who labor, not asking for any reward save the knowledge that they are obedient to Thee. Oh God, create in the nations of this troubled world that love for Thee and for each other which will unite all men. We ask Thy aid to those who strive for peace, and we pray that Thou wilt transform the hearts of men everywhere that they may exalt peace above war, service above gain, and righteousness above personal glory. We especially ask Thy blessing on our President, upon his advisers, and upon all in authority in every branch of our Government. Fortify and strengthen them with the armor of Thy righteousness.

Father, we thank Thee for this food. As we partake of it to the nourishment of our physical needs, may the spiritual content of our program encourage, strengthen, and fortify our spiritual needs.

These things we ask and do in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Senator CARLSON. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, and all gathered in this Christian fellowship, today we extend to you a special welcome to the 14th annual Presidential prayer breakfast. The occasion which brings us together is unique. People from all backgrounds and countries, as well as people representing many different viewpoints, are actually meeting together in a fellowship made possible by the spirit of Jesus Christ. We're especially pleased to welcome presidents of national and international labor unions, some of the outstanding leaders in the fields of industry and business, the chancellors and presidents from a select number of universities and colleges, the national officers and the State presidents of the U.S. Jaycees, who have done such an outstanding job in encouraging similar breakfasts throughout this Nation. We also recognize this morning the leaders from our courts, our communication networks, as well as a host of others who represent a great cross section of our Nation's life.

The growth of the prayer breakfast movement during these past 14 years has been remarkable. As a result of this breakfast, practically every State in the Union now holds an annual Governor's prayer breakfast with the leaders of that State and others, and literally hundreds of smaller groups are meeting to foster faith and freedom in this land and around the world.

We're especially honored to have such a fine delegation from Canada, headed by the Honorable Paul Hellyer, Minister of Defense.

For the last 2 years, a National Canadian prayer breakfast has been held in Ottawa, which is typical of national prayer breakfasts which are now being held, or are being planned, in countries like Ethiopia, Liberia, Costa Rica, Brazil, Korea, and Japan. Some form of this idea has now spread to over 50 countries and on every continent. There's a growing appreciation for the values that are gained when leaders meet in the spirit of prayer, recognizing that our ultimate hope and trust is in our Lord.

This annual event grew out of the inspiration that has been received in the prayer breakfast groups which meet weekly in the the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives. And in these days, when there's so much confusion and misunderstanding, it is unfortunate that there's still a lack of communication, especially among the leaders of the world, and it's our hope that, through the spirit of Christ and the spirit of prayer, we might bridge the gap between the desire for peace and peace itself. So, in this spirit, I want to extend a most cordial welcome on behalf of the Members of Congress, who annually invite the President of the United States to join them for this occasion.

Vice President HUMPHREY asked that his warmest greetings be conveyed to the international luncheon and breakfast. He congratulates the Christian leadership on its inspired role in strengthening spiritual dialog among the nations, and it is his hope that the power of prayer will be realized and applied to a greater extent than ever before in meeting the great problems of our times.

INTRODUCTION OF HEAD TABLE GUESTS

Dr. Abraham Vereide, secretary general of International Christian Leadership.

Hon. Charles Terry, Governor of the great State of Delaware.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John Gardner.

Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Abe Fortas.

Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Dr. Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa.

Minister of Defense of Canada, the Honorable Paul Hellyer.

Member of Parliament and Under Secretary for Parliamentary Affairs in England, the Honorable George Thomas.

Member of the House of Representatives in Liberia, the Honorable Charles C. Dennis.

Postmaster General, the Honorable Lawrence O'Brien.

Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach.

Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett Smith.

Executive director of International Christian Leadership, Dr. Richard C. Halverson.

I purposely refrained from introducing one man who is not going to appear on the program as one of the speakers, but I assure you we're all indebted to him. We're not only indebted to him this morning, but we have been indebted to him for nine past breakfasts, and I want you to meet the host this morning. You're his guests, we all are, Mr. William C. Jones of California.

The Scripture reading this morning from the Old Testament will be by the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Tom Clark.

Justice CLARK. Mr. President, Senator CARLSON, and my friends. I read from chapter 40 of the book of the Prophet Isaiah:

* * * * *

Senator CARLSON. Every Thursday morning they have a prayer group that meets in the House of Representatives, a very outstanding group. This morning we're going to have greetings from that breakfast group from the Honorable ALBERT QUIE, a Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Representative QUIE. Mr. President, honored guests and friends, I want to bring

February 23, 1966

be taken into consideration. And, from an overall point of view, the relation of military expenditures to the gross national product has considerable significance. The ratio of military expenditures to gross national product was very high during World War II—over 40 percent. After World War II it declined down to less than 5 percent, and it rose again during the Korean military buildup to about 12 percent. In 1965 the ratio was about 7½ percent.

The additional cost of military operations in Vietnam is estimated at a little over \$10 billion, which is something less than 2 percent of the \$700 billion gross national product. While 2 percent sounds like a very small figure, an additional \$10 billion does not seem small. For one thing, it amounts to over 12 percent of the anticipated increase in the total output of our economy, which is operating at close to capacity.

When this \$10 billion is translated into specifics, the proportion increases fast. Set-asides of copper for the military now amount to 6 or 7 percent of overall copper production. And when we consider specific copper products, the problem gets worse—15 percent of the production of magnet wire has been set aside for the military. In the case of flat rolled brass products, set-asides of 17 to 26 percent of 1965 production of those products have been established for ammunition strip alone. In the case of aluminum, set-asides come to about 10 percent overall, and all production of certain heavy aluminum extrusions is scheduled for the military. Computing military needs on percentages of gross national product reminds me of the man who drowned crossing a river with an average depth of 3 feet. The average did not help him much when he got to the middle of the stream.

It is the increase in the demand for specific materials and specific equipment which creates shortages in the civilian market and which forces prices up. With the kinds of pressures I have indicated, it is understandable that the price of copper threatened to go up to such an extent that the President felt compelled to release copper from the national defense stockpile to meet the demand. Aluminum was released from the Defense Production Act inventory because of increasing demand and threatened increases in prices. Every housewife knows that the cost of living is going up. The statistics show a 12-percent increase in wholesale prices of farm products during the past year, an 8-percent increase in processed food prices, and an overall average increase in wholesale prices of 4.6 percent. Every man seeking a new home knows that the price of houses is going up. The statistics show an increase in construction costs at the rate of 5 percent a year and in wages in the construction industry of 6 percent or more a year. These increases in prices and the disclosure in the Federal budget that obligational authority for the present fiscal year is 18 percent above that of the past year are far more important than the relation between the cost of Vietnam and the gross national product.

We also know that the so-called 2-percent war in Vietnam may not stay indefinitely at that figure. At the present time, some 200,000 men have been committed to that struggle. The estimate of future commitments run all the way from 300,000 to 600,000 and the duration of the conflict from 1 more year to 10 or more.

While I intend to vote for every dollar the military needs to back up the brave Americans who are trying to stem the tide of communism in the jungles of southeast Asia, I believe the Federal budget contains other programs which can and should be deferred. I will vote to cut domestic non-essentials rather than raise taxes.

I did not believe Vietnam was the place to make a stand against communism, and in

arriving at that conclusion I had the advice of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, an authority on the subject.

But, now that we have chosen that course, we cannot withdraw until we have convinced the Communists that they cannot win. Then, they may be willing to discuss an honorable and just peace. I pray that day will come soon, for the sake of our boys who are fighting against disease as well as sniper bullets in that malaria-infested jungle country.

As I have said, we face the dangers of inflation because we have seen a rise in the general level of prices. Some economists claim that the creeping inflation which usually accompanies the type of business expansion we have enjoyed for the past 10 years is a price the Nation can afford to pay for economic growth.

The purchasing power of our dollar has declined 15 percent in the past 10 years. That decline in purchasing power is illustrated by E bonds bought 10 years ago, the actual yield of which in present dollars is 1½ percent instead of 3¼ percent. To stimulate sales, the President has increased the interest rate to 4.15 percent but the Treasury was already paying more than that on marketable notes of 5 years or less.

It is the slow but steady erosion of purchasing power that we call creeping inflation. In spite of the increase in the money supply two factors have held down price increases in recent years: (1) Few plants were operating at full capacity, and (2) increased production was running only somewhat ahead of an increase in the money supply.

The type of inflation that goes beyond the creeping stage into the stage of acknowledged damage is the type called demand-pull. Demand-pull inflation is created when the demand for goods and services outstrips the supply and additional money is being fed into the money stream to accentuate the pull. In recent years, production has been rising at the rate of about 4 percent per year. In the past year, output increased about 6 percent while the total of bank deposits and currency increased by 8 percent and at a time when much of our production will be devoted to war supplies.

There is a shortage of skilled workers in many industries and many of our factories are working at full capacity. In a situation of that type, to inject billions of dollars of borrowed money into the money stream, with a continuation of abundant credit, will undoubtedly create serious price increases. No one knows exactly what the deficit for the current fiscal year will be, but it will be much larger than previously anticipated because of war expenditures that will be included in fiscal 1966 instead of fiscal 1967.

Some of the money that the Government will borrow this year may need to come from Federal Reserve banks and for each dollar of Government bonds that a Reserve bank acquires, \$6 of new potential credit is created. Thus the money supply may be increased far above the amount of deficit spending.

Another major problem for this session of the Congress will be bills to increase the powers of the Federal Government at the expense of the States.

An example is the bill to repeal State right-to-work laws.

I am not opposed to organized labor, and there is no evidence that those laws have injured unions. But I believe joining a union should be a voluntary decision of each worker and not something he is compelled by law to do under the threat of losing his job if he refuses.

The Virginia law seeks only to preserve this freedom of choice by the individual, and it is just as explicit in guaranteeing a man's right to join a union, as it is in protecting his right not to join. It is a freedom guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and the Congress has no authority to deny it.

If those of us who opposed repeal of sec-

tion 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law were asking, instead, for a Federal right-to-work law that would ban the union shops everywhere, organized labor might have reason to complain.

But all that section 14(b) does is to preserve the right of each State to decide this question for itself. The advocates of repeal are saying to the 19 right-to-work States, "You must go along with the 31 States which do not have such laws."

In short, the 14(b) repeal bill is just one more step in the steady process of destroying State sovereignty by centering all power in Washington. I am glad that we have defeated the repeal bill for this session.

But this is only one round in the almost endless battle to protect State sovereignty. We are faced with measures to Federalize unemployment compensation, to raise the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage rate and extend its coverage to purely intrastate activities. Finally, we may even be asked to give the Federal Government control over the selection of juries in State courts.

I shall oppose all of these proposals because the remedies are worse than the alleged ills to be cured. They threaten our basic form of government by converting 50 sovereign States into mere segments of a centralized Federal Government.

Payroll taxes to finance social reforms are rising steadily, and the end is not in sight.

Only a few weeks ago the payroll levy on both employers and employees was increased to cover the cost of medicare and other changes made last year in the old-age retirement system.

If this Congress passes a pending bill to establish a new system of supplementary Federal unemployment compensation, the separate payroll taxes for this purpose also would go up substantially, especially if the wage base on which this tax is levied goes up from \$3,000 at present, to \$6,600, as proposed.

Unlike the old-age retirement, this tax is levied only on the employer.

When Congress first passed the Social Security Act more than 30 years ago it levied a Federal tax to induce the States to pass unemployment compensation laws. But most of this tax was credited to the employer to meet his obligations under a State law.

Although the pending bill would leave the State laws in operation, it would superimpose on those laws a schedule of Federal benefits to be paid after an employee had exhausted his period of State payments. My fear is that once we set up this machinery in Washington it will be only a matter of time until the unemployment compensation system is federalized completely.

As long as I have the high honor and the coveted privilege to represent you in the Senate of the United States, I shall exert my best efforts in behalf of sound fiscal policies and for the preservation of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom, which were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our colonial ancestors. And, as I have seen our Government grow from a \$4 billion government when I first entered the Congress, to a \$112 billion government 33 years later, I share the sentiment of the man who said: "Any government big enough to give you all you want is big enough to take all that you have got."

THE REASON WE ARE THERE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am very much troubled by the mounting national debate on Vietnam—not because I would dampen debate. On the contrary, I believe debate is necessary for a full public understanding of any major issue.

But I am troubled because I am so much in disagreement with those who

counsel our Government to pull out of Vietnam, to stop bombings and wait for the other side to agree to meet at a conference table, to dig mole-like holes called enclaves and wait for the other side to attack us.

My concern is deepened because—with the exception of the opportunists and rabble-rousers—many of those who counsel us to stop, pause, or hold up are people of sincerity and integrity. But I disagree with them all the same.

Why?

Because we are a nation born out of a historic struggle for freedom, a struggle predicated on the still controversial proposition that all men are created equal.

For nearly 2 centuries Americans have lived by that proposition and have extended it to mean that people who are created equal are also entitled to exercise their freedom through the orderly processes of self-government.

There has never been any question that Americans would defend their freedom at home. They did it in the 1770's and again in the 1860's.

But there have been many other confrontations elsewhere and on other issues. The principal issue in the War of 1812 was freedom of the seas. Our concern under the Monroe Doctrine was with the freedom of other American nations and we have moved troops often to protect their freedom. Then twice during this century our Nation was involved in major world conflicts to defend freedom abroad against wholesale onslaughts by various aggressors.

But since the Second World War our defense of freedom has had to change as the world grew smaller and as aggressors found new and more sophisticated ways to abridge the rights of man.

At times it was naked aggression, as in Korea. But more often it was through insurgency, subversion, and intimidation. And although the probing finger of the Communist attack has moved from point to point around the world, its effect has always been global and the United States could no more hide from it than could an ostrich whose head was in the sand.

The spearhead of the Communist attack is now directed against South Vietnam, that unfortunate land that is being crossed and re-crossed by contending armies. Our troops are fighting there to honor our general commitment to freedom and our specific commitment to the people of South Vietnam. Those commitments were not made hastily and they will not be broken easily.

Meanwhile, the President of the United States has the awful duty—as did many Presidents before him—to decide when the guns shall fire and when the bombs shall drop.

And we, who have many rights and privileges, also have certain duties. One is to support the commitment to freedom. Another is to hope that our Armed Forces will accomplish their mission and return home. And another is to conduct our affairs at home so that nothing we do will interfere with the first two objectives.

SOUND ECONOMY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is being said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The President's objective is full employment without inflation.

He has asked that wage and price policies of labor and business be responsible, and he is promising that this administration will be "fully responsible."

Commenting on the President's comprehensive Economic Report to Congress, the Philadelphia Inquirer recently said:

It might even be said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The Inquirer added:

Economists are enthusiastically confident of the future.

Because of the light that this editorial focuses on a matter of vital concern to us all, I hereby submit it for inclusion in the Record.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 23, 1966]

PROFILE OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

In his comprehensive economic report to Congress Thursday, President Johnson pronounced the state of the Union's business and financial health to be good and sound.

It might even be said that the economy is as sound as a dollar.

The President did, in fact, temper his generally glowing portrayal of American prosperity with another timely warning about the continuing threat of inflation. He urged again that wage and price policies of labor and business be "responsible," and he made a personal pledge that fiscal policies of his administration will be "fully responsible."

He emphasized that the Government has neither the authority nor the desire to impose statutory controls on wages and prices—but he appealed for public cooperation in exercising voluntary restraints.

This is advice worth heeding by all concerned. There also should be continuing voluntary cooperation by the business and financial community in preventing excessive flow of American dollars abroad, so that the deficit in this country's balance of international payments can be eliminated.

We believe the American people are prepared to accept whatever tax adjustments may be required to do what needs to be done to defend the lines of freedom in Vietnam, or in any other place where this Nation's courage and honor are put to test by the forces of Communist aggression. The President has not yet asked for tax changes of a major nature that would demand substantial sacrifice or inflict real hardship upon the public. In time, however, he may find it necessary, in response to unpredictable events, to do so.

Economists are enthusiastically confident of the future. The domestic indicators support their forecasts. There is, though, the shadow of Vietnam hanging over all.

WHAT A COMMUNIST TAKEOVER WOULD MEAN TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been much conjecture in the ongoing debate on our Vietnamese policy on how we would get along if the Communists should succeed in their ambitions to control all of that troubled land. Not too much thought has been

given to what this event specifically would mean to the South Vietnamese.

In a column which appeared in the Evening Star on Monday, Crosby S. Noyes rectified this situation with a very perceptive look at what a Communist takeover would mean to South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

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

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1966]

FEASIBILITY VERSUS EXTERMINATION

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Of all the issues to emerge so far from the great debate on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the one which causes most trouble might be called the question of feasibility.

Critics of the American effort to contain Communist aggression in southeast Asia almost invariably start from the premise that it can't be done.

Even if they are finally persuaded that the task is feasible from a military standpoint, they remain unconvinced about the possibility of ultimate success. How, they ask, can the United States possibly achieve a stable political solution in Vietnam under the leadership that now seems available?

The question of feasibility, oddly enough, is never raised in connection with the Communist effort in South Vietnam. The military capacity of the Vietcong to "pacify" a country whose people, in the great majority, have resisted the Communist guerrilla forces bitterly for a decade is apparently never questioned. The ability of the leadership in Hanoi to absorb South Vietnam into the disciplined organization that exists in the north is apparently taken as a foregone conclusion.

Critics who boggle at the price of winning the war never think of the price tag that would be attached to a Communist victory in Vietnam. Those who protest most loudly against occasional civilian casualties incurred in fighting the Vietcong would cheerfully condemn a whole population to the tender process which the Communists refer to as "anti-imperialist purification."

The price, conservatively, would be the death of well over a million people. It would mean the systematic destruction of all the major groupings in the South—Buddhists, Catholics, and other religious sects, trade unions, intellectuals and students—all of which have remained strongly anti-Communist.

The purification process also would prove fatal to a large proportion of the leadership of South Vietnam, civilian and military. The landowners and urban bourgeoisie would suffer the fate of all such people with the takeover of a Communist regime. For the anti-Communists of South Vietnam, there would be no Formosa refuge.

The methods used by the Hanoi regime to establish its hold on the people is a matter of historical record. Even in North Vietnam, already partially "purified" for communism by the flight to the South of more than a million refugees in 1954, the toll was impressive. Indeed, it reached the point in 1956 that such a hardened revolutionary as Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap was moved to protest that the regime had "executed too many honest people" and "seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror, which became far too widespread."

Moralists who agonize over the American effort in Vietnam might do well to ponder the morality of abandoning 15 million people to a painful reconciliation with their brothers to the North. The Communists, to be sure,

have no qualms whatever about the feasibility of attaining their objectives in the South. But in fact their problem is enormous, compared with the American problem of helping to restore order and stability in South Vietnam once the military struggle is won.

Under conditions of reasonable security, a stable and representative government in Saigon is by no means impossible. Remarkable progress in this direction was made between 1954 and 1956.

Stable government in South Vietnam was, in fact, an early casualty of the subversive war. The excesses of the Diem regime, his overthrow and the subsequent political upheavals were all the indirect results of Communist pressure. The present government of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, which represents no more than a consensus of top military officers is recognized by everyone, including Ky himself, as a temporary military necessity.

The process of rebuilding, in the opinion of most experts on Vietnam, must be from the ground up, rather than from the top down. In many ways, the central administration in Saigon is less important to good government than the quality of leadership on the provincial, district, and village levels.

Election of top Government officials by universal suffrage is admittedly a difficult process in a country where the average person rarely ventures beyond the confines of his own village. A growing number of experts believe that indirect elections, starting with the selection of village councils and progressing upward through the higher levels of administration to the final designation of national leaders provides the best guarantee of responsible representative government.

Village elections held under the direction of the Ky government last year could represent, then, the start of the political rebuilding process. Even in the midst of war, the Vietnamese themselves are taking steps to restore the legitimacy of their government. And despite the pessimists, there is reasonable hope in Washington for success.

THE PROBLEMS OF WATER SUPPLY AND MANAGEMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today we Americans are facing a national challenge in the mounting problems of water supply and management.

Our water need now stands at 370 billion gallons a day. In 1980—14 years from now—our water need will more than double. By the turn of the century—it will rise to triple what it is now.

In meeting such a monumental challenge we must consider and explore every possibility.

One approach to the problem is the North American Water and Power Alliance, more popularly known as NAWAPA.

Senator FRANK MOSS, my distinguished colleague from Utah, headed a Senate subcommittee that studied the NAWAPA concept, and when I was privileged to be a member of that body, we recommended that further studies be made jointly by the United States and Canada.

There is an excellent article about NAWAPA in the February 14 issue of the National Observer. Written by Patrick Young, I highly recommend it as a reference on a far-reaching resource problem.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the National Observer, Feb. 14, 1966]
WATER IS THE MOST EFFICIENT CROP THEY CAN HARVEST—A DRAMATIC PLAN TO TAP CANADA'S RIVERS FOR A CONTINENT'S NEEDS
(By Patrick Young)

The deep, cool rivers of Canada are drawing covetous glances from some U.S. engineers, who talk of diverting Canadian streams to help slake rapidly expanding American demands for fresh water. And though our northern neighbors are responding to such proposals with the enthusiasm of a man told he must pay authors' taxes, there is a growing feeling in the United States that Canada will eventually find water a profitable export, and agree to the diversion.

This may be years in coming. But Canada's reluctance to part with its water isn't stopping discussion of the proposed North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), an ambitious plan to reverse the flow of several subarctic rivers, and redistribute their waters in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. This fascinating proposal, vast enough to boggle the mind of a Jules Verne, would cost \$100 billion over 30 years. Should it ever reach full development, it would bring major changes to North America's topography.

NAWAPA envisions an Alaskan dam 1,700 feet high, a 500-mile-long reservoir high in the Rocky Mountains of British Columbia, a seaway for oceangoing vessels spanning Canada from the Great Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, and an 80-mile-long tunnel blasted through the Sangre de Cristo Mountains on the New Mexico-Colorado border. NAWAPA's 370 major projects would include 15 reservoirs larger than Hoover Dam's Lake Mead, the Nation's largest manmade lake.

Supporters contend the project would bring new life through irrigation to 86,300 square miles of arid land—an area nearly equal in size to Utah; help flush pollution from the continent's waterways, generate enormous amounts of electric power, and earn \$4 billion a year through the sale of water and electricity. This, they say, would pay for NAWAPA's construction and operating costs.

In all, these backers say, the project would benefit directly one territory and 7 Provinces in Canada, 33 States in the United States, and Mexico's 3 northern States, as well as bring an economic and recreation boom to all three nations.

This concept of a continental redistribution of water is only a few years old. Until the Ralph M. Parsons Co. advanced its proposal in 1964, U.S. water planners talked of transferring water from one river basin to another within the United States, but not of diverting Canadian water.

The proposal often evokes the kind of skepticism people reserve for visionary projects. But many people who have studied NAWAPA think it is feasible.

"The concept is entirely practicable," says Senator FRANK E. MOSS, the Utah Democrat who headed a Senate subcommittee that studied the NAWAPA plan. "There have been enough engineering studies made in broad terms to establish that there is water available that can be transported and stored along the way, and that this is all within economic and engineering reach of our economy right now."

WHY PARSONS IS INTERESTED

Senator MOSS' subcommittee recommended that further studies, including detailed engineering and cost surveys, be made jointly by the United States and Canada. The subcommittee said many water projects proposed by both governments could be integrated into the NAWAPA plan, thus reducing its cost. So far, however, the U.S. State Department has not formally proposed the NAWAPA concept to Canada.

Parsons, of course, is greatly interested in seeing its project developed, and not for al-

truistic reasons. "If they're going to spend a huge amount of money for construction, we're going to get a piece of it," says Ralph M. Parsons, chairman of the worldwide company that bears his name. And there seems little doubt that something must be done about the Nation's water needs, expected to double by 1980 and triple by the year 2000. These demands are particularly great in the Western United States.

"A water crisis is upon us. It will steadily worsen," Senator MOSS' subcommittee said in its report last fall. "So great is the problem and so important its solution that it now has become imperative that consideration be given to what at one time seemed unachievable proposals."

NAWAPA is just such a proposal. It is not, however, a detailed engineering study. The plan was drawn up, without field surveys, on the basis of available topographical and hydrological data. "Everything that's been done has been done with maps," says a Parsons executive. "It's all swivel-chair engineering." And Parsons engineers are the first to concede that their plan needs detailed surveys to fully prove its practicability. "We don't want this thing thought of as a developed plan," Mr. Parsons says.

THE DAM ENVISIONED AT CHITINA

NAWAPA proposes to utilize some of the water that now flows unused into the Bering Sea from the northwest section of North America. High dams in Alaska and Canada's Yukon Territory would create a series of huge, interconnected reservoirs. One of these dams, on the Copper River near Chitina, Alaska, would tower 1,700 feet, nearly twice the height of the world's highest dam (988 feet) now abuilding in Russia.

Water in these manmade lakes would be diverted through rivers, reservoirs, canals, and tunnels as far south as Mexico. For the most part, the flow would be downhill. But, when necessary, powerful pumps would lift the water over mountains and to higher elevations to begin again its downward surge.

The key reservoir in the NAWAPA system would be a 500-mile-long lake in the Rocky Mountain Trench. This deep gorge, 3,000 feet above sea level, would be dammed to form the world's largest manmade lake, holding 518,200,000 acre-feet of water or 16 times the capacity of Lake Mead. Branching off from this lake, the system's major storage point, would be the Canadian-Great Lakes Waterway and the Fraser River. Together they would link the Great Lakes with Vancouver, British Columbia.

Water from the Rocky Mountain Trench could be used to maintain a constant level in the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest. This would assure maximum year-round power output from generating plants on the river, as well as providing flood control.

ONE OF THE GREAT RECREATION LAKES

The Rocky Mountain Trench is adjacent to Canada's Banff and Jasper National Parks. "I see this as one of the greatest recreation lakes in the world," Senator MOSS says. "It would be up against the Canadian Rockies, one of the most spectacular ranges in the world. It could even be a good transportation link between northern and southern British Columbia."

The southern tip of this reservoir would be in northern Montana. From here water would rush southward to be pushed over the mountains of central Idaho by six huge pumping stations. A canal 630 feet wide and 35 feet deep would carry the water into Utah, Nevada, and back into Utah where the water flow would split in two. The Colorado Basin aqueduct would carry water southwest into Nevada, California, and finally Mexico. The southwest aqueduct would flow into Arizona and New Mexico, before branching off into Mexico and looping up into Colorado.

All along this nation-spanning route, water would irrigate new farmland, serve industry, and quench the thirst of cities. Enormous new lakes would be formed—one a few miles north of Las Vegas, another near the Grand Canyon, a third east of Denver. And the water, as it flowed beyond this Nation's border, would enable Mexico to develop eight times the new farmland that Egypt's high dam abuilding at Aswan will provide.

"All three of the Northern States of Mexico are extremely arid, and suffer from a lack of water," Senator Moss says. "If water can be brought here, their agriculture will blossom. And this would help alleviate some of the poverty."

Canada, too, would benefit from the NAWAPA proposal, Senator Moss believes. "First, there is the power produced," he says. "The second thing is irrigation water in the Southern Provinces where they have a drought problem just like our Great Plains. The third is transportation."

The Canadian-Great Lakes Waterway would flow from the Canadian Rockies. Coupled with the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, this 730-foot-wide, 30-foot-deep canal would provide a seaway between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Thus man would create the fabled Northwest Passage, which early European explorers vainly sought.

The waterway would flow into the southern tip of Manitoba's Lake Winnipeg, before eventually emptying into Lake Superior. At Lake Winnipeg's northern tip, the Hudson Bay Seaway would link the waterway with Hudson Bay.

LINKING CANADA TO U.S. RIVERS

A barge canal splitting off from the waterway northwest of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, would flow through North Dakota and Minnesota to Minneapolis on the Mississippi River. This would link Canada to the Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, and Ohio Rivers. Wheat from Canada could flow to the grain elevators of Minneapolis or St. Louis, and steel from Pittsburgh or petroleum products from the gulf coast could be shipped to Canada.

Another segment of the NAWAPA proposal, which could be constructed separately, would harness the waters from rivers south and east of Hudson Bay. The James Bay Seaway would connect Hudson Bay with Lake Huron. Waters from dammed rivers in the mineral-rich Quebec northlands and diverted southwest would form the Knob Lake Barge Canal. The canal would join with the James Bay Seaway near the Quebec-Ontario border.

Controlling the sprawling fingers of NAWAPA would be an immense task, requiring sophisticated analysis of meteorological information, and the water and power demands of various parts of the continent. Water for summer irrigation in Mexico, for example, would have to be released from high-altitude reservoirs in Canada and the northern United States sometime the previous January or February.

To solve these problems, the NAWAPA plan includes a central computer center with a complex network of microwave systems, landlines, and relay stations covering two-thirds of North America. This system would relay the necessary instructions from the center's computers to deliver water when and where it's needed.

Yet even if this complex plan should become reality, it would not solve all this Nation's water ills. "This is not an answer to all the aches and pains," Mr. Parsons says. And Senator Moss agrees. "This concept isn't designed to supplant or make unnecessary efforts to clean up or use our water over again and again," he says.

NAWAPA supporters realize staggering problems must be solved if their plan is to be fulfilled. None will be more difficult than

overcoming Canada's reluctance to participate. The Canadians say there is no such thing as continental water, and they aren't interested in supplying water to the United States if this means Canada might someday suffer.

ACT LIKE SEPARATE KINGDOMS

"While they're trying to make up their mind, they'll naturally barricade themselves behind a negative attitude," says an American long familiar with Canadian affairs. "But to talk about a continental approach to water is useless until you can get the Provinces to agree. They act like separate kingdoms up there."

This, indeed, is particularly true regarding water. The 10 Provinces of Canada control the water within their borders, and they find it nearly impossible to work together in developing this important resource. NAWAPA supporters, however, think at least part of the plan may soon take shape. This is the James Bay Seaway. A Canadian engineer, Thomas Kierans, has proposed a similar project, and there is talk the two plans might be combined to take advantage of the best features of each.

There is yet another reason why some NAWAPA supporters are confident the Canadians will eventually agree. "The almighty dollar always overcomes their prejudices," one of them says. "As we look at this, water is the most efficient crop they can harvest, and it makes sense for them to join in a continental redistribution system."

BANKERS JOIN EDUCATORS IN OPPOSING ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO CUT OFF NDEA STUDENT LOANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, President Johnson, in his budget message submitted last month, indicated that the administration would propose legislation "to shift the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the newly authorized subsidized loan guarantee program" enacted as title IV, part B of the Higher Education Act of 1965—Public Law 89-329. An estimated \$200 million will be borrowed under the National Defense Education Act student loan program during the next fiscal year. I fully favor the subsidized loan guarantee program established last year by the Higher Education Act, but believe the National Defense Education Act program must be funded and carried on, too.

Educators and college administrators throughout the Nation have already voiced their objection to the administration proposal which would oblige needy students to seek guaranteed bank loans to pursue their studies rather than obtaining the necessary funds directly from the colleges administering the National Defense Education Act loan program.

Now, the banking community has added its voice to the chorus of opposition to the administration proposal. While banks are already committed and are supporting the guaranteed loan provisions of the Higher Education Act written into law last year, they are fearful that under the administration proposal "a situation could possibly develop which might jeopardize the inception of the guaranteed loan plan and at the same time not fully serve the important needs of the National Defense Education Act program."

The views of the American Bankers Association on this question have been detailed in a letter to me by Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the American Bankers Association, dated February 16, 1966, be printed in the Record at this point.

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

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., February 16, 1966.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am pleased to respond to your letter of January 27, seeking the views of the American Bankers Association with respect to the plan of the administration, as announced in the President's budget message, to propose legislation shifting the National Defense Education Act student loan program to the guaranteed student loan program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

As you are well aware, this association worked closely with those in the administration and the Congress, including yourself, who were principally responsible for the development of the provisions in the Higher Education Act of 1935 authorizing the new program of guaranteed private loans for college students. We are most interested in seeing that this program is successful and have firmly committed the resources of the association to that end.

The administration's proposal to transfer the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act to the new guarantee plan manifests a confidence in the private financial community which is most gratifying to the American Bankers Association. This expression of confidence in the capacity of the private sector to work with the Federal Government in meeting major national social needs should provide an added incentive for vigorous performance by financial institutions in meeting the loan demands arising from the new guarantee program.

Despite our gratification with the philosophy underlying the administration's recommendation, it is our considered judgment that implementation of that proposal at this time might not be in the best interests of either the National Defense Education Act program or the new guaranteed loan program. It is estimated that the guaranteed loan program may well generate student loan demand in the order of \$500 million for the first academic year of operation. Meeting such an initial demand, with credit resources already under heavy pressure, is going to require a major effort on our part. If, additionally, the \$200 million in anticipated loan demand from the National Defense Education Act program is shifted to the private credit sector, a situation could possibly develop which might jeopardize the inception of the guaranteed loan plan and at the same time not fully serve the important needs of the National Defense Education Act program. In short it would seem that the better course would be for the private sector to concentrate its energies and attention on a successful launching of the guaranteed loan program, and to withhold a decision on the proposed change in the National Defense Education Act loan program until the guaranteed private loan program has gained some experience and maturity.

I hope that these observations are responsive to your question and will be of benefit to you in your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. WALKER.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3713

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the George Washington University, Washington, D.C., bears a name long honored in our country. It is my belief that Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, the new president of this justly famed institution of learning will administer his new duties in a manner which will add luster to its name and will continue and advance the aims and traditions so long associated with its functions.

Those persons not familiar with his background will be interested in learning of Dr. Elliott's intensive career in the area of education.

He was born in Clay County, W. Va., and began his undergraduate work in education at West Virginia Institute of Technology in the town of Montgomery. He continued his studies at Glenville State College, Glenville, W. Va., receiving his bachelor of arts degree from that college in 1937. Afterward, he attended West Virginia University at Morgantown, where he earned his master's degree in education.

Dr. Elliott has been in the education field all of his life, with the exception of the period of his military service during World War II. He received his doctorate from the University of Colorado in 1948, having received some financial assistance under educational provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights.

Dr. Elliott came to the George Washington University from the presidency of the University of Maine; and, in presenting his inaugural address on Monday, February 21, he spoke of the way in which many dissident elements of our present society have used universities in a manner not part of their historical heritage and not integral to their mission. He forcefully stated the imperative need to reserve to our universities their primary reason for existence—the advancement of knowledge.

West Virginia is proud of its native son, and I am confident that the citizens of my State join with me in commending him on the sound philosophy which he stated on the occasion of his assumption of the Office of President of the George Washington University here in the Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that his inaugural address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY LLOYD H. ELLIOTT,
FEBRUARY 21, 1966

Those who build universities are involved in a task that is always incomplete; their fellow-laborers include members of all generations. In joining that large group of men and women who have had a part down through the years in fashioning this distinguished university, I pledge my every effort.

The office to which you have elected me carries in itself a full measure of responsibility but, when coupled as it is with the founding of the Nation, the presidency of the George Washington University brings an even greater dimension of accountability. It was Washington's hope, you will recall, that students from all parts of the country would acquire the habits of good citizenship while being instructed in the arts and sciences.

In paying tribute again to the vision of the leader whose name this institution so proudly bears and, standing behind the seal which carries his profile, I join all friends of this university both far and near in working to realize now the greatness which it will one day attain.

Much has been written in recent years of this instrument of society—the university—in which the George Washington University holds membership. Perhaps there is still room for further dialog.

Traditionally, the university has been required to defend itself against outside intervention. Through the years this intervention has taken different forms. No matter what its origin, it has been aimed generally at restricting academic freedom—the first standard of a university. Many of our institutions must yet today fight continuing battles against such interference. Some of this interference is brought about by those who would make of the university a battleground for the dissident elements of our society. This is not unusual. Opposing groups have always sought to shift the debris of strife from their own doorsteps, and universities sometimes have been offered up on the sacrificial altar.

The university cannot be a tool of government; it cannot be a servant of industry; it must not become the playground of the rich nor the caretaker of the poor—the university cannot, in short, become something it is not, and still remain a university.

I suspect the greatest danger today stems from those who would like to turn the university into a battlefield for causes unrelated to academic freedom and the pursuit of knowledge. The necessities of the university remain the same, however, as in earlier years. They are the knowledge with which to consider the worthy life, the intellectual stimulation necessary to encourage the search, and the community of scholarship in which reason predominates.

The university is, therefore, an inappropriate home for the student who does not study, the professor who does not teach or search for knowledge, or the administrator who does not dedicate himself to the furtherance of the institution.

Given these simple requirements, the university is the proper home for the man who is reaching for something nobler than himself and, while reaching, wishes the guidance of accumulated knowledge and the inspiration of others who are dedicated to the same objective.

There is some danger that today's disorder in the university may render sterile the nourishment that is the heart of intellectual growth. As in earlier days, the university must be protected from such circumvention of its basic purposes.

For some time it has been recognized by most leaders in American society that to a very large degree what happens to America depends on what happens in American education. Business and industry, whether we speak of management training or antipoverty programs, have accepted the economic soundness of this general principle. The principle, of course, is equally sound when applied to the whole world. Namely, to a very great extent what happens to the world, depends upon what happens in educating the world's peoples. We are now hearing voices which suggest that America's relationship with the rest of the world, specifically its foreign aid programs, might appropriately be based on educating insofar as resources and personnel can be organized, the peoples of the world. The reasoning is rather simple and direct. It suggests that understanding is the only real path to a better life; understanding is to be gained through education; therefore, if we would achieve the necessary understanding, we must educate. To all the world we must ascribe our intellectual axiom that the truth will make you free.

Only in this approach can peoples learn the relationship of population to food production, economic problems and cultural pursuits, and the meaning of freedom or justice. Our foreign policy must somehow be extricated from the short-range "crisis to crisis," "brush fire to brush fire" conditions which have plagued us for several decades.

Here at home we are beginning to recognize the promises of a broader base of education. The program labeled Headstart, the efforts in continuing and adult education, the program for retraining workers in our changing society, the multidisciplinary centers being established in metropolitan areas, the special programs for school dropouts, and the seminars on art and music are all evidences of a greater concern for education and training throughout our lives. A program, therefore, of domestic education based on knowledge of human behavior and human needs of all ages as being the most direct path to the Nation's welfare, is gaining acceptance.

Some years ago, we heard a philosophy of education which seemed to say that the formal school, as organized, should be all things to all people. In practice we rejected that philosophy as we must do so today. But education in all its facets, the out-of-school forms coupled with the in-school programs, has emerged as society's chief instrument for its own survival. Public policy, however, is only beginning to recognize that fact. The anthropologist, Margaret Mead, put it in today's perspective when she wrote:

"We must rid ourselves of the idea that anybody can ever finish his education. We cannot give our young people a good education. We can give them some education. We need extended education. We need to set up a program into which people can come at any time in their lives and get as much education as they can take."

America's economic base is now sufficient to release the manpower necessary for implementing a public policy of this kind and the productive power of our society is sufficient to provide the physical facilities and necessary equipment. That which remains is more challenging than that which has been achieved. We must decide now whether we have the moral fortitude to forgo more private pleasures in order to provide for the greater public benefit. Let me turn to another student of contemporary life, this time Walter Lippmann, for the precise statement:

"We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

Having made a case thus far for both a domestic and an international policy based on the achievement of understanding through education, I must now ask the question: What is the objective of the society built on education—the pursuit of truth, wherever it may lead? Its objective is manifold.

It includes a better life, adequate food and shelter, better health, greater control over nature's upheavals, relief from boredom, and a release of man's creative talents. While our objective may be broadly defined, it must rest on simple truths. Understanding comes from a great complex, but Shakespeare warned all when he wrote, "Who understandeth thee not, loves thee not." And while truths may be self-evident, sacred and undeniable, they do not make free those who lack understanding.

This Nation's responsibility to the world will require sacrifice and lives given in service to others; it will require humility, a long-

term commitment, less emphasis on the material things ourselves, and a dedication to these objectives by example on the part of those who would teach the young. Of America it is being asked: Did this Nation come to power too soon? Is the leadership of the world which has been thrust into the hands of this young Nation too much of a responsibility? Is America unable to understand and, therefore, to grasp this leadership? Will America be too slow? Will the United States fail?

When George Washington urged the establishment of a center of learning in the Nation's Capital, did he dream that someday the world's heartbeat would be centered on the banks of the Potomac? Did he foresee, even then, that the university must serve as the world's center for the serious, critical pursuit of truth and knowledge?

Washington was ahead of his time in many areas. It is not too much to believe that his ideas for a college were also in the front ranks. It remains, however, for each generation to preserve the freedom of the university, and to guarantee its health.

Having fashioned an instrument of infinite worth in service to humanity, it remains to be seen whether or not our self-indulgence and the pursuit of private pleasure will prove to be hurdles too great to surmount. Perhaps the real test of civilization is now before the citizens of this Nation. When the work of the few is sufficient to provide for the many, what will happen to enthusiasm, discipline, meditation? Will lives be filled with noise, drivel, and frivolity? Will America have leadership, service, sweat and tears to export when that day comes? What follows when the fatigue of work no longer requires rest? Many peoples of the world do not have such a choice. How will we use our choice?

In order that people may make the reasoned choices, the university must continue to serve as the center for truth and understanding. As knowledge expands and explodes the responsibility of the university for integrity—the responsibility to speak with the unbiased voice of accumulated wisdom—becomes the duality of burden and opportunity.

As John Masefield wrote, "To be a member of one of these great societies must ever be a glad distinction."

To serve this noble institution is both an honor and a burden; and for whatever period it may be my responsibility, I pledge an uncompromising effort to achieve that level of courage and integrity necessary to the highest fulfillment of the office of president of the George Washington University.

CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the President's proposal for an attack on the water pollution problem on a river-basin basis offers an opportunity to take a giant step forward.

Our present pollution control programs are oriented toward the immediate needs of individual cities and municipalities throughout the Nation. While these programs are important and have served a useful purpose, they do not go far enough. We need now a program that will provide Federal assistance in cleaning up an entire river. We can do this if the States and cities will cooperate by taking the necessary action to be sure that the river, once clean, will remain clean. The Federal Government will help to take care of the backlog, so to speak, and the local agencies will then be in a position to control pollution in

the future without further Federal assistance.

The program offers great promise. Its success will depend, of course, on the willingness of the States and local agencies to cooperate and participate in this concentrated attack. They must make plans that are broader than their immediate local needs. They must plan for the entire river basin. Our growing population permits no other course. It will do little good for one city to control the pollutants it dumps into a river if the other cities and communities along the river do not take similar action.

COLD WAR MYTHS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, many observers in foreign countries find U.S. foreign policy out of joint with the times. Our policy strikes them like the clothing fashions of the forties might strike us today: full of melancholy, but bulky, slightly humorous, and ill fitting.

And indeed we are draping today's realities in the raiment of yesterday, clothing uncomfortably complicated facts of life with a black and white view of the world which fit better in the forties than today.

Ronald Steel, an American who has come to this conclusion from the perspective of living in Europe while writing a book about NATO, "The End of Alliance," has contributed to numerous American and English journals. In the current issue of *Commonweal*, he discusses the manner in which we have transferred an eminently successful policy for Europe to the far different climate of Asia, bringing with us all the baggage of outmoded rhetoric. I believe Mr. Steel's article deserves the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Cold War Myths" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLD WAR MYTHS

(By Ronald Steel)

Empires crumble, great leaders rise and fall, but political dogmas carry on, burdening each new generation with the obsessions of the last. The cold war is no exception. With its own set of dogmas evolved in the late 1940's, it has proved remarkably resilient to everything that has happened ever since. The world power structure has gone through an extraordinary upheaval during the past decade, but the popular mythology of the cold war remains solidly in place. Despite recent exercises in myth raking by Senators, journalists, and academicians, most of them are still unbowed, though perhaps a bit worse for wear. Our cold war slogans are comfortable, and like old sweaters, we hate to get rid of them even though they may be full of holes.

Some, of course, like that old standby, the "Sino-Soviet bloc," have had to be regretfully abandoned now that Peking and Moscow are making a public spectacle over their inheritance claims to the new Jerusalem. Others, like the "international Communist conspiracy," although hopelessly outdated, linger on as handy explanations for otherwise depressingly complicated problems. As such they are extremely useful for Republican conventions, Birchite handouts, and congressional joint resolutions. They are not, however, normally taken seriously at the

highest levels of government. There a more sophisticated set of myths remains supreme. As we have learned most recently from the inspirational explanations of our involvement in Vietnam, it is an American responsibility to intervene in the universal struggle between "freedom and communism," on whatever dubious or unfavorable terrain it may take place.

This dogma has a stirring ring, and in touching the proper spirit of moral fervor, it sets all the patriotic glands going. But it also conceals more than it explains about the nature of some of our involvements. It tells us nothing about the new ground of common interest between Russia and America, about the mounting spirit of independence in the satellites and the desire of Europeans on both sides of the Iron Curtain to shake themselves loose from their opposing protectors, about the tidal wave of anticolonialism which is sweeping the Western powers—America included—from their bridgeheads in Africa and Asia, about the convulsions going on within the Communist movement itself as nationalism takes precedence over the demands of Marxist ideology, and about the fact that the "communism" espoused in Belgrade and Hanoi may be just as hostile to Russian or Chinese imperialism as it is to Western intervention.

The conventional cold war labels conceal all this because they are rooted in a view of the world which has not changed to any real degree since 1948 when the Red army seemed ready to march to the channel and swoop a defenseless Western Europe into its paw. From this assumption, which seemed perfectly valid at the time, but which no one any longer considers likely, sprang the NATO alliance, the rearming of Germany, the semi-permanent garrison of 400,000 American soldiers on the Continent, and periodic visions of an Atlantic Community knitting Europe and America together in atomic wedlock around the MLF. The belief that it is America's destiny to remain forever as the nursemaid of Western Europe has struck such deep roots on both sides of the Atlantic that, as that astute observer of our national folklore, D. W. Brogan, has commented, "anyone who resists or even complains is, if not an actual traitor to Western civilization, at least a howling cad."

But even those emotionally chained to the idea of a little Europe divided at the Elbe and nestling obediently under America's wing, are having a hard time reconciling this with the realities of a world which has changed profoundly since the Czech coup and the Korean war. With Europe no longer on her knees, with Russia no longer so menacing, and America no longer invulnerable, the conditions which originally inspired the alliance have disappeared. In their place are ambiguous and shifting relations between three changing powers, America, Europe, and Russia. Now that the two superpowers have become increasingly engaged by their dialog with one another and their preoccupation with a revived China, the Europeans are gradually moving toward a common approach to their own political problems that will of necessity involve a common defense no longer under American direction.

As one of the last monuments to the problems, and the rhetoric, of the late forties, NATO has been made largely irrelevant by its own success and the changing power structure in Europe. Today the whole focus of American interests is switching away from Europe, where the job of containing Russia has been largely achieved and can be taken over by Europeans themselves, to an unstable Asia and a revolution-prone "third world." There the sudden transition from colonialism to independence has been accompanied by virulent nationalism and civil disorders into which the great powers are drawn, or even

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

fling themselves, for fear of losing influence to their rivals.

Consumed by our own quarrels with Russia, we could only see these disorders as part of the universal struggle between freedom and communism. And because that struggle had begun in Europe where the problem was one of defending weakened nations from a powerful Red army breathing down their necks, we let ourselves assume that the same situation applied everywhere else—ignoring that other nations might have reasons of their own for welcoming our military equipment. A military numbers game quite out of touch with the realities of geography and politics, the pactomania of the fifties rested on an obsession with aggression in areas where it was often unlikely and frequently impossible. Trying to reproduce NATO in contexts where virtually none of its elements applied, we somehow never let it sink in that Peru was not really in danger of a Russian invasion, that the only enemies Pakistanis and Indians worried about were one another, or that the states of Indochina were not so much threatened by a Chinese invasion as by the conflict of the great powers that have divided them into rival spheres of influence.

Dulles' pacts, for the most part, have been forgotten by all but that handful of diplomats and generals whose job it is to attend their yearly conferences in such agreeable places as Teheran and Rio. But the dogma that inspired them lives on untouched by the upheavals that have taken place since they were evolved some 15 years ago. The idea that all Communist governments are alike, all of them organized conspiracies equally hostile to American interests, is slowly being scuttled in Europe, but is not even challenged in Asia. There, by treating such Communist nationalists as Ho Chi Minh as agents of Peking, we have managed to reinforce the very Chinese influence in Vietnam we have been trying to combat. And by intervening with our military power in a civil war among Vietnamese, we have polarized the extremes, handed the Communists the banner of nationalism, and made it seem as though we had imperial designs of our own.

The obsession with external aggression which burdened us so long in Europe has now changed its roost to Asia. The analysis is the same; only the object is different. Now that the Russians have begun to mellow, and are joining forces with the West to slam the door on the nuclear club and keep an unruly tiers monde in line, the specter of Cossacks sweeping to the Channel is being replaced by the vision of Mao Tse-tung picking up all the states of Asia from the Bay of Bengal to the Sea of Japan like falling dominoes. While this, to be sure, is an awful prospect, it is not a very likely one, since China has neither the means nor the freedom of action to impose its will on all of Asia. If the Chinese should embark upon a policy of direct aggression against their neighbors, this can be met by a judicious application of American air and sea power—perhaps joined by Russia, which has even more reason to contain China than we do, and other interested nations as well. But fomenting revolutions in unstable countries, however irritating and unfriendly, is not the same as direct aggression. And while the creation of stable, non-Communist governments on the Asian mainland is an eminently desirable goal, it is not one which can be achieved by American military power.

LINGERING DOGMA

The futile attempt to do so in Vietnam is simply the most dramatic example of how the old dogma has lived on to haunt our rhetoric and defeat our diplomacy. Although the postwar world dominated by those twin symbols of intransigence, Dulles and Stalin, has largely been eroded, the facade remains intact in the vocabulary of the outworn doctrines. Largely inappropriate

to the political realities of the world of the sixties, the dogmas remain untouched because they alone explain a good many of our current involvements. Doubly mischievous, they not only inspire interventions of questionable wisdom, but provide the justifications for them once undertaken. "The dogma is," as Richard Rovere has pointed out, "the basis for popular Congressional assent" to most of current American policy, since "almost everything that we do in the mid-sixties * * * must somehow be justified with the rhetoric of the late forties."

It is not only the public, but the policymaker as well who suffers from this cultural lag, for those whose job it is to deal in realities have, in fact, become prisoners of their own rhetoric. So used to explaining every American involvement anywhere in the world—whether it be furnishing Cuban exile pilots to Tshombe or sending a gymnastics instructor to Guatemala—as part of the struggle between freedom and communism, they end up believing themselves the cold war pabulum which they feed the public. The mythmaker becomes a mythmonger, as chained to his myth as Elvis Presley to his guitar. Even if he wanted to, he could not scuttle the old dogma without seeming to betray the very principles which he has been proclaiming to Congress and the voters with such tiresome and predictable ardor.

The mythmonger's excuse for chanting the old dogma, insofar as he himself is aware of its irrelevancy, is that the public is too unsophisticated to understand the nuances of foreign policy. But this, too, may be an old myth that has dragged on indecently long and should be given an early burial. The public is not as stupid as its leaders imagine, and in a good many instances—such as its favorable reception to Senator FULBRIGHT's minor heresies, and even the more fundamental criticisms of our Asian policy made more recently by Senators CHURCH, MORSE, GRUENING, MANSFIELD, and MCGOVERN—may be ahead of official wisdom in its freedom from cant and self-justification. The voters are rarely as chained to any particular line of policy as are the professionals whose job and whose self-respect are attached to those policies, and they are often willing to consider a good many of the unthinkable thoughts still whispered furtively in the corridors of the State Department.

Perhaps we are barking up the wrong tree in blaming the public for hanging onto the old myths. In truth it seems to be the policymaker, not the voter, who sees his assumptions as the epitome of political wisdom. To get him to contemplate the possibility that some of these may be outdated, or actually harmful, is to challenge much that he holds dear. "The really dangerous myths," as Irving Kristol commented aptly, "are not to be found among the unenlightened populace; they are lodged in the uppermost echelons of the government." Prying them loose from that citadel is a task of heroic proportions. It is also one of urgent necessity, for with all the talk of new realities, the old and cherished myths hang on with dogged persistence. Obscuring the real world in a fog of tiresome rhetoric, they hobble the mythmonger even more than a dogma-weary public, and paralyze the vitally needed reassessment of a foreign policy grown desperate and irrelevant.

A STUDENT SPEAKS OUT ON WATER POLLUTION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Linda Olson, a student at the James Madison Junior High School in Appleton, Wis., has written an imaginative and charming essay dramatizing the water pollution crisis now facing this Nation. I commend Linda's essay "Drippy the Rain

Drop" to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DRIPPY THE RAIN DROP
(By Linda Olson)

This is the story of my life. I used to be clean and nice, but now I'm dirty because I fell into the river and got all dirty like the other drips. They all told me that the water was getting dirty because of Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown owned a factory, and he dumped all the mill's waste in the river. Then one day he turned on his water to get a drink, but it was all dirty.

So he went down to the water company and said, "Why is my water all dirty?" Then the man at the company said, "You just make water dirty so why should we clean your water for you?"

Then Mr. Brown said, "I will clean the river if you will clean my water." The man said, "It's a deal."

The very next day he cleaned the river and now the river is clean, and all the drips are, too. Now the sun comes out and gets water, and I'm one of the drips that came back up in the cloud.

ALASKAN NATIVE LEADERS SUPPORT SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President on Monday I spoke of the Bureau of Indian Affairs policy of de facto segregation as practiced in Alaska at the BIA-operated schools. I spoke of the need of regional high schools in Alaska's outlying communities so that our native youth might have greater opportunities to attend high schools closer to their homes. I suggested that regional dormitories be constructed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to house our native youth and in conjunction with the dormitories, construction of regional public high schools so that the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska could attend wholly integrated schools.

In this morning's mail, I received a letter from Mr. Arthur L. Nicholson, the mayor of Bethel, Alaska, which is one of the outlying communities I spoke of on Monday. Mayor Nicholson recently wrote 50 village chiefs in Kuskokwim and the lower Yukon area requesting their views on the matter of native education in Alaska. Mayor Nicholson drafted a model resolution protesting the expansion of the Bureau of Indian Affairs high schools in Alaska and asked the village chiefs and counsels to express their feelings.

Now, I do not agree with that portion of Mayor Nicholson's letter that opposes expansion of the high school at Mount Edgecumbe. I do not agree for the reason that segregated facilities are better than no facilities at all, and as we have about 800 native children who are not afforded the opportunity to attend school anywhere, I strongly support this expansion of the Mount Edgecumbe facilities. This does not mean that I support the idea that Mount Edgecumbe should remain a segregated facility. Within a few city blocks of the Mount Edgecumbe installation is the complete public school system of Sitka. These two school systems

should be combined. These native youth should attend public school with their contemporaries and nonnative children should be admitted to Mount Edgecumbe. It does not make good sense to operate two separate school facilities side by side when a combination of the two would provide integration of the school and greater utilization of financial and professional resources available. This resolution was sent out to the villages on February 3 and within 2 weeks, replies were received from 10 villages that had already approved the resolution. This occurred in an area where mail service is limited to weekly or biweekly deliveries if the weather permits any delivery at all. This action by those village councils reinforces the views I presented here on Monday. These villages and Mayor Nicholson should be commended most highly for their interest in the education of their children and their desire to change the system.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent to me by Mayor Nicholson, the letter Mayor Nicholson sent to the village chiefs, the draft resolution and the list of the village councils who have approved the resolution, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter, the draft resolution, and the list of villages, with dates and names of councilmen, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF BETHEL,
Bethel, Alaska, February 18, 1966.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In an effort to determine the consensus of opinion among the residents of the Kuskokwim and lower Yukon area regarding BIA secondary schools versus State-administered schools, the enclosed memorandum was mailed on February 3, 1966, to 50 villages in this area along with a suggested resolution.

Many of these villages consist of from 1 to not more than 10 families and do not have a village council. They were mailed copies anyway to try to keep them informed.

We have received to this date resolutions from 10 villages. We are enclosing a list of the villages, date of approval, and councilmen who signed the resolution.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR L. NICHOLSON,
Mayor, Bethel, Alaska.

MEMORANDUM

From: Arthur L. Nicholson, mayor, city of Bethel.

To: All village chiefs—Kuskokwim and lower Yukon areas.

Subject: Regional high school.

DEAR VILLAGE CHIEF: The President's budget just submitted to the Congress included over \$7 million for the BIA for the expansion of the school at Mount Edgecumbe.

I do not believe this is what the native people of Alaska want. Neither do I believe it is to their best interest. If this happens it means continuation of and expansion of the present policy of sending the young people away from their homes and families for their secondary education.

I believe that State regional high schools located in the trade areas where these young people have grown up would be much more acceptable and would prepare them much better for a productive and happy life.

The city of Fairbanks is striving for the location of a regional high school there. I believe this is an excellent idea if it is intended for students from that general area. It would be a replacement for the BIA schools and no doubt would offer better educational opportunities in an integrated school. If it is intended that it would serve the entire State this would still require that many of these students be taken away from their homes and families.

I think it would be wise for all village councils to express their feelings on this matter to our State and Federal Government officials without delay.

I am enclosing a copy of a resolution that might be used to assist you. You may use it as it is written or change it any way you wish to express the views of the residents of your village.

The State legislature and the U.S. Congress are in session now and I encourage you to make them aware of your feelings at the earliest time possible. You may send copies directly to these officials yourself or if you wish you may send them to the city of Bethel and we will send them on.

If we are to get a regional high school located in this area, it means that we are all going to have to work together. I would appreciate any ideas you may have for development in the area and would be happy to discuss them with you when you are in Bethel.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR L. NICHOLSON,
Mayor.

A RESOLUTION PROTESTING THE EXPANSION OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS HIGH SCHOOLS AND REQUESTING THAT ADEQUATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS BE PROVIDED BY THE STATE

Whereas the Village Council of ———, being aware of the educational needs of its young people, and

Whereas the only secondary schools open to our young people are located great distances from their homes and families, and

Whereas to enroll into these schools involves a move away from the young students' home area bringing about a feeling of strangeness which detracts from their academic accomplishment, and

Whereas the schools open are completely segregated and not sufficient to the need, either in enrollment or opportunity, and

Whereas the State of Alaska being responsible for the education of all its young people: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Village Council of ———, That:

1. The U.S. congressional delegation from the State of Alaska be requested to oppose any further expansion of the BIA secondary schools for Alaska students but rather that any such funds be to the establishment of State-operated schools.

2. The Governor of the State of Alaska and our legislative representatives be advised of our feelings and requested to locate a State regional high school at Bethel at the earliest date possible for the benefit of the needy students of this area.

Approved this — day of ——— 1966.

Council President,

Councilman.

Councilman.

Councilman.

Councilman.

Councilman.

Councilman.

Councilman.

Villages who have approved the State administered school resolution:

February 8, 1966, Napakiak, councilmen: James Willie, Robert Jimmy Ayagabria, Isaac Paul, Jack Kernak, Petz Andrew, Allen Jimmy, secretary.

February 10, 1966, Kasigluk, councilmen: Irvin Brink, Alexie Pavilla, Jr., Nick Martin, Yaho Tinker, Nicholas Pavilla, Kiilla Slim.

February 7, 1966, Kipnuk, councilmen: Luke Amik, Paul R. Kurnya, Jimmy J. Anoner, Carl Dock, Kay Sukoteuok, Yoku Pavilla, David Martin.

February 12, 1966, Crooked Creek, councilmen: Miskka Andreanoff, Evan Wassily, Golga Sakar, Sr., Andrew Alexie, Onessia Phillips.

February 11, 1966, Akaik, councilmen: John Phillips, vice president; Frank Demantle, Wassilie Evan.

February 11, 1966, Tuntululiak, councilmen: Willie M. Wasslie, John Enock, Katy Green, assistant secretary; Peter Luxie, Paul Andrew, Peter Miller.

February 10, 1966, Platinum, councilmen: James Kassayulle, Robert R. Echuck, Willie Echuck, Henry Williams, Henry Bavilla, Moses Kilbuck.

February 8, 1966, Naspaskiak, councilmen: Alexie K. Evon, Peter Clark, Teddy Clark, Wasley Jones, Peter Pittuska, Zacharies Steven, Nicholas Steven.

February 4, 1966, Kwigillingok, councilmen: Henry K. Evon, Tommy Phillip, Jesse K. Igkurak, Evon Agean, Walter Wallen, Frank M. Andrew, Joe Evon, Roland Phillip.

February 14, 1966, Kaskag, councilmen: Joe McKindy, Willie Pitka, Moses Vaska, Nick Passamika, Wassili Kameroff, Gulga Kameroff, George Ony.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 20th anniversary of the signing into law by President Harry Truman of the Employment Act of 1946.

The significance of this law is not only in the procedures it established but also in its expression of the national concern that those able and willing to work should have an opportunity for employment.

The preamble of the act of 1946 states:

The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

In this declaration of policy, the act stated the responsibility of the Government to review and evaluate economic developments, to analyze economic problems and to recommend methods and procedures by which these problems could be met.

The act established the Council of Economic Advisers, in the executive branch, and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and these groups over the past 20 years have provided a contin-

mons, a fierce and old-fashioned engagement that thwarted an enemy attempt to drive the Yanks off Guadalcanal and into the sea.

The Japanese lost 2 battleships, a cruiser, 2 destroyers, and 12 transports. Something like 24,000 Japanese soldiers aboard the transports were drowned. The United States lost two light cruisers and six destroyers.

The tide of war turned against Japan with the final conquest of Guadalcanal. At this time, the commands of Admiral Nimitz and General of the Army Douglas MacArthur were separated, with Nimitz controlling land as well as sea forces in his area and MacArthur commanding sea and land forces in the South Pacific.

A ROYAL WELCOME

The Joint Chiefs of Staff later reassigned the commands, with MacArthur in charge of all land forces and Nimitz directing sea forces as the drive went forward that finally brought Japan to her knees.

Admiral Nimitz was aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay on September 2, 1945, to witness the formal surrender of Japan. He then returned to the United States and on October 5 received from Washington the greatest welcome the Nation's Capital had given a returning Navy hero since Adm. George Dewey came home after his victory in Manila Bay.

Addressing a joint session of Congress, the tall, white-haired Nimitz talked about the reasons for Japan's defeat, saying:

"Japan, a maritime nation dependent on food and materials from overseas, was stripped of her seapower" while the United States "had the seapower which made it possible to capture—and hold—the bases within Japan's system of inner defenses from which our Army's very long range bombers and other aircraft operated."

He urged Congress and his countrymen to maintain the Nation's seapower that "we may continue to live as free men."

"Seapower is our birthright," he said in another speech that year. "Without seapower we would not be the victors today."

As a young officer, Admiral Nimitz spent much of his career on submarines, and throughout World War II his flag flew from the submarine *Grayling* at Pearl Harbor, amidst the wreckage of ships bombed by the Japanese. He hauled down his flag in giving up his command, and on December 16, 1945, succeeded Adm. Ernest J. King as Chief of Naval Operations, an assignment that lasted for 2 years.

HEADED SECURITY GROUP

In 1951, President Truman appointed Nimitz as Chairman of a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights, an agency that grew out of charges made by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, about Communists in Government.

Admiral Nimitz also served for 8 years on the board of regents of the University of California, and acted as adviser on a motion picture of the life of Revolutionary Naval Hero John Paul Jones.

Chester William Nimitz was born in Fredericksburg, Tex., on February 24, 1885, the son of Chester Bernhard and Anna (Henke) Nimitz. His paternal great-grandparents, Charles Heinrich and Meta (Meirrotte) Nimitz, came from Bremen, Germany, in 1843 and settled in Charleston, S.C. They later moved to Fredericksburg, a town was a large German population situated near the present site of President Lyndon B. Johnson's ranch.

REARED IN TEXAS

The future admiral's father died before he was born, and he was reared by his grandfather at Kerrville, Tex. As a youth, he wanted to go to West Point, but went instead to the U.S. Naval Academy. He was graduated seventh in his class at Annapolis in 1905.

He was assigned to the U.S.S. *Ohio*, and sailed aboard her to the Far East, where she became the flagship of the Asiatic Fleet. In September 1906, he was transferred to the U.S.S. *Baltimore*, and on January 31, 1907, he was commissioned as an ensign. His progression in rank thereafter was steady, and he was promoted to rear admiral on June 23, 1938.

In World War I, he was on submarine duty as aide and later chief of staff to Adm. Samuel S. Robison, commanding the submarine force of the Atlantic Fleet. Then in the post-war years came a course of instruction at the Naval War College in Newport, R.I., and various sea assignments.

In June 1939, Admiral Nimitz became Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department. He held this position at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, he proceeded to Hawaii in the greatest secrecy, in civilian clothes and under an assumed name.

FIVE STARS IN 1944

The ranks of admiral of the fleet and of general of the army, symbolized by five stars, were authorized by Congress in December of 1944.

Admiral Nimitz was the last of the four Navy men who achieved the rank. He was preceded in death by the others—Admirals King and Halsey and Adm. William D. Leahy, personal adviser to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Only two five-star generals remain of the five who held that rank: Dwight D. Eisenhower and Omar Bradley. The others, now dead, were Generals George C. Marshall, Douglas MacArthur and H. H. (Hap) Arnold, who was in command of the wartime Army Air Corps.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

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

SUPPLEMENTARY MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

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. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice in support of this authorization bill.

The bill is recommended unanimously by the 17 members of the Committee on Armed Services.

These 17 members probably have some differences of opinion on whether we should have become committed in South Vietnam in the first instance and about what we should do to bring about an honorable end to the conflict there.

The reporting of this bill without dissent is to me an indication that the com-

mittee has looked upon it as a means of supporting the members of our Armed Forces and of making it possible for the President to negotiate from strength.

If there are Senators who are thinking of opposing this bill to record their displeasure with some aspect of the policies being followed in Vietnam, I urge them to consider how they would construe such opposition if they were on active duty in our Armed Forces and risking their lives in combat in southeast Asia.

If there are some who are tempted to vote "no" in protest against a failure to follow one course or another, I ask that they contemplate how those hostile to us would react to a substantial vote against this bill.

I submit that in such an event our adversaries are likely to be much more obdurate in their refusal to talk peace. If there is even a close vote, these adversaries are much more likely to scorn the diligent efforts of the President to find a solution that maintains our national honor.

The procurement authorization in the pending bill would support appropriations to buy more aircraft, missiles and tracked combat vehicles. Some of these weapons are needed to replace losses already incurred and others are sought to build our strength in case the Vietcong give us no choice except to continue to fight.

The research and development authorization would support a more intense effort to combat the new kind of malaria our forces have encountered in Vietnam. Other research and development objectives include more protective clothing, transportable medical facilities, devices to warn of the presence of a stealthy enemy, better defensive fire for helicopters, adaptations of aircraft to configurations useful in southeast Asia, and improved weapons and ordnance for the fleet.

The construction authorization would facilitate the movement of troops and supplies to southeast Asia and the unloading of weapons and equipment there, and it would provide facilities for our forces stationed in that area and the weapons they must use.

I am convinced the President is relentlessly pursuing an objective of peace with honor. If he succeeds, and we pray that he may, it would be a simple matter to stop the use of any funds authorized but no longer needed for their original purposes. But surely it is better to have the military potential this bill provides and not to need it than to need it and not have it.

As the chairman has suggested, I hope every Member of the Senate will conclude that this is a measure he can conscientiously support without compromising any convictions.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote in favor of S. 2791, the bill authorizing supplemental military appropriations for fiscal year 1966. Approximately one-third of the amount of the funds provided in the bill has already been spent by reason of the conflict in Vietnam. However, my vote will not be a vote approving the present policy of committing hundreds of thousands of our boys to the war in Vietnam.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3721

the high mountain country around Spruce Knob and Spruce Mountain, with beautiful and extensive scenic views; the highly scenic sidewalls of the two main streams; the long vistas of North Mountain, Cave Mountain and other of the high ridges, which appeal to hikers, hunters and sight-seers.

Abundant wildlife roams the forests and mountains. There are impressive geologic formations such as the spires of Seneca Rocks, rising 1,000 feet above the valley floor, also Blue Rock, Castle Rock and Engle Rock, all popular with mountain climbers.

Included are the intriguing Smoke Holes, over which a smoky haze hangs, and Seneca Caverns. Extensive opportunities exist for camping, picnicking, rock hounding and cave exploration.

If the envisioned—and controversial—dam is built at Royal Glen on the South Branch, just below its confluence with the North Fork of the South Branch, it will create a 2,800-acre reservoir on which, dam partisans say, boating would be permitted.

In addition to serving recreational needs, development of the area will provide new jobs and business opportunities in a section of high unemployment.

By 1970, the Forest Service estimates, annual recreational use of the area will amount to 1 million visitor-days and will provide an annual income of from \$6.5 to \$10 million for a part of distressed Appalachia.

DEATH OF ADM. CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I know all in this Chamber were saddened over the death of Adm. Chester William Nimitz. Having had the pleasure of being in charge of some of this Nation's entertainment activities during World War II, I had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with this great man. During our visits to the Pacific, he could not have been more gracious and courteous despite the demands upon his time and the pressures of the war.

Mr. President, Admiral Nimitz' feats will certainly be enshrined in the annals of naval and American history. Given the awesome task of rebuilding our fleet following the devastating attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, he fired our men with new courage and took the steps necessary to assemble the greatest armada under one flag in history. The rest is, although sounding legendary, history.

The battles of the Coral Sea, Midway, and Guadalcanal come readily to mind. It was this last engagement that turned the tide of war against Japan, and, of course, led to the surrender of Japan on the battleship, *Missouri*, on September 2, 1945. Admiral Nimitz rightfully participated in that ceremony.

Mr. President, upon returning to this country, Admiral Nimitz was given a tremendous welcome and invited to address Congress. In this address, he pointed out the importance of seapower in history and, of course, these words certainly have great significance today. Following the war, the five-star admiral was called upon to serve in various positions of responsibility in the Government and also served 8 years on the board of regents of the University of California. Interestingly enough, he also acted as an adviser on the motion picture portraying the life of our great naval hero, John

Paul Jones. Certainly, Mr. President, Admiral Nimitz carried on in the finest traditions of our country and the Navy. His life, like that of John Paul Jones, will serve to inspire countless midshipmen as they continue in the great tradition of the Naval Academy, which Admiral Nimitz loved so dearly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Los Angeles Times and an article from the Washington Post commending Admiral Nimitz be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 22, 1966]

THE WISE LEGACY OF ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Serenely, with the dignity that marked his life, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz died Sunday at his home on the naval reservation on Yerba Buena Island, in San Francisco Bay.

Here was a man, an intellect, a military leader, who led the mightiest fighting fleet ever known—and ruled an area greater than ever entrusted to any one commander.

Admiral Nimitz, a submariner, supervised the Pacific underseas forces that brought Japan to its logistic knees in World War II, many months before the atom bomb administered the coup de grace. He also directed the buildup of an array of land and sea-based airpower that wiped out the enemy's fleets, and completed the devastation of its homeland.

This soft-spoken, introspective officer, therefore, presided over the vast engines of destruction of what mankind hopes was the last of the total wars. (One more global conflict, of course, would indeed be the last.)

Now that Admiral Nimitz has departed, at 80, to the special Valhalla reserved for our national heroes, it might be well to ponder his legacy. To the day of his death, he was an abiding believer in seapower. But he realized, and often said, that seapower must meet the changing strategic needs of our times.

For example, the major element of today's Pacific Fleet stands guard off southeast Asia. Modernized, mobile, it is our reliable backup for Vietnam land operations. Its commitment ranges from pole to pole. And it boasts the first nuclear-driven vessels ordered for the Navy, including the superb carrier *Enterprise*.

We have 56 nuclear submarines at sea; Polaris-armed submarines rim the world's continents.

Our Navy insures that supply lines will remain open between U.S. coastal ports and areas of conflict, large or small, actual or impending.

There is a continuing need to keep the fleet modern, however, despite the existence of missiles and rockets. As Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of Montebello, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has said: "We must be alert to assure that the reluctance of the Defense Department to invest in surface warships does not let our Navy lapse into obsolescence. We must build modern warships for our future Navy—warships with the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 21, 1966]

ADM. CHESTER NIMITZ, 80, DIES—LED HISTORY'S GREATEST FLEET

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Fleet Adm. Chester William Nimitz, the last of America's five-star sailors who distinguished themselves in World War II, died yesterday at his home on Yerba Buena Island, near San Francisco. He was 80.

A Navy spokesman said Admiral Nimitz, who had suffered a cerebral hemorrhage January 3 and was hospitalized for 2 weeks afterward, died of "complications following a stroke."

He had undergone back surgery November 9, 1964, and was in Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland, Calif., for a checkup when he suffered the stroke. President Johnson sent him a telegram at that time praising his "indomitable spirit that gave us hope 20 years ago."

A graveside service and burial with military honors are scheduled for Thursday afternoon at Golden Gate Cemetery in nearby San Bruno.

In World War II Admiral Nimitz had under his command the greatest armada under one flag in history—6,256 ships of all types, and 14,847 combat aircraft. Besides the hundreds of thousands of officers and enlisted men needed to operate and maintain this great force, he had under his command six divisions of U.S. marines.

But this was in August 1945, at the time of Japan's surrender in Tokyo Bay.

When Admiral Nimitz was assigned as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, on December 17, 1941, the large part of America's seapower was a shambles. Ten days before this, Japanese bombers had attacked Pearl Harbor and sunk 18 ships, including 8 battleships—all of the heavyweights that the United States had in the Pacific.

Admiral Nimitz succeeded Adm. Husband Kimmel, who was relieved of his Pacific command after the Japanese attack. It was a painful duty for Nimitz since Kimmel was an old and close friend.

"It might have happened to me," he told the heartbroken Kimmel.

Admiral Nimitz had a formidable job on his hands. He not only had to prevent the Japanese from taking advantage of their Pearl Harbor strike, but also to rob them of the initiative and go on the offensive. Fortunately, his aircraft carriers were at sea when the bombs fell on December 7.

"I have just assumed a great responsibility which I shall do my utmost to discharge," he said on taking command.

He began to make good on that pledge in a spectacular way on May 4, 1942, when American and Japanese forces clashed in the Battle of the Coral Sea. The engagement lasted 5 days, and the consequence was that the Japanese were frustrated in an attempt to bring off a seaborne invasion of Port Moresby, New Guinea.

The Battle of the Coral Sea was fought entirely by naval air forces; at no time was there contact between surface ships, which got into the action only to the extent of firing their antiaircraft guns. The United States lost the aircraft carrier *Lexington* in the fighting, but the threat to Australia and New Zealand had been eliminated for the time being.

A month later, June 4 to 6, came the Battle of Midway in which American carrier planes sank four of Japan's finest and largest carriers and a heavy cruiser. An estimated 4,800 Japanese were killed or drowned.

This battle ended Japan's hopes of taking the Hawaiian Islands, and was a turning point in the war. Some time later, Admiral Nimitz said that after the Coral Sea and Midway victories, it "just became a question of time."

JUDGED CORRECTLY

Naval historians always have considered the Battle of Midway a great test of Admiral Nimitz's nerve and judgment. In ordering Adm. William F. Halsey to take his task force to the waters near Midway Island, he was risking a Japanese attack in some other area—but he had judged correctly that the enemy would strike toward the Central Pacific, and was waiting for him.

In mid-November of 1942, the Americans met the Japanese in the Battle of the Solo-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3723

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I asked the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, when he was before our committee urging that we report the bill:

Do you care to make a statement about how you personally, as Secretary of Defense, would regard this, whether you would regard this as congressional approval of further escalation of our fighting in South Vietnam?

To my question, Secretary McNamara responded:

Unless the legislation is drawn differently than the present draft or unless the legislative situation develops differently than I believe it will, I would not believe this particular action of Congress would affect the question of escalation. I would not consider that the Congress in this action has expressed its will one way or the other, either in favor of or in opposition to escalation.

Also, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the highly respected chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, stated that a vote in favor of the pending bill is not a vote in favor of escalating or expanding the conflict in Vietnam but is merely a vote to authorize funds for our men serving in Vietnam, and that some of that amount has already been spent.

Many thousands of the finest young men who have ever served in our Armed Forces anywhere are now serving in Vietnam. I spent from September 28 to October 19, 1965, in southeast Asia. I visited every area of South Vietnam, including every Air Force base. I spoke with many GI's from my State of Ohio. With deep sadness, I have written to the mothers, fathers, and wives of a number of these boys from Ohio who were later killed in Vietnam.

Mr. President, those men did not ask to be sent overseas. Many of them have been killed or wounded or have been afflicted with malaria in its most virulent form. They have been exposed to other tropical diseases against which we Americans seem to have little or no immunity. They did not go over there of their free will. Therefore, we owe them the duty, so long as they are there, to provide them with the utmost support. That is the least we can do for those young men who are committed by this administration to conflict. It is better to provide those young men with more than they need rather than with less. So, of course I support measures for their welfare while they are involved in the fighting.

At the same time, I repudiate any suggestion that Americans in Congress and out of Congress have no reason to be critical of the policies of President Johnson and the militarists who seem to have had the President's ear to a far greater degree than they had with his immediate predecessors in the White House. I repudiate any suggestion that we lack patriotism.

By the way, a century and a quarter ago, a Member of the House of Representatives, Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, strongly and vehemently opposed a declaration of war by our Government against the Republic of Mexico.

His was the leading voice in Congress at that time against the Mexican War. Lincoln was vilified and denounced by

the flag wavers in the House of Representatives who questioned his patriotism. Time and events have proved his greatness.

Last week, at Atlanta, Ga., Secretary of State Rusk made another "warhawk" speech. He announced that neither international opinion nor dissension at home would cause the United States to halt its present policy in Vietnam. He told those who attended the meeting that the United States has a commitment in Vietnam, a commitment signed by three Presidents. It is evident that he referred to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. But it has been stated many times in this Chamber, and can readily be proved, that President Eisenhower made no commitment whatever to involve our forces in combat overseas. On the day he left the White House, the United States had only 685 military advisers in Vietnam. He distinctly stated, time and again, that it was the responsibility of the Government of South Vietnam to prosecute the war there.

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He claims to control only 700 of 2,600 villages in South Vietnam. He could not remain in power 1 month except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

It is historically incorrect to state that the United States was committed to combat in Vietnam by President Kennedy who said:

Transforming Vietnam into a Western redoubt is ridiculous.

Also, shortly before his assassination, our late great President, John F. Kennedy, said:

I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government [of South Vietnam] to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists.

We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the Government had gotten out of touch with the people.

There is no commitment whatever there. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not being entirely truthful with the

American people when he states that there is such a commitment.

It occurs to me that I would sleep better at night if Dean Rusk were not the Secretary of State of the United States. I am perhaps paraphrasing the statement of Jack Valenti, special assistant to the President, a dedicated public servant and a very fine man, in a speech he made not long ago when I say that frankly, I would sleep better tonight and every night, if someone else were Secretary of State. I am sure that many thousands of American parents of the more than 210,000 boys presently in the poisonous jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam—a nation that is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States—would sleep better at night if some outstanding American civilian leader were Secretary of State, rather than Dean Rusk, who is the leading war hawk in the President's Cabinet.

Recently Secretary Rusk was asked:

In connection with any conference for a cease-fire or an armistice in Vietnam, would you be agreeable to permitting representatives of the Vietcong to sit at the conference table?

Dean Rusk said:

I would have to consider that.

He refused to answer that question. He has stated on other occasions that he would be opposed to such a course of action. Yet our President in recent addresses has represented to the American people that he, in the quest for peace, will go anywhere and meet with anyone.

Every knowledgeable person in the United States knows that there can be no cease-fire or armistice in Vietnam unless the representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so called, are included as delegates at that conference.

They should be included not as part of the Hanoi delegation but as independent delegates.

I would sleep better at night if we had some outstanding American appointed by our President as Secretary of State, after the President wrote a "Dear Dean" letter to eliminate this warhawk Secretary of State from his Cabinet.

I can name three outstanding Americans. I realize that it is perhaps effrontery for a humble Member of the legislative branch of the Government to make such a suggestion to our President.

There are many outstanding American civilian leaders, men of achievement, any one of whom would make a great Secretary of State.

Averell Harriman would certainly be an excellent and outstanding Secretary of State. It is well known that three Presidents, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and the late great President John F. Kennedy, tried to secure a limited nuclear test ban treaty. We failed to accomplish this until the matter was placed under the leadership of Averell Harriman. There has been no violation of that limited nuclear test ban treaty which was achieved by this great civilian leader, former Governor, man of attainment, and presently roving Ambassador at Large of the United States.

Another great American civilian leader who would have the respect of our coun-

try if he were Secretary of State would be the former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg.

Mr. President, there are a number of U.S. Senators whose life achievements and outstanding patriotism are so unquestioned that there is no doubt but that they would make fine Secretaries of State. One such U.S. Senator whose name occurs to me is the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Secretary of State Rusk has said repeatedly—and I have heard him say it so many times I feel like telling him it is time to stop playing his worn-out record:

If the neighbors to the North will stop their aggression in South Vietnam, then immediately we will withdraw our Armed Forces from South Vietnam.

I saw an officers' club being erected at Cam Ranh Bay. It seems to me that the club now being constructed would last in perpetuity. We are building permanent bases at Cam Ranh Bay and elsewhere in Vietnam and others in Thailand. It appears that we intend to be there for a long time.

Mr. President, after 1 or 2 weeks in southeast Asia, what I observe and caused me to change my mind about many things.

For example, I learned firsthand that the forces of the National Liberation Front, which is the official Vietcong organization in South Vietnam, were not infiltrators from the north, and that the bulk of them were not Communists. The NLF has representatives in various Asiatic, African, and European capitals.

Secretary Rusk, however, evades the question as to whether they should sit in a conference. Instead, his argument is that Hanoi represents the Vietcong, because of the close ties between the Vietcong and Hanoi.

Mr. President, our American Revolutionary War could properly be termed a national war of liberation. According to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, George Washington, when he crossed the Delaware River with his forces on Christmas night, was guilty of making a sneak attack. In almost every public speech our warhawk Secretary of State has made, that I have read, he refers to "sneak attack"—"the sneak attack at Pleiku," and sneak attacks elsewhere by the Vietcong.

Well, on Christmas night, in the darkness, Gen. George Washington took his little force across the Delaware River. We Americans do not consider that he made a sneak attack when he attacked the Hessians at Trenton, killed their leader, Colonel Rall, and captured 2,000 of them. We Americans consider that a great victory, and a turning point of the revolution.

I have suggested that I would sleep better at night if any one of three outstanding civilians in our country were Secretary of State instead of Dean Rusk. I see before me Senators whom I would like to see in that capacity.

One is the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL],

to whom I adverted a few moments ago, and whom I hold in highest admiration. But, of course, he has a sure and certain seat in the U.S. Senate. He is the greatest vote getter in the South. I happened to be in a delegation to a Democratic National Convention from my State of Ohio that cast some votes for him for nominee for President of the United States some years ago. I know that his work is too important and he is too highly respected and honored by his Senate colleagues to consider leaving the Senate to serve as Secretary of State; but I am merely naming him as one of three distinguished Americans who, I feel, would have the confidence of the American people.

Secretary of State Rusk stated that the National Liberation Front was not duly elected by anyone in South Vietnam. Was Prime Minister Ky, this flamboyant air marshal, so called, of the Saigon government of South Vietnam elected? He was made Prime Minister by 10 generals who overthrew the civilian authority in the Saigon government, and he has been in power since, bolstered up, of course, by our CIA and by the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Ohio mind yielding to me?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator. I think he knows that he is one of the great sources of inspiration to the senior Senator from Oregon, and has been for a long, long time, particularly in connection with the views of the Senator from Ohio on foreign policy. I have said out of his presence, and I say now in his presence, that he, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], whom I see on the floor, and certain other Senators, have been my leaders in this field.

I was particularly interested in the Senator's comments about the position that the Secretary of State has taken in regard to the foreign policy of the United States in South Vietnam.

Does the Senator from Ohio share my interpretation of the policies of the Secretary of State in connection with his testimony the other day, when he pointed out that we have some 40 security pact commitments around the world, and does he share my understanding, subject to further clarification by the Secretary of State, that he would have us move in with American troops to enforce those security pacts if, in any of those underdeveloped areas of the world, a civil war breaks out, there is some challenge to an existing government, and we decide to support that existing government? Does the Senator share my view that apparently the Secretary of State's doctrine, as Mr. Reston referred to it the other day as the "Rusk doctrine," means that the people of our country can look forward to the commitment of thousands of American boys dying all around the world in case an issue is raised under any of those security pacts.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I share the Senator's apprehension. I share his views. That is precisely the import of the Rusk doctrine which draws no distinction whatsoever between powerful,

industrial democratic states in Europe, and weak, underdeveloped, undemocratic states in Asia.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that the Secretary of State relies heavily upon the so-called Tonkin Bay resolution of August 1964. The Senator will recall that I asked the Secretary of State if he thought the vote would have been the same in the Senate had the Senate known that instead of having 20,900 troops there at the time of that resolution, we would have 205,000 in South Vietnam today plus an additional many thousands, making a total of some 305,000, if we count the Navy personnel now in the waters of that area, and the troops we have in Thailand and other surrounding areas.

Does not the Senator share my viewpoint that if the Senate knew at that time, in the course of 18 months, that we would have in the neighborhood of 300,000 American boys there, risking their lives in support of what the Senator has referred to as the South Vietnamese Government which is not even covered by the Geneva accords, that the vote might have been different?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. In connection with the kind words of the Senator from Ohio concerning the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that he was part of an Ohio delegation which once voted for the Senator from Georgia for President, I would add that if the Senator from Georgia had been Secretary of State or President at that time, we would not now be in the mess we are in southeast Asia today, because he opposed our military commitment. However, he may feel, having been committed, that we would have to go ahead; but, at that time, he was utterly opposed and so stated on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Georgia therefore deserves the congratulations and thanks of all of us for the stand which he would have exercised, had he been in power to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will permit me to express my humble thanks and deep appreciation for the very complimentary statements made about me.

It is true that I did strongly oppose becoming involved in Vietnam, even in a limited war, at the outset.

However, after we became involved, I must say in all candor that my views are completely different from those of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alaska as to how we could extricate ourselves.

I am looking for someone to come forward with a magic formula to permit us to get out of this situation with honor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course, I had knowledge of the views of the Senator from Georgia regarding our initial involvement in Vietnam.

As a student of history, I know that at the time John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower had come to a meeting of the minds that we would send in our paratroopers and airplanes to the rescue

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3725

of Dienbienphu, trying to make a last minute effort to save the French colonial empire, the Senator from Georgia's strong views against that operation prevailed. His strong views also had important backers in Europe among our allies. Anthony Eden, then Foreign Minister of Great Britain, and Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, manifested a feeling of outrage that we would even think of sending in our Armed Forces at that time.

We refused to sign the Geneva accords in 1954 which provided that there would be an election in Vietnam—not in South Vietnam or in North Vietnam, but in Vietnam—and, it was agreed in that agreement that the line of the 17th parallel was not a boundary which separated the country but was an artificial demarcation line. The Geneva accords provided for a free election in Vietnam. Then, after the CIA and others got through, it was called off and that free election was never held.

President Eisenhower, in his memoirs stated that had the election been held in accordance with the Geneva accords, then, in his opinion, Ho Chi Minh would have received 80 percent of the vote.

Mr. President, recently, an argument has been advanced in the Senate and elsewhere which has no validity whatever I believe, and this is another of the straws at which Secretary of State Dean Rusk has clutched.

He refers to the SEATO treaty which this Nation entered into in 1954. The SEATO collective defense treaty was signed by eight nations. We signed. Australia and New Zealand were signers. Australia has sent 850 combat troops to our aid in Vietnam. New Zealand has sent a token force of 200 men.

Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, France, and Great Britain, also signed that agreement, but not one of them has sent a combat soldier to our aid. The nations who are closest to the scene of the trouble and would have the most to fear if there were real aggression to face, have not sent in one soldier.

Pakistan has refused and is unfriendly toward us.

In the Republic of the Philippines recently, there were demonstrations against us. To date, they have not sent in any soldiers.

The Kingdom of Thailand has not sent one soldier to our aid.

From Great Britain, none.

From France, none—nothing except hostility toward us.

This treaty provides that "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."

Mr. President, it is noteworthy to mention that Vietnam is not a party to this treaty. It is also noteworthy to mention in passing that there have been no unanimous agreements entered into pursuant to the provisions of this treaty. It is noteworthy to mention that the SEATO Treaty has never been

invoked with reference to Vietnam. This is an argument which just has no validity whatever.

Here we are, the most powerful nation in the world, a nation whose Navy is greater and has more firepower than the navies of all the other nations of the world combined, an Air Force that is superior to that of all other nations combined; and yet there are some misguided people who seem to feel that Saigon is necessary to the defense of Seattle. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Mr. President, let us try to be optimistic. Let us hope that reason will prevail instead of the pronouncements of the warhawks such as Dean Rusk. Let us hope that there may be a conference and a cease-fire or armistice worked out, whether it is done under the auspices of the United Nations, the International Control Commission, or a reconvened Geneva Conference. Of course, should there eventually be a free election in Vietnam under the supervision of one of these organizations, then we must abide by the results.

When I was in Asia, there were anti-American riots raging in Japan, where we have spent \$6 billion of American taxpayers' money building up that nation, and where there are now 250,000 men in her armed forces. They are rioting against us. They are telling the world through their newspapers that the United States is the only nation in the world that used the atomic bomb in warfare, and that it did not use it against the Germans, but used it against the yellow race.

This is the kind of trouble we are in in Asia, because of the belligerence and the thoughtless attitudes of men like Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio. The courageous voice of the Senator from Ohio has been raised once again, as he had raised it before, against the mistaken course of action of our country in southeast Asia.

I said earlier he is a source of inspiration to me. This speech will be studied by American students of history after he and I have long left the scene; but it is appropriate today that his voice be raised again, because there are thunderous attempts being made, and being applied to the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Oregon, and the rest of us who are protesting this executive war of the United States in southeast Asia, which in our opinion, is against the public interest of this country, to deny the American people our side of the case.

But with fearless men such as the Senator from Ohio speaking out on this subject, I think many people are going to come to realize there is another side, and that the propaganda and pressure of the Johnson administration will not succeed in denying to the American people the chance to hear the other side on this issue.

I want to thank the Senator from Ohio for his courage. I want to thank him for his comments, with which I associate myself. In my opinion, he has performed a service for this Republic by this fearless speech.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I support S. 2791 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and I regret the delay which has attended the passage of this vital measure.

Although I attended and participated in all of the hearings on S. 2791 held by the Armed Services Committee, it had not been my original intention to speak on the floor of the Senate with regard to the bill. Time is an important factor in connection with this authorization, and I shall have more to say on this during this address. The report of the committee on the bill is adequate and self-explanatory, and, as I had anticipated, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has ably managed this measure which the committee has recommended for passage without dissent.

In view of the course and tenor of the debate in the Senate since this measure was made the pending business, however, I feel compelled to comment not only on the bill itself, but also, and particularly, on some of the matters raised in the debate.

Mr. President, S. 2791 is a military authorization bill. It is not a foreign policy declaration. It is designed to meet urgent needs of our Defense Establishment. It is necessitated because the regular military authorization legislation for fiscal year 1966 proved to be inadequate, and, indeed, was acknowledged to be inadequate at the time it was acted upon by the Congress. It was well known at the time the regular military authorization for fiscal year 1966 was before the Congress last year that a very substantial supplemental authorization and appropriation would be necessary in the early part of this second session.

The authorizations in S. 2791 are for fiscal year 1966, of which there are now only slightly more than 4 months remaining. Even after the authorization before us is passed, implementation cannot be accomplished until the supplemental appropriation is considered and passed also.

In short, time is of the essence.

In truth, the only relevant issue raised by S. 2791 is its adequacy. As the distinguished chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee has pointed out frequently in recent months, the subcommittee has found evidence that raises serious questions as to the sufficiency of military authorizations and appropriation requests in years prior to our Vietnam buildup, for the attainment and maintenance of Army modernizations and readiness at the level then required by our commitments. This situation has been accentuated, to say the least, by the substantial increase in our force commitments in southeast Asia.

Even when the situation in southeast Asia required only a token commitment of U.S. defense forces, we deemed it essential to maintain within the United

States and in other areas of the world a very substantial Defense Establishment. The escalation of the war in Vietnam has in no way obviated the necessity for maintaining these forces at the same level, over and above that portion of our Defense Establishment preoccupied with the war in southeast Asia.

Not only is it necessary to provide in full measure the material required by our fighting men in southeast Asia, but it is also necessary that the material diverted and withdrawn from stocks and from units not committed to Vietnam be replaced. It is also necessary to prepare against the contingency that the war in southeast Asia will escalate further. It is well to hope for the best, but the only safe course is to prepare for the worst.

As the hearings on S. 2791 reveal, production of military material has been increased in some areas, and will be increased in other areas as a consequence of this authorization and the supplemental appropriation to follow. There is a serious question, however, as to whether our production base has been and is being broadened by the opening of additional production lines and alternate sources of procurement to the extent which probable future contingencies now appear to make prudent.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a relevant news article written by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, entitled "U.S. Combat Forces Spread Thin," which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1966, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am of the opinion, based on the evidence which is available, that there have been serious shortcomings in our preparedness efforts in recent years which bear materially on our capability to meet our commitments in Vietnam and worldwide. I am also convinced that unless these shortcomings are corrected more rapidly and with a more acute appreciation of the peril caused by them than has been evidenced to date, we are likely to suffer substantially as a result.

Despite the relevancy of the issue of the adequacy of this military authorization bill, I do not believe that it is appropriate to debate this matter in any detail on the Senate floor in connection with the bill. Any such debate, if it were meaningful, would necessitate the discussion of specifics, the revelation of which might well, and probably would, be of value and assistance to the enemy.

So much for the issues which are relevant to the bill under consideration.

There are many issues connected with the situation in Vietnam, which although not relevant to this bill, are on the minds and hearts of all Senators. Few, if any, of the Senators would probably concur in totality with all of the decisions made by our Government in connection with this war.

I am concerned that our military commanders in the field have been unduly limited in the conduct of operations. I shudder at the extent to which profes-

sional advice and recommendations of our senior military officers have been rejected.

I am convinced that a more realistic application of our air and sea power against military targets in North Vietnam might well alleviate the requirement for so large a buildup of U.S. forces on the ground in South Vietnam, and also might minimize American casualties and should greatly hasten a termination of the war.

I entertained the strongest misgivings about the lengths to which our Government took its most recent "peace offensive." My apprehension was based on the possibility and even probability that such intensive efforts for a negotiated settlement would be interpreted by the enemy as an expression of weakness on the part of the United States, thereby causing the enemy to persist in his aggression with renewed tenacity.

On all these matters and others, I have expressed myself in executive sessions of appropriate committees. I have also given voice to my opinions on these matters to members of the executive branch, including the President, in private. And, within limitations, I have commented publicly on the war and its conduct.

I am fully aware, Mr. President, of my right to debate all these matters fully on the Senate floor, and in other public forums, to give vent to my strongly felt opinions, and to voice my criticisms of the policies and decisions with which I disagree.

I am just as conscious, Mr. President, that my right to criticize publicly carries with it a weighty and sacred responsibility to refrain from saying or doing anything that would give aid or comfort to the enemy, or contribute to a protraction of the war in southeast Asia.

Whatever our individual opinions be about the advisability of our commitment in southeast Asia, or the precise nature of this commitment, the fact is that our Nation is at war in every practical sense of the word. American men have been and are now facing enemy fire in Vietnam. More than 2,000 Americans have already made the supreme sacrifice. Thousands of other Americans have suffered wounds and the ravages of disease wrought by this conflict.

We have a responsibility to authorize and appropriate funds for anything and everything needed by our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Our responsibility does not end there, however. We have an obligation to balance carefully any public criticism of our Government's policies in Vietnam which we are prone to utter, against our responsibility to keep the faith with those doing the fighting. It is inconceivable to me, and I feel sure to our men in southeast Asia, that we can keep faith with them if we say or do anything which gives useful information, aid, encouragement, or support to the enemy.

Mr. President, it is not for me to act as conscience to the Senate, or to any Senator except myself, nor would I presume to do so. I think it is fair comment, however, that the debate in the Senate in the past week has often indi-

cated that far more attention has been paid by some to Senators' rights than to Senators' responsibilities.

By this comment I neither seek nor intend to impugn the motives of anyone. There comes to mind, however, both General Sherman's definition of war, and the familiar saying that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions."

It has been charged in the Senate that our Nation is an outlaw, acting contrary to international law and agreements and specifically that the United States is violating the Geneva accords, which, I might add, neither the United States nor South Vietnam signed. Not only are such charges grist for the Communist propaganda machines, but they are absurd.

In 1928, the United States signed the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, by which all signators renounced war as an instrument of national policy. To charge that the United States is in violation of the Geneva accords has about as much validity as charging that the United States violated the Kellogg-Briand Treaty by declaring war on Japan when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

It has been alleged in the Senate that the American people do not support our Nation's commitment and operations in southeast Asia. This allegation is patently false. For instance, opinion polls show that a majority of Americans approve of our present conduct of the war, and of the remainder who would change our operations, almost three times the number favor doing more with air and sea power than favor withdrawing. Such false allegations mislead the enemy concerning our will to continue, undermine the faith of our allies in our national pledges, and jeopardize the morale of the Americans doing the fighting.

Both our southeast Asian allies and our military men in the field are aware of the oft-repeated conclusion that the French lost the war not at Dienbienphu, but in Paris. While I realize that the situation in Vietnam now and the French war in Indochina are not on a parallel, and I am not one of those pessimists who believe that victory is impossible, I do think we should ponder the thought that should we lose the war in southeast Asia, it is probable that the responsibility for the loss is more likely by far to be situated in Washington than with our fighting forces in the field.

Our forces in Vietnam have been charged in the Senate with "aggression" and "military adventurism." Once again, not only are the charges intemperate and ill advised, they are ridiculously false.

If anything, our policies in southeast Asia, and our Government's intentions and motives, are far more altruistic than the actual circumstances justify. It is the official position of our Government, as expressed by the President and his principal assistants, that this is South Vietnam's war, and that the United States has the sole intention of assisting South Vietnam to oppose aggression and to maintain its independence. Our operations in Vietnam are severely, and at times, agonizingly, constricted to conform to this position. We scrupulously

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3727

avoid any action that might jeopardize the political institutions of North Vietnam. We even eschew a unified military command with the South Vietnamese, although we learned from experience in Korea the advantage of such an organization.

Although our Nation's policies and operations are free of motives of aggrandizement, and to that extent justifiably altruistic, in a larger sense, and to a far greater extent than our Government chooses to publicly admit, this is our war. We fight not just for the freedom of the Vietnamese, but also for our own freedom.

The conflict in southeast Asia is but one battle in the farflung war of aggression being waged against freedom, and of which war the United States is the ultimate and final target. It is not the first, nor is it likely to be the last, eruption into overt conflict in this war which is waged against us. Only last month in Havana, Cuba, Communists of all factions from some 82 countries met and established a permanent organization with the avowed purpose and intention of aggression in the pattern of Vietnam on the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This Communist organization is to operate from Havana, Cuba. The highly publicized proceedings of the so-called "Tricontinental Conference" in Havana leaves no doubt that the United States itself is the principal and ultimate target of aggression at which the so-called wars of liberation to be supported and coordinated by the Havana organization are aimed and directed.

The fact is that the war in southeast Asia involves more than just an attack by Communist North Vietnam against South Vietnam. It is more, too, than an exhibition of the more violence-prone brand of communism pushed by the Red Chinese, of which we hear so much. The Soviet Union is supplying the major portion of the wherewithal with which the war is being fought by the Communists. The eastern European Communist countries are making substantial contributions to the aggression in Asia. Whatever the differences among Communists, they are all apparently agreed to assisting in the war of aggression in southeast Asia, just as they are agreed on starting new wars of this type in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is in this context that the antiwar criticisms and recommendations here in the Senate must be considered. It is in this context that the cries for U.S. withdrawals or surrender must be considered.

For instance, to give the self-styled National Liberation Front, which is the instrument of the North Vietnamese, representation in the government of South Vietnam, would be equivalent to giving gangsters representation on a police force. The Vietcong do unquestionably have influence and control over as many or more people in South Vietnam as does the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The influence and control of the Vietcong was established and is maintained, however, through tactics of terror and military force of arms.

Any proposal or agreement by the United States for the inclusion of the Vietcong in a coalition government in South Vietnam would constitute a reward by the United States of Communist aggression and a betrayal of our solemn commitments to the people of South Vietnam. Even more unthinkable, it would render vain the supreme sacrifices made by more than 2,000 American servicemen in southeast Asia, who have given their lives there for the cause of freedom.

Americans would not be deceived. The foul odor of surrender, whether called by the name "coalition government" or labeled outright, remains the same, as do the shameful consequences.

By this time, Mr. President, it should be obvious even to the most naive, that there is no easy way out in Vietnam.

There are risks involved in all of the decisions on the war. There are risks that the Red Chinese will come into the war overtly, and there are risks that the Soviet Union will come into the war; and although I personally believe these risks to be of small magnitude, it must be acknowledged that they do exist.

It should also be noted, however, that there are also risks which attach to courses which involve retrenchment, withdrawal, or surrender, either directly or indirectly. The risks which attach to these courses are undeniably of great magnitude, particularly in terms of encouragement of aggression by communism in other areas of the world and on an even greater scale. The danger of a general war is not lessened by virtue of the fact that its likelihood or occurrence is postponed to a date in the future. We must face reality somewhere and sometime.

Some of my colleagues appear to be distressed because the war in Vietnam is an unpopular war. It will be a time for real concern about our own people when any war is popular with them.

Of far more relevance, the broad majority of Americans support the commitment of our Nation to wage war in defense of freedom, despite its unpopularity. Also, despite the philosophical meanderings and high-flown speeches to which they are subjected from all official quarters, I suspect that the great majority of the American people realize that it is their freedom, too, that is at stake, and are anxious to get on with winning the war and getting it over with.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate should demonstrate its own sense of responsibility by passing this military authorization so that we can get on with winning and ending the war.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
Feb. 21, 1966]

U.S. COMBAT FORCES SPREAD THIN—READY UNITS AT HOME LARGELY COMMITTED TO VIETNAM WAR—SHORTAGE APPEARS IN ITEMS OF CLOTHING AND AMMUNITION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This is the conclusion of a study of U.S. Regular and Reserves forces by this correspondent.

Virtually all the combat-ready units in the United States have been committed to Vietnam, and except for a few Army and Marine battalions and a few squadrons of the Tactical Air Command no more units will be fully trained and equipped for a number of months.

In addition to the shortages in trained military manpower and in field-grade officers, there are major existing shortages in uniforms and clothing, and actual or potential shortages of various types of ammunition and equipment that are causing the services increasing concern.

The commitment of more than 200,000 men to Vietnam, supported by strong air and naval forces, and the maintenance of two divisions in Korea, more than five in Europe, and of smaller units elsewhere, including the Dominican Republic, have reduced the forces in the United States to a training establishment.

The experience level of the Atlantic Fleet and of all other commands has been reduced to provide the needs of Vietnam.

According to the services, the "squeeze" appears to be becoming worse instead of better. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. Commander in Vietnam, is understood to have stated a requirement for some 200,000 more men in Vietnam during the 1966 calendar year, and a proportionate increase in air support.

High-level decisions about whether and how to meet these needs are expected shortly. The Joint Chiefs of Staff has recommended the limited mobilization of Reserve forces ever since last spring, but President Johnson and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara ordered instead increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments to build up the Regular Forces.

In recent weeks, the services have been conducting studies at various command levels to determine how best to meet General Westmoreland's 1966 requirements. The alternatives considered were continuation of the present slow buildup of the Regular Forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments; transfer of troops from Europe, Panama, Alaska, and anywhere else available; or a selected callup of the National Guard and Reserves.

The studies, as far as could be learned, have not yet been completed. But preliminary indications were that the first course—continued dependence upon draft calls and enlistments—could fill only a fraction of General Westmoreland's requirements within the time he desired them and that the result would be what one officer called "a very slow and disorderly buildup" of the regular forces with a greater and greater lowering of the experience level and more and more bottlenecks.

Transfer of troops from Europe and elsewhere would supply a greater proportion of General Westmoreland's stated requirements, but not all of them. Even the mobilization of the Guard and Reserve might not supply all his stated needs, it was said, since various material shortages—as well as shortages in certain types of trained manpower—might develop by the end of the year.

A recently retired officer, whose last active duty assignment was concerned with the Army's mobilization base and strategic reserve, said that "whatever the course of action [in Vietnam]—continued, escalated, or modified downward—we are in a situation of perilous insufficiency," without much capability of "a graduated response to any serious challenge."

The actual and potential trained manpower and material shortages are affecting all the regular services—particularly the Army

and the Marines—and the Army National Guard and Reserves. One National Guard general said "there is not a Guard division in the United States today that could fight its way out of a paper bag." There are many reasons for the difficult situation in which the services now find themselves, officers say. Many of the officers in the services have long felt that many of Secretary McNamara's cost-effectiveness formulas were too rigidly applied and did not allow a sufficient "cushion" of supplies and equipment for emergencies.

Some of the centralized control procedures instituted in the Defense Department have proved to be too inflexible or too slow in response to the needs of the services.

For some years, even before Vietnam became acute, the services were tending to live off inventories, particularly in spare parts and ammunition, and full replacements were not provided.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN

Equipment, particularly radios and automotive equipment, was withdrawn from National Guard and Reserve units to supply Regular Army units and this has not yet been replaced.

As the Vietnamese war became larger and larger the services were required until last year to fit the extraordinary expenses of the war into their regular budgets. The war was "unfunded" until last spring, and no special appropriation in any way commensurate with the war's expenditures was asked for until last month.

Service requests for reopening production lines of aircraft and other items were rejected or postponed until the emergency became acute. The letting of contracts was thus delayed and replacement of expended material was further delayed as available inventories became dangerously depleted. Officers point out that the administration's defense request for the fiscal year 1967, starting July 1, contains many items that were requested and rejected a year ago.

Other major reasons for today's "squeeze" are several. Expenditure rates—particularly for certain types of ammunition and ordnance and clothing—have been considerably higher in Vietnam than expected.

The administration's decision to depend upon the regular services, without calling up the Guard and the Reserves, increased tremendously the strain upon the Regular Army and the Marines.

RESERVES IN PLAN

The Army's concept of mobilization had always been predicated upon the assumption that in case of any war as large as Vietnam the Reserves would be mobilized, and the supporting combat and supply units essential to supply and sustain Regular Army combat units would be furnished by the Reserves.

The concept also envisaged the replacement in the United States of Regular Army units transferred to the theater of war by mobilized Reserve units, thus maintaining the strategic reserve available for use in any emergency.

The Marines also depended upon a fourth (Marine Reserve) division, well trained and equipped, to supplement their three regular divisions, which are already almost fully committed to Vietnam, the Western Pacific, the Caribbean and the Mediterranean, and to training duties.

The Army's problems have been further complicated by the fact that ever since the Korean war, the main thrust of the Army's strategic planning had been based upon the assumption of a mechanized war in the European theater. A major war in an undeveloped country, like Vietnam, with inadequate ports, piers, airfields, roads and warehouses, required considerably more specialized units, such as engineer construction

battalions, terminal service companies, port construction companies and, for the Navy, Seabee battalions, than were included in the peacetime force totals of the regular services.

CADRES TRANSFERRED

Without mobilization of the Reserves some of these specialized units had to be created from scratch, and the trained cadres for them had to be transferred from other units.

Thus, the policy now in effect, of gradually building up the strength of the Regular forces by increased draft calls and voluntary enlistments, has resulted in very considerable reduction in overall experience levels and in constant "squeezes," or as one officer put it, in "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The trained manpower situation in the services today is as follows:

REGULAR ARMY

The last of the Army's trained major units—the 25th Division in Hawaii—has just sent two of its brigades to Vietnam; the third is expected there shortly. No other major units in this country are immediately ready for service, although part of the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash., is expected to be trained shortly. About a third of the 101st Airborne Division (Fort Campbell, Ky.) and a third of the 82d Airborne Division (Fort Bragg, N.C.) are in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, respectively.

The two other brigades of both divisions, which have been used to provide replacements for Vietnam and cadres for new units, will be filled up to strength soon, but except for a few battalions they cannot complete unit training for some weeks.

They could, however, be sent overseas—as was the 1st Cavalry Division (airmobile)—without completion of unit training. The 5th Infantry Division (mechanized) (Fort Carson, Colo.), like other Army units, has been attempting to ease the heavy burden on the Army's crowded replacement training centers by training its own recruits; it cannot be ready for some months.

TRAINING DIVISIONS

The two armored divisions at Fort Hood, Tex.—the 1st and 2d—are acting, in effect, as training divisions; they have almost completed the training of one cycle of recruits who will be used to fill out new units or as Vietnam replacements and will start on a new cycle shortly. The III Armored Corps staff at Fort Hood was transferred bodily to Vietnam last year, and now a new corps staff, reformed and trained, has also been transferred there. The Army's new division, the 9th Infantry, at Fort Riley, Kans., and one of the three new brigades authorized last year, the 196th at Fort Devens, Mass., have just been activated, and will not be ready for many months. Smaller combat and support units are being filled up with new manpower and trained as rapidly as possible.

In Europe, the combat strength of the 7th Army has been approximately maintained in numbers, but the experience level has dropped as specialists and individuals have been transferred to Vietnam. Supply and support units are at their lowest strength since before the Berlin crisis of 1961.

The dimensions of the Army's problem are illustrated by the fact that the Army took in almost 100,000 drafted men in November, December, and January and 46,533 volunteers.

The training load for training centers, schools, etc., has climbed from 135,000 men in the month of January 1965 to 240,000 men in January 1966.

Scarcities in trained noncoms and in certain officer grades are becoming acute.

Officer candidate school graduates will climb from 2,319 in the fiscal year 1965 to 4,091 in fiscal 1966, and to about 11,000 in the next fiscal year, starting July 1.

In addition, Reserve Officer Training Corps

graduates will provide almost 11,000 officers annually. However, these are all inexperienced second lieutenants; there is no immediate prospect of eliminating the shortages in major and lieutenant colonel rank unless the Army is authorized to call up individual reservists.

The Army's manpower problem will become more acute late this spring and summer, as the 1-year tour of duty of troops sent to Vietnam last year expires and thousands of troops must be replaced by trained men from this country.

MARINES

The Marines have been authorized another regular division, in addition to the three now in existence. The 3d Marine Division and most of the 1st are now in Vietnam, and the 2d Division at Camp Lejeune, N.C., is responsible for maintaining one battalion afloat with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and another in the Caribbean. The need for replacements for the Marines in Vietnam and for training cadres for the increased training load, will delay the activation of the new regular Marine division until late spring or early summer, and it cannot be ready for many months thereafter.

NAVY

The Atlantic Fleet is about up to strength in numbers of men, but the experience level has been greatly reduced by the transfer of 5,000 trained men and specialists to the Pacific. Ships in the Mediterranean and Caribbean are kept as close as possible to full complement; the remainder of the ships in the Atlantic are to a large extent in a continuous training cycle. One antisubmarine warfare carrier, minecraft, and other ships have been in reduced commission or reduced complement.

The Navy has relieved some of its worst personnel problems by extending enlistments for 4 months, but this authorization ends June 30.

AIR FORCE

The Tactical Air Command and Military Air Command are particularly affected. For a time, the Air Force rotated squadrons for temporary duty to Vietnam, but this system has been replaced by assigning pilots to 1 year's tour of duty in South Vietnam or, if flying over North Vietnam, to 100 missions.

Squadrons that have been rotated to southeast Asia from the Tactical Air Command in this country have now returned to the United States, or other home stations, leaving their equipment behind at the bases from which they operated.

The F-105 fighter-bomber, being used by the Air Force against North Vietnam, is not in production; losses are being replaced by transferring F-105's from Europe, and these in turn are being replaced by McDonnell F-4's. But there is delay in the process and some of the returning squadrons find themselves temporarily without planes.

Some of the few Tactical Air Command squadrons remaining in the United States have been charged with a refresher training mission, in addition to attempts to maintain combat readiness.

Pilots of B-47 medium bombers, phased out of the Strategic Air Command, are being trained in the F-105 as replacements for Vietnam. The Military Air Command, which has long been strained with the airlift to Vietnam, has been utilizing to an increasing degree planes and pilots of the Air National Guard on weekend flights or on missions of a few days' duration.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

The Air National Guard, the Naval Air Reserve, and some units of the Naval Reserve are in relatively good condition, though few of them have really modern equipment. But the condition of readiness of the Army National Guard and of many units of the Army Reserve is lower than it has been in the past

decade, according to many officers. Repeated withdrawal of equipment; the attempted merger by Secretary of Defense McNamara last year of the Reserves into the National Guard, a move opposed by Congress and still in abeyance; the inactivation of six Reserve divisions and the projected elimination of other Guard and Reserve units; the confusion resulting from the constant changes and reorganizations in the Reserve structure, and the saturation of the Army's replacement training centers with Regular Army inductees have all contributed to the low state of readiness.

Today, there are about 90,000 recruits of the National Guard and the Reserve waiting for 6 months' training by the Army; some estimates are that this total will increase to 120,000 by the end of June.

When Mr. McNamara deactivated the 6 Reserve combat divisions last year, he announced the creation of a select Reserve force of about 150,000 men, composed of 3 National Guard divisions, each composed of units drawn from 3 different States, 6 independent brigades, and hundreds of smaller combat and support units from the Guard and from the Reserves drawn from all 50 States.

This new high-priority force was to be built up to 100-percent strength and trained and equipped by this coming summer. The Pentagon hoped that about 15 percent or more of the 87,000 reservists in the 6 disestablished tactical divisions of the Reserve would voluntarily join the Guard.

Nevertheless, by virtue of its priority the select Reserve force is almost up to strength numerically, though several thousand of its men have not yet completed 6 months' training. The force is supposed to have completed all basic training and unit training through battalion level by the end of June, but opinions differ about whether or not it will be able to do so. Some Guard officers say it will maintain its training schedule; others say that shortage of equipment and delay in training 6-month inductees will make it impossible.

New York State has only 1,600 National Guardsmen, plus Reservists, assigned to the Select Reserve Force. Maj. Gen. A. C. O'Hara, chief of staff to Governor Rockefeller, said recently that "there is no SRF unit in New York State at the moment prepared for intensive training."

Twenty other National Guard divisions, and other Guard and Reserve units, not included in the SRF, are the "low men on the totem pole" in the military structure, and are many months away from readiness for deployment.

ARMS, CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT

There are worldwide scarcities or shortages of many items. In Vietnam all the services have experienced temporary shortage or scarcities of many items, some of them due to the local shipping tieup and logistical difficulties. These have not materially interfered, however, with combat operations.

Clothing: Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially issued to recruits, and the Marines except to issue only "half a bag" soon unless the shortages are relieved.

Some National Guard recruits have been temporarily drilling in civilian clothes until furnished with a suit of fatigues taken from the clothing allowance of other guardsmen. In some cases substitute items have been issued for standard ones.

The Defense Supply Agency, a centralized agency under the Secretary of Defense, which is responsible for procuring common-use end items for the services, said, through a spokesman, that there was a worldwide shortage of uniforms and clothing but that the

United States had enough on hand and on order to meet its needs, that all troops were "well clothed" and there had been no interference with training.

The agency said it had initiated accelerated uniform and clothing orders last June, and that uniform and clothing contracts had increased from \$55 million in the last quarter of the 1965 fiscal year to \$200 million in the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Officers pointed out, however, that increased clothing orders were not placed until after the start of the Vietnamese buildup and that inventories on hand were inadequate to supply needs until the contracts had been fulfilled.

Ammunition: Many different items of ground, air, and naval ordnance are in short supply. Reports that rifle ammunition shortages had interfered with the training of recruits are denied by the Army, but a spokesman said that at a few camps there had been temporary shortages, due apparently to maldistribution, which did not delay training more than 2 or 3 days.

Some units of the Air National Guard have reported shortages of certain types of bombs and other aircraft ordnance needed for training.

In Vietnam there has been no ammunition rationing as such, but many different items, including 5.56-millimeter ammunition for the M-16 rifle, 2.75-inch rockets, illuminating shells, and 750-pound bombs have been issued on an as available basis, which means these items are not always available without limitation.

In part, these and other scarcities in Vietnam are due to Vietnam's inadequate port capacity and local supply problems. Worldwide, there has been a major reduction in ammunition stockpiles, not yet compensated for by new production.

Spare parts: Spare parts of every type for aircraft, helicopters, communication, and electronic equipment, engineering equipment, and motor transport are in short supply everywhere; it is not uncommon for a Navy destroyer to wait for months for spares for missiles or generators.

The Military Air Command, which had stocked spare parts adequate to sustain a peacetime tempo of operations, is finding it difficult to keep its planes flying on the accelerated basis of the past year.

Arms and weapons: Except for some of the newest items the Army denies that it has any major weapons shortages. However, some of its weapons are old and the National Guard has severe shortages. In New York State, according to an assessment by General O'Hara, Guard units, even in the Select Reserve Force, are "still utilizing the M-1 rifle and have never been issued any quantity of M-14 or M-16 rifles."

"We do have," he said, "a few M-60 machineguns." Old ¼-ton trucks "are still being used with parts becoming almost impossible to procure; major weapons systems are old." Communications equipment is the "most critical" item in short supply, "and I foresee no immediate relief to this problem."

Many other items that are in short supply include generators of all types, batteries, tires for jeeps, trucks, and aircraft, engineer and material handling equipment such as forklifts, and, in Vietnam, barbed wire, sandbags and other field fortification material.

Aircraft: There is no actual shortage of aircraft and so far the United States has been able to replace its combat losses in Vietnam and its operational losses all over the world. But the margin of production over expenditure is small, aircraft production rates are still small and are limited chiefly, for combat aircraft, to the McDonnell F-4, the Douglas A-4, and the Northrop F-5. Increased losses and an increased air effort in Vietnam could greatly intensify the problem of aircraft replacement.

The scarcities or actual or potential shortages in trained manpower and equipment have caused considerable concern to the armed services, not only because of the increasing requirements of Vietnam and continued commitments elsewhere in the world, but because of the restrictive effect of these factors upon U.S. capability to meet other emergencies that might arise.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR McNAMARA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, within the past hour my senior colleague, Senator McNAMARA, has announced his decision not to seek reelection and to retire from the Senate at the end of this year.

At a time like this, everyone expects one to express regret. Yet, in my case regret is a very meager word, a very inadequate expression of what I feel when an old friend and comrade at arms prepares to leave the field.

I have read Senator McNAMARA's retirement statement several times. Typically, it is succinct and honest. He states, among other things: "I make this decision with both reluctance and relief." He is reluctant at leaving an exciting and personally gratifying and exciting job. He feels relief at having made a decision at a time when he was no longer sure that he could undertake the kind of workload he feels his State and Nation deserve.

I believe that every Senator will agree with me that there is nothing in PAT McNAMARA's history to indicate that his State or Nation have ever been short-changed by his efforts.

There is no need for me to read the long list of significant legislation which he has offered, supported, and seen enacted into law. Everyone here is aware of it.

We will be deprived of a strong, effective force in this body, but we shall miss more than that.

We shall miss a colorful personality, a man who mixes crustiness and kindness, incisiveness and humor, pragmatism and idealism in an utterly charming manner. I am sure that charming is an adjective which my senior colleague perhaps would not select or approve.

PAT is a man who, after listening to 2 hours of involved argument, can cut to the heart of a problem with about five well-chosen words.

He is a man—as I well know—who will go to great lengths to do a good turn for a younger colleague and then gruffly wave off any attempt to express thanks.

PAT is no respecter of the conventional wisdoms and whenever he runs across one, he seldom resists the temptation to violate it.

In a profession that often regards personal publicity as a key to survival, PAT McNAMARA is no publicity seeker.

In a job where fence-straddling sometimes holds attractions, PAT McNAMARA never leaves doubt about his position.

In a city that puts a high premium on the diplomatic approach and the tactful answer, PAT McNAMARA speaks short, blunt truths.

Perhaps that has been one of his greatest contributions: his puckish ability to keep men and ideas from becoming

overinflated. But, mind you, he does it with a blend of humor and tolerance that generates more laughter than anger, even within his targets.

I know that I have dared to become long-winded in PAT's presence on several occasions and I can testify that his retirement is a victory for every stuffed shirt in the Nation, in or out of the Senate.

Senator McNAMARA has a great many friends in the Senate. Perhaps some are closer friends than I, but no one owes him more than I do.

The State of Michigan is proud of his service. It is true that we find ourselves in agreement on most issues and personalities. However, my regret at PAT's decision, which I now seek without great success to voice, is not consciously affected by the fact that we are usually in agreement concerning public questions and public figures.

PAT just happens to be a solid, honest, and courageous Senator who will be missed, I believe, by every man and woman in the Chamber.

I am proud to have served as his junior colleague. If he approaches his retirement with relief, it is certainly a well-deserved relief.

Naturally, I want to say more, but I must bear in mind the sensibilities of my subject. He can tolerate a man who does not know how to begin a speech but he has very little patience with the man who does not know how to end one. I regret his retirement but it is largely a selfish regret because I shall miss him. All of us will. But we all know that he deserves—and will find—a pleasanter life than this job can offer him. And he will find some way to make his retirement a productive one.

Meantime, in the months between now and his retirement, every citizen of this country owes his a sincere "thank you." And I want to be first in line with mine.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement issued a few minutes ago by Senator McNAMARA, which has been the basis for our expressions.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McNAMARA

I have decided not to seek reelection to the U.S. Senate in November.

After 2 terms, representing 12 years in the Senate, I make this decision with both reluctance and relief.

I am, of course, reluctant to leave this body which has such a vital role to play in shaping our country for the present and the future. To have been an active participant in this effort has been exciting and personally gratifying.

Yet, there also is a sense of relief in making this decision, especially when one is at an age when he must question whether he can continue to give the kind of service over the next 6 years that his job demands.

As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee and of several subcommittees, I have found that the responsibilities of handling legislation grow with each session of Congress, as do the services required of a Senator by his constituents.

While my health is reasonably good, relatively minor ailments in the past year or so have served warning to me that I might not

be able to do full justice to my Senate responsibilities throughout another full term if I should seek and win reelection.

The requirements of our State and Nation demand nothing less than full-time dedication. Therefore, I have concluded that I should retire at the end of my present term rather than risk inability to meet my obligations.

The satisfactions of these years have been many. I am proud that many of the programs on which I based my two successful campaigns for the Senate, and for which I have since worked, have become reality.

These include Federal aid to education, health care for the elderly, new and strengthened civil rights laws, programs to build the economy toward full employment, and a beginning of the war on poverty.

However, I will leave the Senate with the full knowledge that none of these jobs will ever be truly completed. I will miss not being a part of the activity necessary to strengthen these programs and to develop new ideas to keep pace with a complex society.

Finally, I express my sincere thanks to the people of Michigan for their honor and trust. I want nothing more to carry with me into retirement than the conviction that I have been able to fulfill their confidence. Also, I am grateful for the privilege of having served under the banner of the Democratic Party of Michigan. One could wish for no greater support from a party, or for programs to champion that were more meaningful and responsible.

The letters I have received urging me to run for reelection are heartwarming and appreciated, but my decision has been made.

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

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to join with the junior Senator from Michigan and share with him the sense of loss and the feeling of regret that he has expressed over the announcement today of Senator PAT McNAMARA that he has decided not to run for reelection.

I know that Senator HART, as well as other Senators, have tried to persuade PAT McNAMARA not to make that decision.

I visited with PAT McNAMARA over the lunch table over the last 10 days. He told me that this was his contemplated announcement. I tried to urge him not to do it. But, as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has pointed out, when PAT McNAMARA makes up his mind, one can be sure that it has only been after very thorough and careful thought. He did reach this conclusion and made it clear that he was going to stand by it.

I want to say very briefly, as a colleague of his, who has served as a member of his Subcommittee on Labor, and as one who has had the privilege of having him serve as a colleague of mine on my Subcommittee on Education, that I just cannot let this moment pass without expressing for the RECORD my high regard not only for this great Senator's statesmanship, but also for his dedication and service to the people of the State of Michigan. He has shown a dedication not only to the people of the State of Michigan but also to the U.S. Senate and to all people of the country.

My testimony is that every boy and girl in every elementary and secondary

school in America, public and private, and every college student in every college in America, public and private, not only now, but also for years to come, will owe a great debt of gratitude to PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan.

PAT McNAMARA, from the very beginning of his service as a Senator 12 years ago, has stood shoulder to shoulder with those of us who have urged that we break through the barriers of opposition to Federal aid to education and get on with the job of the Federal Government living up to its obligations to the young people of the country.

I notice that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVRS], a member of my subcommittee, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], a member of the full committee, are in the Chamber.

Every Senator on the subcommittee and on the full committee can give the same testimony that I now give concerning the contribution of PAT McNAMARA to the Federal aid to education program that resulted in making it possible for President Kennedy, after the first year of his term in office, to thank the members of my subcommittee, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], for the support that we gave to him in getting started in breaking through the barriers to which I have just referred, and which resulted in President Johnson's being able to say, after we had completed action on 20 of the 24 segments of President Kennedy's original omnibus bill on education, that "the 88th Congress will go down in history as the education Congress."

Already the 89th Congress has exceeded the accomplishments of the 88th Congress in the field of Federal aid to education. I wish to testify that in my judgment, PAT McNAMARA, of Michigan, deserves great credit for the success we have had in the field of education legislation.

Now as a member of his Subcommittee on Labor, I wish to say that every working man and woman of the country, and every employer involved in the legislation, owes PAT McNAMARA, also, a great debt of gratitude for his industrial statesmanship in connection with legislation dealing with the problems of labor-management relations. As is pointed out in his statement, he has worked on the health legislation. We all know of his leadership in the Senate on the medicare bill. In my judgment, had we not had the stubborn insistence of this great Senator from Michigan, we would not have today on the books the medicare law for the assistance of the elderly of this country. Every old person in America, now and in the years to come, owes PAT McNAMARA a deep debt of gratitude.

I wish to comment on his fight for civil rights. Who could have been more persistent, insistent, and consistent than the Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, as he stood here and battled shoulder to shoulder with us, over the years, to try to see to it that second-class citizenship in the United States be eliminated, at long last, from the history of this Republic?

Then there is the matter he mentions in his statement of the work that he has

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President I wish to thank my good colleague [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and all the other Senators who have expressed themselves in over-generous remarks concerning my announcement of today.

Let me assure them that I expect to be in the Senate for some months yet, and will be able to continue working with them on the programs in which we mutually believe.

I thank them again for their very flattering and overgenerous remarks about me. I appreciate them very, very much.

U.S. COAST GUARD OBSERVES ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 25 years ago, on February 19, 1941, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve was established with the enactment of Public Law No. 8 by the 77th Congress. As a captain in the Coast Guard Reserve and one who enlisted in it as a seaman shortly after its inception, it is with distinct pride that I rise here today and take this opportunity to honor this outstanding Reserve component of our Armed Forces on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 8 the peak strength of the Coast Guard was somewhat less than 20,000 officers and men. They had no organized reserve forces and as the clouds of war darkened Europe and headed toward our shores, the Coast Guard was called upon to perform many additional duties. They found it necessary to expand as rapidly as possible.

The high caliber of its regular force, their complete devotion to duty and their gallantry in the face of danger are well known to the citizens of Rhode Island. Through the years our coastal waters and the heavily traversed sealanes off our shores were constantly watched over by the Coast Guard and we viewed with a personal pride many of their heroic exploits in that area.

With the creation of a Reserve component it was but natural that we who felt so close to the regular Coast Guard service and to some extent regarded some of their units as our very own, would expect nothing short of perfection and a similar high standard in performance of duty from the members of its Reserve force. Throughout World War II, that expectation proved fully justified as members of this newly created Coast Guard Reserve served with distinction, on every front.

From Guadalcanal to Okinawa in the Pacific, from North Africa to Normandy in the Atlantic—and they made all the stops in between—they manned troop transports, escort vessels, and landing craft, hitting the invasion beachheads with the troops and carrying on in noble fashion the proud tradition of their parent service. At the conclusion of the war the Coast Guard had 802 vessels of its own and in addition was manning 351 Navy and 288 Army craft.

Total Coast Guard personnel had reached a peak of about 174,000 and of that number more than 150,000, or nearly 90 percent, were members of the

Coast Guard Reserve established by the enactment of Public Law 8 but a few brief years before. Less than 6 percent of this total Coast Guard force, both regular and reserve, were serving in shore billets as the war came to a close in August of 1945.

With its end, the Coast Guard was without funds to cover Reserve peacetime training. Additional legislation had to be enacted. Organized Reserve units established and programs of regular training set up. Before this could be accomplished, many of those reservists who saw wartime service were discharged. Others, however, encouraged by the Coast Guard, organized themselves in training groups and met regularly each week without benefit of pay or other form of allowance until necessary legislation could be enacted and appropriation of funds made for established Coast Guard Reserve training.

Today, this program has been expanded to a point where there are presently 146 Reserve port security units with more than 10,500 men attending regular weekly drills. Many of these reservists are also qualified for assignment to floating units should conditions dictate.

Other organized Reserve training units are of a support nature, providing additional trained personnel for vessel augmentation and activation, search and rescue, aviation, electronics, coastal forces and mobilization detachments. During the past 7 months 4,142 members of these organized units received 2 weeks' active duty for training at the Coast Guard Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Va.; another 1,031 at Alameda, Calif., while many more received their 2 weeks' training in their particular specialty at regular Coast Guard units or at Coast Guard or other service schools.

Currently, there are approximately 15,952 reservists in organized Reserve training units. This is the maximum number that the present Coast Guard Reserve budget will support. Additional personnel, facilities and equipment are needed to meet mobilization requirements.

However, I can state with a great deal of conviction that from my experience and association with the Coast Guard Reserve a personal knowledge of the type of training that they are now receiving and the caliber of its men, the Coast Guard Reserve will, within the limitations of its operating budget, be both ready and reliable should they be called upon at some future date to help defend this Nation. This is indeed fitting for a service whose motto is "Semper Paratus."

It is therefore a great pleasure for me to address this honorable body here today and to pay deserving tribute to this organization, one with which I am exceedingly proud to be affiliated, the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, on this occasion of its 25th anniversary.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY OF NEW YORK ON VIETNAM POLICY HAS SERVED A USEFUL PURPOSE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe that the Vietnam statement of the junior

Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], has served a very real and useful purpose. When carefully read, it is apparent that the actual differences between his views and those of our administration are slight. But what he has done is to thoroughly establish the irreducible minimums on each side and highlight the area where negotiations could be conducted.

Essentially, what he has done is to narrow the spectrum of negotiations, thus affording certain guarantees to both sides. It would seem to me that rather than postponing the time when they might come to the conference table, his statement might serve to shorten this period.

Although I recognize that we may never get to a conference table, I would hope there would then eventually be a diminution of hostilities and a reduction in terroristic acts by the Vietcong which, in turn, would mean we could reduce the level of our military activity. In this connection, let us remember that time is on our side, and that the very passage of time without escalation of hostilities is in our favor.

I, for one, commend the Senator from New York on his thoughtful statement and also am delighted to see from the statements of General Taylor and Mr. Moyers that there is no great difference in viewpoint.

I sympathize immensely with our President in his problems, and I know that there is no man more intent on peace in the United States than he. However, we all recognize that the executive branch of the Government cannot express its views with the same freedom that we individual Members of the legislative branch do. And here is where we legislators, I believe, serve a useful role in giving some direction to our policy, and indications of where we hope to go.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OPPOSE DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, after more than a year of careful study and evaluation of all aspects of State legislative apportionment, the League of Women Voters of the United States went on record last January in opposition to any amendment which would revoke or dilute the Supreme Court's decision requiring the apportionment of both houses of State legislatures on the basis of substantial equality of population.

The league found that the population standard for legislative apportionment is the "fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative form of government."

In recent days, I have received letters from the president of the League of Women Voters of Maryland and officials of the League of Women Voters of various counties in Maryland. At least three of these letters came from the presidents of county organizations where the county today is substantially overrepresented in the Maryland State Legislature and will lose representation in a fair reapportionment of the Maryland House of Delegates and Senate.

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3731

done in connection with programs to build the economy of this country to full employment. Here again, we all owe him a vote of thanks.

But the last point of many that I could mention I wish to make in behalf of the people of my State. For PAT McNAMARA, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, has done a great job of passing judgment on public works requests on their merits. Here was a Senator who would not tolerate pork barrel. Under his leadership of the Public Works Committee, anyone who sought to get anything that was not on its merits had short shrift, as far as his handling of such requests was concerned. I thank him in behalf of the people of my State for the fair, impartial consideration he has given to us on our requests for public works in the State of Oregon, on their merits. All he asked was, "What are the facts? What can you show on the cost-to-benefit ratio? What can you show from the standpoint of public necessity?"

I have never asked for a public works authorization or appropriation except on the basis of presenting such facts; and I know that the people of my State would want me, at this time, to express to PAT McNAMARA the heartfelt thanks of the people of Oregon for his recognition of the public works needs of our State, and for his appreciation of the fact that as we build up the economic productive power of our country—and that is what sound public works do—we strengthen the security of the Republic itself.

These are only a few of the many items I could mention in connection with his great statesmanship as a Senator from Michigan; and I join with his junior colleague in expressing my sense of loss upon his retirement from the Senate at the close of the present term.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for those remarks, most importantly because I think there is no Member of this body for whom Senator McNAMARA has a deeper affection—though on occasions it has been concealed.

As the Senator from Oregon highlighted some of the significant legislative achievements of Senator McNAMARA, it occurred to me that he was listing those things which identify a good society: concern for those who are full in years, and provision for opportunity for those who are yet to begin their life, and to make sure that each one, young, old, and in between, is judged as an individual who is good or bad, and not by reason of the way his name is spelled or the color with which God has marked him.

In all of those areas, Senator McNAMARA has given effective, successful leadership.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with Senator HART and Senator MORSE in expressing my great regret that PAT McNAMARA has seen fit to retire.

I hope he will not retire completely; he is too salty, too active, and too exciting a personality to retire in the literal sense of the term. I hope he will give his talents and his great heart and great friendship—which is what I have personally appreciated so much about him—

to other causes, and that we will find him a frequent guest and friend right here on the floor of the Senate.

I adopt what my colleagues have stated as to his service, which I think has been extraordinary, and tremendously gratifying to the country and to the people of his State, and add to it that my personal experience with him as a man—we get to know men around here, of all the places on earth—has been that in his personality, his character, his integrity, and his idealism, he measures up to all the accomplishments with which he has so properly been charged, for credit of service to the people of his State and the people of the United States. I join with my fellow Senators in their warm sentiments and best wishes for many years of fruitful living to PAT McNAMARA.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself also with the views that have been expressed about the coming retirement of the senior Senator from Michigan. I have been honored and delighted to serve on the same committee with him.

I have been particularly struck by his concern for all people, particularly little people, when they are young, through their working years, when they are middle aged, and when they are old; and I know the Senate will not be as fine a body in his absence as it has been with him.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I have learned of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] not to seek reelection next November.

In his two terms here, he has established an enviable position in the esteem and affection of all of us. We respect his down-to-earth judgment. We respect his rugged honesty. We admire his ability to get to the heart of an issue quickly and to state it unmistakably.

He has been associated, as a sponsor and leader and legislative architect of programs of tremendous importance to our people and our country—education, civil rights, health care for the elderly, economic development, resources development and conservation, the war on poverty, and so many more.

All of us in the Senate, I am sure, hope to make a solid contribution to the future of our country, to leave our mark on its policies and its capacity to serve its people. PAT McNAMARA has done that beyond doubt.

I am sure we all regret his decision for personal reasons. I have mine. I played a small part in each of his campaigns for the Senate. I have been privileged to serve under his distinguished and constructive leadership as chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I have been the recipient of his warm friendship and return it in full measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks which have been made about the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] upon the announcement, which we regrettably heard today, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works will not seek reelection.

Although I am a freshman, I was successful this year in being assigned to the Committee on Public Works. I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve in the Senate with the Senator from Michigan.

I can only reiterate the remarks which have been made concerning him. We hope, even though he does retire from the Senate, that his great ability, energy, and talents will not lie fallow and will be put to good use by the people of Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have just learned of the announcement of Senator PAT McNAMARA that he will not be a candidate for reelection to the Senate. I know this was a difficult decision for him to make, but one of the characteristics of Senator McNAMARA is his ability to make decisions that he thinks best, no matter how they affect him personally.

I have had the honor and the privilege of serving with Senator McNAMARA on the Senate Public Works Committee since 1957, and during the last 2½ years, I have served with him as the ranking Republican member of the committee. In this capacity, I have had a close relationship with him in the consideration and disposition of legislation before our committee. We have not always agreed upon legislative measures, and this is natural. But I have been impressed by his fairness as chairman of the committee to all members of the committee, whether they be members of the majority or minority.

Senator McNAMARA has always been willing and in fact has insisted that each member of the committee be given full opportunity to state his views and he has insisted that they be given full consideration. He has been large enough to accept the views of members of the committee when their reasoning convinced him. But at the same time, he has expedited the work of the committee and worked to secure action by the committee on the important measures before it.

Although a strong representative of his own State, he has been sympathetic and understanding of the problems of other States in areas of our country. I could give many examples of this quality; one that I will always remember was his interest in the problems of the Appalachian area, and the very fine way in which he devoted himself to the legislation, which is doing and will do so much for this region of our country.

In a broader sense, Senator McNAMARA's work, through his work in fields of legislation concerning river and harbor developments under the Corps of Engineers, highways, water, and air pollution control, economic development programs, and the TVA self-financing act has made major contributions to the economy and the strength of our Nation, and the welfare of the people.

His basic kindness and consideration for others, his forthright way of making decisions and taking firm positions on legislation which he supported, are testimonies to his character and quality as a human being. The Senate will miss Senator McNAMARA, and I shall miss him as a coworker and a friend.

3734

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 23, 1966

tion of lawmaking. This bill simply restores to Congress its rightful responsibility to make the laws of the land." Senator DRAXSEN, interviewed in U.S. News & World Report, January 17, 1966, devoted a good portion of his remarks on State legislative apportionment to checks and balances within the Federal Government. We would like your opinion of the possibility, as well as the plausibility, of legislation which would implement, rather than nullify, the Supreme Court decision.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. RICHARD SHERWIN,
Apportionment Chairman.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.,

Las Vegas, N. Mex., January 27, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I should like to thank you for the collection of materials that you sent our league recently. We found the material most useful in our recent study of reapportionment. As you know, the National League of Women Voters made reapportionment an emergency study item less than a year ago.

Here in New Mexico we had just completed a State study on a similar topic, and so this gave us a chance to review the whole problem. Our local league, and the national league, recently arrived at consensus on this item, as you have undoubtedly heard from league members in your State, and we are supporting reapportionment of both houses of State legislatures on the basis of population—one-man, one vote. We are all opposed to any amendment to the Constitution making it possible to apportion either house on a basis other than population.

We want to thank you again for assisting us in our study by making so much material available to us.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS MALONEY,
President.

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 vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the problem before the Senate, the supplemental military appropriations bill. I believe that it is very important for Senators to state their position on this matter, because it will have an effect upon the policy of the Nation and what happens in the world. Inasmuch as I believe that, in terms of the relationship of the executive and legislative arms of the Government, we are coming to something of a confrontation on this subject, it seems to be appropriate to speak now.

There are three aspects of the Vietnamese situation which I believe trouble our people greatly. First, we are troubled by irresponsible criticism—unjust criticism, to make use of a milder word—of U.S. policy in Vietnam. We are troubled by those who assume that the United States is to blame for this predicament, by those who ask us to

concede all and achieve nothing, by those who confuse words with deeds and posturing with policy.

Second, we are troubled by the possibility of military overcommitment, the pouring of unlimited numbers of American troops first into the quicksand of a largely guerrilla war—albeit an aggression by North Vietnam—then into a major Asian war; by plans that would expand the bombing of North Vietnam to punitive and not military targets alone, by those who believe escalation is a cure-all and by those who dream of military victory in a nuclear age where such victory courts only disaster for all.

Third, we are worried about the lack of clarity in our objectives, by the fact that the explanation of our goals is often in phrase-making and not in specifics, by predictions that have invariably turned out to be overly optimistic—all this when clearness, steadiness, and consistency are called for.

CRITICISM OF OUR POLICY

The problem with much of the criticism of our policy in Vietnam is that it is most often destructive criticism. Few of the critics have proposed viable alternatives to the policy they are attacking, and I have heard very few of the critics accuse Hanoi, Peiping, and the NLF with the same vehemence with which they have gone after our policy. Until the criticism on Vietnam takes on more balanced proportions and until it presents real alternatives, the value of the criticisms will not match the importance of its concern.

But the criticism has followed a number of paths that call out for refutation.

One consistent theme of attack has been the historical argument, one that attempts to get at the so-called root of the present situation in Vietnam. According to this view, the present struggle is merely a continuation of the Vietnamese struggle against colonialism, and the Vietcong are in the vanguard of a civil and revolutionary war; the people of Vietnam are said by this argument to regard the NLF as the true representatives of their desire for national dignity and independence.

Mr. President, I might characterize this whole argument with the phrase: this is Ho Chi Minh as the George Washington of Vietnam argument. The further charge is made that the United States would never be in this war today, were it not for our refusal to favor the holding of elections in South Vietnam in 1956, were it not for our helping Saigon to violate the 1954 Geneva accords, and were it not for our unwise backing of Diem and other dictators.

I believe this reasoning to be both wrong and counterproductive. Even if the conflict in Vietnam did begin as some sort of revolutionary confrontation in 1954, it quickly came under the command of Hanoi.

Today—and I have been there, and many others have been there—there can be no disputing of the fact that in South Vietnam the Vietcong are directly supported by troops and supplies from the North and are fighting in association with regular Hanoi troop units. Moreover, it seems highly unlikely to me that

the Vietcong ever represented the true desires of the South Vietnamese. Otherwise, why would the Vietcong have to systematically murder over 12,000 village chiefs and village officials? Is murdering the leadership a sign that the people are on your side? Are 600,000 refugees to the Saigon side evidence of the people's support of the regime?

I have no crystal ball, but neither do the proponents of this line of reasoning have any evidence to back up their claims. The only thing we can be sure is that the South Vietnamese really want peace without slavery. Finally I see no real point to focusing the present debate on history.

To do so would be to go very wide of the mark. Even if the United States committed errors of judgment in the past, even if our vital interests were not initially involved, as they are now in Vietnam, certainly there is no turning back the clock. Vietnam is now a vital interest and it is to the present that debate must be drawn.

Another source of criticism has been international law. The critics contend that the Charter of the United Nations prohibits U.S. intervention in Vietnam without the approval of the Security Council and that, in any case, if there be any intervention at all, it must be under U.N. Security Council auspices. They also contend that U.S. commitments under the SEATO pact extend only to the obligation of consultation with other treaty members, not to military intervention.

These legal arguments are specious on their face. Indeed, the American Bar Association's House of Delegates found that to be the case.

In the first place, article 51 of the U.N. Charter provides for the right of individual and collective self-defense and article 53 permits regional defense organizations to function when the Security Council is duly notified. In the second place, while it is correct that the SEATO pact does not legally bind the United States to take military action in defense of what is called under the treaty a "protocol state," we are morally and practically bound to take such action when we are convinced that aggression has occurred endangering the security of the treaty area. To say that we are not legally obliged to intervene is not to say that it is not proper and right for us to intervene, and now we have.

A third line of criticism has maintained that our present line of action in Vietnam is likely to lead to Communist Chinese intervention and a full-scale Asian land war.

The fact is that Red China has not moved to take any direct military hand in Vietnam to counter our military operations. Even when we began bombing the supply lines in North Vietnam, Peiping did not intervene militarily as it threatened. That does not mean that Peiping may not react tomorrow—this is solely a matter of Red Chinese choice and the possibility of such intervention must always be taken into account. But our military commanders believe that so long as we stay in South Vietnam—and our plans certainly do not include any

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3733

I have also received letters from spokesmen of the League of Women Voters of the State of Tennessee, and the State of New Mexico, opposing the Dirksen amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have these letters printed in the RECORD.

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

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF MARYLAND,

Annapolis, Md., February 9, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: Your Maryland constituents have watched with a good deal of interest your leadership in the fight against the Dirksen amendment and for equitable representation in State legislatures. We know that as a former member of the Maryland General Assembly, you are aware of the real implications of malapportioned legislatures and the deleterious effect on the vigor of State government.

The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned on the basis of population, and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for factors other than population. The league in Maryland is happy to join the effort to defeat the Dirksen amendment and to support your efforts in any way that we can.

Respectfully,

Mrs. HOWARD KOSS, *President.*

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Md.,

Silver Spring, Md., February 12, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: For many years the League of Women Voters of Maryland have been concerned with reapportionment for our own State. Now, however, our position has become a national consensus of the league just as reapportionment has become a national concern of all those interested in our government following the design of the U.S. Constitution.

We commend you on your leadership on this issue last summer, and hope that you will be equally successful in the next round against the opponents of fair representation.

Our consensus is that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned according to population, and we oppose any constitutional amendment proposed to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court.

If apportionment is not based on population, then one of our basic rights as citizens of this country is infringed upon, and the erosion may well not stop with an unequal voice in government.

The league of this county was a solid part of the national consensus. You have our full support in your fight on the Senate floor, and our willingness to help in any way the league can.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM N. GARROTT,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Md.,

Silver Spring, Md., February 12, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am sure that you are well aware that the league in Maryland has had an intense interest in reapportionment for a long time. Now our Maryland consensus has been translated into a national one after a year's study by members across the Nation. As the time rapidly ap-

proaches when the Congress will again be faced with this issue, we want you to know our consensus on this matter, and that you have our fullest support.

We feel that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned according to population, and we oppose any constitutional amendment proposed to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court.

Citizens should have an equal voice in government on any level, and any modification of this right is a restriction of our liberty.

We wish to commend you for your outstanding fight for reapportionment last summer, and to assure you of our willingness to help in any way our league can.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. JAMES A. DORSCH,
State Item Chairman.

SMITHSBURG, Md.,
February 14, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The League of Women Voters of Washington County has studied the apportionment of State legislatures and agrees with you that representation in both houses of State legislatures should be based substantially on population.

We oppose the efforts in the Congress to amend the U.S. Constitution to allow for factors other than population to be considered as a basis for representation.

We hope that State governments will be strengthened by having them more representative of the people, wherever they live.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GEORGE W. COMSTOCK,
*President, League of Women Voters of
Washington County.*

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF FREDERICK COUNTY, Md.,

February 8, 1966.

The Honorable JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the 7 years of our existence, the Frederick County League of Women Voters has been engaged in the study of and work for gaining the reapportionment of our State legislature on the basis of population. Just as it looked as if our local and State league effort was going to be rewarded, opposition activity began in Congress. The Frederick League joined in urging the National League of Women Voters to adopt apportionment as a special study item. This was done. Enclosed is the resulting position which represents the feelings of league members throughout the country, Frederick County members included.

We hope this expression of our concern will be of value to you in acting upon this issue.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BENJAMIN WARSHOWSKY,
President.

JANUARY 12, 1966.

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON APPORTIONMENT
OF STATE LEGISLATURES

(As announced by the national board of the League of Women Voters of the United States, Jan. 12, 1966)

The members of the League of Women Voters of the United States believe that both houses of State legislatures should be apportioned substantially on population. The league is convinced that this standard, established by recent apportionment decisions of the Supreme Court, should be maintained and that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended to allow for consideration of factors other than population in apportioning either or both houses of State legislatures.

Of overriding importance to the league in

coming to this decision is the conviction that a population standard is the fairest and most equitable way of assuring that each man's vote is of equal value in a democratic and representative system of government. Other considerations influencing league decisions are that the U.S. Constitution should not be amended hastily or without due consideration because of an "unpopular" court decision, and that individual rights now protected by the Constitution should not be weakened or abridged.

Against the background of its longstanding interest in State government, the league also hopes that by maintaining a population standard State government may be strengthened by insuring that State legislatures are more representative of people wherever they live. Finally, the league feels certain that the term "substantially" used in Supreme Court decisions allows adequate leeway for districting to provide for any necessary local diversities.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF ALLEGANY COUNTY, Md.,

Frostburg, Md., February 17, 1966.

Hon. JOSEPH TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The League of Women Voters, after careful consideration of other alternatives, has gone on record in support of the apportioning of both houses of our State legislatures on substantially a population basis. This is not merely the opinion of a majority of the members, but is the consensus of large and small leagues, urban and rural alike, from all of the United States.

The Allegany County League of Women Voters would like you to know that we concur in the league's position and hope that you, as our representative, will do all you can in support of the principal of one man—one vote.

Sincerely yours,

MARY ELIZABETH H. VANNEWKIRK,
President.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF TENNESSEE,

February 21, 1966.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your speeches on State legislative apportionment in the Senate, June 2, 1965, and November 2, 1965, were most edifying. Your arguments in favor of the population standard are well stated and no doubt the League of Women Voters of Tennessee will have occasion to quote from your analysis of Senate Joint Resolution 103 in the near future, as we take action in support of the "Statement of Position on Apportionment of State Legislatures," issued January 12, 1966, by the League of Women Voters of the United States.

We note that Senators DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and others refer to you, Senator TYDINGS, as having taken leadership in opposing the so-called rotten-borough amendments. While we lack the financial affluence Senator DIRKSEN attributes to his "Committee for Government of the People," league members in Tennessee will oppose any amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would nullify the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling. If Senator DIRKSEN again rewords his proposal for amendment, we should greatly appreciate receiving your comments, which will be distributed to the 12 local league chairmen on apportionment here in Tennessee. May we have extra copies, 12 if possible, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 2, 1965, No. 200?

In his news release of August 19, 1964, Tennessee Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, said in support of the Tuck bill, "The Supreme Court has seen fit to invade the func-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

invasion of North Vietnam or even the overthrow of the government in Hanoi—Red China will refrain from intervening.

Should Red China decide to come in, however, our military commanders in Vietnam believe that its supply lines both in the air and on the ground would be severely overextended. Given these logistical problems and our own force-level projections, our commanders are confident that they can deal with the Red China military contingency.

One point, however, must be emphasized in this regard—we cannot shrink from defending our interests or protecting our allies, simply because of the possibility of a Red Chinese countermove. We cannot let fear of an aggressor paralyze our will. Every precaution should be taken to avoid Red Chinese intervention, but not at the price of sacrificing the cause for which we fight.

Another school of criticism has centered around the belief that we can end the conflict by a series of concessions to Hanoi and the Vietcong. Six months ago, this group was demanding that the United States cease bombing targets in the North. Bombing was halted for 37 days—I agreed with that pause, but I also agree that we had better learn from experience—and all we received from Hanoi was added defiance and a military buildup. Several weeks ago, they insisted on our bringing the Vietnam situation to the U.N. This too was done without receiving any positive response from Hanoi. Now these same people are rallying around the cry that the United States ought to try to force the government in Saigon to form a provisional coalition government with the Communists prior to negotiations or free elections.

This is the proposal put forward by my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. His proposal is entitled to thoughtful consideration by all. As I have read it and others have read it, it sought to bring about a coalition government in Saigon before negotiations as an inducement for negotiations. But apparently the author of the proposal says that is not what he has in mind at all. What he has in mind is that the National Liberation Front should be a party to the negotiations. I said that myself a week ago, as did many others. As to the point of a coalition government, I believe, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk so testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the United States will abide by all results of any genuinely free elections. Moreover, should future negotiations decide upon a provisional coalition preceding free elections, I would support this as well.

My point is, however, Why should we surrender in advance the question of what the composition of the provisional government should be until we find this concession to be warranted in the course of negotiations? In order to encourage Hanoi to the conference table, I too have proposed concessions; namely, to accept the NLF as an independent negotiating party. In view of the fact that Hanoi has insisted upon a "decisive role" for the NLF in South Vietnam, Senator

KENNEDY's proposal is not likely to be enough of an inducement. The proposal would only open the door for further Hanoi demands for concessions. The line must be drawn somewhere.

I believe we must make concessions to reality and not to fear, and also not to ungrounded hopes. In this regard I have urged the President to propose the inclusion of the NLF in any future negotiations on Vietnam as an independent group or party with a participating role. It is my impression, moreover, that President Johnson is moving in this direction as evidenced by Averell Harriman's press conference of 2 weeks ago in which he said that the NLF could attend talks "as an independent group who have an interest in the discussion." It now remains for the President to make this policy public.

Recognizing the NLF as an independent negotiating group is a delicate diplomatic matter with deep political and military implications. On this proposal rests the future stability of the present Saigon government, and the cause for which we fight. But, I believe that it is a necessary proposal and one that is superior to the alternatives of either insisting that the NLF attend the conference only as part of the North Vietnamese delegation; or allowing the NLF to attend the conference as the decisive part of a newly constituted South Vietnamese Government as Ho Chi Minh demands. The former alternative is not likely to bring the Communists to the negotiating table and the latter would only serve to reward terror and aggression. Opponents, like the Communists in Vietnam, who are capable of marshaling such large forces, have to be dealt with in peace negotiations, but we cannot do so at the price of selling out an ally. The line I draw here takes account of the vast difference between making the NLF a party to negotiations on the future of Vietnam and giving them a place in the Government before negotiations. The composition of the Government in Saigon should be a matter for future negotiations, and should not be prejudged by any prior concessions at this time.

Finally, I believe that it is irresponsible to criticize our posture in Vietnam from the assumption that the guilt is on the American side, that the reason a peace conference has not been called is due to some fault of our own sincerity, and that otherwise the Communists would jump at the chance to negotiate. It is one thing to question the judgment of the President; it is another to question his motives and intentions. There is no doubt in my mind that we are trying to seek peace in Vietnam, and that guilt for the continuation of the war rests not in Washington, but in Hanoi and Peiping.

I have urged the Congress, since June 1965, to conduct a full-scale debate on Vietnam and with Senator RANDOLPH have offered two resolutions for that purpose. I am not against debating the issues of Vietnam. I am not against attacking the judgments of the administration when I think the President is wrong. I am against forms of debate which score

points which exploit the peoples' fears without giving them knowledge, and which criticize everything without offering alternatives.

THE MILITARY SITUATION

Much attention of late has focused on the military situation in Vietnam, and I am disturbed by the fact that this debate has been dominated either by advocates of military passivism or by the advocates of open ended military expansionism. I believe that the consequences of passivism would be a longer war and that the consequences of expansion would be a larger and more dangerous war. Neither is likely to lead to negotiations.

First, the concept of confinement to set military enclaves in Vietnam, which is what General Gavin was first thought to have advocated, is untenable. But I agree with General Gavin that the administration should limit our commitment in South Vietnam to the forces we can deploy without general mobilization or material prejudice to our other military responsibilities in the world and this requires that primary consideration be given to the coastal area, the Mekong Delta, and the Saigon region in which 70 to 80 percent of the Vietnam population is to be found. The way to accomplish this is not to have U.S. troops consolidate in static defense perimeters and wait for the Communist troops to attack them.

Second, I reject the theory that we should punish the enemy into submission by whatever military means appear expedient. The advocates of this theory do not understand the central fact of the nuclear age and they have failed to learn the lessons of history as well. In the nuclear age, "victory" on the battlefield in the sense of bringing the enemy to submission is an illusory goal. Expansion begets counter expansion, and the cost of the war spirals beyond any reasonable objective. Moreover, wars of the past demonstrate that the punishment of an enemy through all-out air attacks does not diminish greatly his will to fight on.

I am opposed to bombing: First, the civilian populations in Hanoi and Hai-phong; second, dams that provide drinking water and irrigation; third, power-plants that serve only civilian purposes; and fourth, sources of food supply for the people of North Vietnam. These are not vital military targets; they are punitive targets.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator from New York feel it is possible to send 100 planes daily to drop bombs without hitting a lot of civilians? Does the Senator think that it is possible to confine ourselves to military targets? I do not believe it is possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it is practical with the modern bombing techniques to pinpoint military targets. That does not mean that some civilians in the area of a military target might not be killed. But we cannot scramble this omelet without breaking some eggs. I cannot

guarantee that kind of immunity in response to the question of the Senator.

By confining our bombing to military targets we are showing our good faith; that we do not intend to punish the civilian population in North Vietnam. That is all I am talking about. It represents a military and not civilian bombardment.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator will permit, I have one more observation.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for an observation.

Mr. GRUENING. I consider our bombing of North Vietnam thoroughly immoral and illegal. It is the kind of thing that does not bring honor to the United States. When Hitler and Mussolini entered into Spain's civil war and bombed Spanish towns, when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia and rained death from the air on its villages, when Goering bombed Rotterdam, there was profound revulsion in the United States. What we are doing now we condemned unsparringly on those previous occasions. It is outrageous that we should be doing the same thing now.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry that I disagree with the Senator on that score.

The Hanoi government and the Vietcong, from all one can see, are engaged in a ruthless and murderous enterprise in Vietnam.

Our military forces in Vietnam are there quite properly and legally, in my opinion, and are entitled to be there by virtue of international law and treaty obligations. We have been, moreover, invited into South Vietnam by the legally constituted Government of that country—a government which is recognized by most of the world with the exception of the Communist bloc. I again refer you to the ABA brief of February 22, 1966, which supports my argument.

Mr. GRUENING. I think there was no legal justification for our being in South Vietnam in the first place. The allegations made by the administration that three Presidents have supported such a policy and that the United States has made a solemn national pledge to do what we are doing are not factual. President Eisenhower offered economic aid, and with conditions which were never fulfilled. President Kennedy merely sent military advisers. It is only within the last year that we have sent our troops into combat and started bombing.

We are the strangers in that country. The others, north and south, are all Vietnamese. I think there is just as much evidence that we are aggressors as are those whom we charge with aggression. It is their country; we have no business there. Our intervention has never been authorized by Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. On that theory, we might sell the whole thing out to the Communists and forget about Asia and the rest of the world, because it is possible to dress up the national role of liberation anywhere one pleases. If the case is as impeccable as the Senator from Alaska says it is, the Communists have found the Achilles heel of the whole free world, and we are through.

But I do not believe that. I believe people have a right to self-defense; and

if they do not have the means to defend themselves because the other fellow is better prepared and disciplined—as the Communists are—they have a right to call on other free people to help to defend them. Someone will get hurt in the process, but someone always gets hurt when there is immorality, aggression, and murder in the world. I could not disagree more with the Senator from Alaska.

I am also opposed to a vast buildup of American troops in Vietnam. Such a buildup would not only entail a general economic, military, and civilian mobilization in the United States; it would also have to be at the expense of defending other U.S. interests throughout the world. We must not lose sight of priorities of interest. We must not overcommit our troops where we have other responsibilities to uphold.

Based upon my own observations in Vietnam and upon talks I have had with military commanders there. I believe that the military policy now being pursued in South Vietnam is, in general, a policy adaptable to a force with a ceiling of approximately 400,000 men. I invite the attention of Senators to page 55 of the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services on the bill which is before us, where the order of magnitude which is contemplated by this appropriation is discussed. The testimony is that of Secretary McNamara, so far as it can be made public commensurate with the interest of security. Secretary McNamara said:

The net increase we are asking above the original 1966 total is 452,843.

I should like to read a question asked by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the reply by Secretary McNamara:

Senator ELLENDER. Well, of that 453,000, how many of those will be used in South Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, these are additions to the total U.S. military force, and it is not possible to say that any of those in particular will be used in South Vietnam. But in the net, all of them are being added because of the South Vietnam conflict.

So I think it is fair to say, Mr. President, that we are dealing with a troop strength of 450,000, as the policy upon which we are basing this appropriation.

We are in the process of building up and consolidating our military positions on the coast up to the 17th parallel, around Saigon, and in the Mekong Delta, and we should continue to focus our pacification and construction efforts within these areas. The enclaves which we now have must be linked up into a stable, contiguous, and democratically run area. This area should then be used as a springboard for the application of power—for probes in the countryside, to keep the Communist forces on the move and to prevent them from consolidating.

So our military strategy should always keep our global needs in mind. Most importantly, we should never allow battlefield commitments to limit or determine policy choices. The quicksand of a jungle guerrilla war can only be avoided by conscious and determined choices at policy levels, specifying limits within which we propose to proceed and the

means which we propose to devote to the attainment of our goals.

THE CLARITY OF U.S. OBJECTIVES

It is an onerous task in hard and long struggle to keep objectives clear in the minds of the policymakers, in the minds of the American people, for the enemies, and for the world. It is difficult, but it must be done. Unless objectives are made clear and held firm, they become the targets for the forces of frustration and hysteria, and they become suspect even by those who want to believe.

I would like to suggest that if the President is to continue to have the support of the American people, and my own support, as well, he must not waver or let the public become confused on six key points:

First, that our interests are involved in Vietnam, and that it is a war to stop the expansion of communism by naked aggression; that the United States understands the distinction between true revolutionary upheavals based upon popular discontent and so-called wars of national liberation.

Second, the President should propose to include the National Liberation Front in future peace talks with a full participating role. The time must come when the Saigon Government has to face this reality, and we must not lead them to believe otherwise.

Third, we must never let ourselves or others believe that there is a final military solution to this kind of war. The risks are too grave. Our purpose is to show that aggression does not pay.

Fourth, the President should always keep the extent and nature of U.S. commitments in Vietnam before the people of the United States and subject to their approval. There is some fear that new commitments were made between Washington and Saigon in Honolulu, and the President should make it clear that no secret commitments were entered into.

Fifth, one of our main goals in Vietnam is to insure future elections in that country which will be genuinely free, and to allow the Vietnamese people to determine their own way; and this includes the question of reunification. We must leave no doubt in the minds of the world that the United States will accept the results of free elections, probably under United Nations control; and should the National Liberation Front be victorious at the polls, we will accept that, too.

I have confidence, however, that free people in the future, as has been the case with free people in the past, will prefer freedom to slavery and will not, therefore, vote the Vietcong in as their rulers.

Sixth, we must never lose sight of the fact that a real peace and true stability will have to await the evolution of social and economic justice within Vietnam, and that it is up to the United States to convince whoever are the leaders in Saigon that a real victory can come only when they successfully promote the dignity of their people and the decency of their lives.

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

Before I conclude, I should like to deal with the meaning of the coming vote,

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3737

which we hope will take place not later than this Friday.

I believe it is important for each Senator, without being offensive or disrespectful, to serve notice on the President. I believe that the President is making a great mistake in not coming to Congress for another support resolution to replace the one of August 1964, which is completely out of date and no longer relevant. He would thereby give us an opportunity to join in developing what should be the policy of the United States.

In voting for this supplemental military authorization bill, we in Congress must do so with our eyes open. We should understand that by approving this measure, we are in effect ratifying the administration's policy in Vietnam in its presently contemplated order of magnitude. Unlike the debate on the previous supplemental appropriation for Vietnam of \$700 million in May 1965, which did not involve such a decision, this one does. For at that time, it was not yet clear, as it is now, that the President does not intend to seek any additional authority from the Congress.

It is necessary for the President to seek new authority. We cannot merely pass a resolution because, if we did, it would destroy the President's position as the leader of the foreign policy of the Nation. This is an authority which he has under the Constitution. The President must give us the opportunity and must take the initiative.

The Constitution gives the President the initiative in matters of foreign policy and gives him enormous powers, not only as President, but also as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. At the same time, the most significant power given to Congress by the Constitution, in addition to the power to declare war, is the control over appropriations. Thus, Congress can use the power of the purse to affect the power of the sword.

I have decided to vote for this supplemental authorization bill because I believe that the order of magnitude contemplated by this bill is necessary to the cause for which we are fighting in Vietnam. If I did not feel that way, it seems to me that duty would compel me to seek to amend the bill or to vote against it.

I have specified the order of magnitude, as indicated by Secretary McNamara's testimony, as being approximately 400,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam.

However, in voting for the bill, I reserve the right to vote against future authorization bills should I believe they would constitute an overcommitment of our resources, or if I find myself in disagreement with our fundamental policy.

I emphasize these points because we often hear it said that the President's executive power has grown to enormous proportions, and that Congress power has become subservient to it. But the essential fact of this imbalance is not that the executive has grown too big, but that Congress has let itself become too small. Thus, if we truly do not believe in the President's course, this is the opportunity to assert our power. If we agree with it, this is the time to affirm our support.

I have been arguing for nearly a year that the President should come to Con-

gress with a new resolution to update the Bay of Tonkin resolution voted by Congress in August 1964. He has chosen not to do so. I believe this is a mistake on his part, but I recognize that in not doing so, he is exercising his prerogative and his powers to the fullest.

Congress must be prepared to exercise its powers to the fullest also. We can pass a resolution on our own initiative if we choose to do so. And those who oppose the magnitude of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam and who oppose the additional commitment contemplated by this authorization bill, have the opportunity—and the duty, it seems to me—to seek to amend this bill accordingly. I do not agree with the Senator from Oregon on this matter, but I believe he is taking the proper course, as he sees it, in seeking to amend this bill, in order to rescind the Bay of Tonkin resolution. I respect him for taking that step, although I shall vote against his amendment.

So let us not delude ourselves or the American people. The vote on this authorization bill does affect our policy in Vietnam. I intend to vote "yea" with my eyes open, because I believe in that policy, because I believe that our cause is just and because I believe the order of military magnitude contemplated by this authorization is worthy of that cause.

I close by saying that I reserve the right to vote against future Vietnam bills if that is the only way the President gives us to express agreement or disagreement with U.S. policy. I express the hope that, in the interest of the Nation and in the interest of crystalizing the country behind the President's policy, the President will ask us, as he did in August 1964, to join with him in a declaration of policy, which policy would then represent the policy of the United States.

Mr. President, while I believe there is no deep division in the country concerning Vietnam, I believe that there is deep worry in the country.

I believe that the President can go a long way toward relieving the American people of that deep worry by asking Congress to join with him, under the advice and consent authority of Congress—and the Senate specifically—in declaring the determination of the United States to seek peace, to honor its commitments, and to pursue limited objectives by limited military means.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that the present debate should be brought to the earliest possible conclusion. I believe we should proceed to the consideration of the authorization bill with the greatest dispatch. I wish we could vote today.

I believe the debate should be brought to an early conclusion. I intend to make my remarks very brief.

In the light of what has been said in the Senate over the past few days, I feel that I must say something in my capacity as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as one who has maintained an abiding interest in foreign affairs and in international politics, as one who has always been concerned with the state of preparedness of the United States, and

as one who has had an opportunity to visit our forces in southeast Asia and to see the splendid work that our American boys are doing there.

Mr. President, the debate over the validity and correctness of Presidential policy in southeast Asia at this time is poorly timed. The debate should have been conducted on the basis of whether or not the additional funds are needed to sustain what we are doing.

It is unfortunate that so many Members of Congress have seized on this particular issue as a time and place to debate policy—indeed, "debate" is stretching the point—and to attack with great vitriol the basic policy of the administration, which puts us in southeast Asia today.

I would be hypocritical if I did not point out that I have opposed the administration vigorously on many, many issues in this body. But I should like to note now that in his basic policy, in his announced intention to preserve the independence of South Vietnam, in his apparent determination not to abandon southeast Asia to Communist conquest, I support my President 100 percent.

Mr. President, I do not know of any time in previous wars—certainly not in my living memory—when Congress has been engaged in active debate over whether or not we should be at war, at a time when we actually are at war. The fact of the matter is, we are currently involved in Vietnam. Thousands of American boys are fighting there, risking their lives daily, and unfortunately too many of them losing their lives.

I wonder what kind of spectacle this debate presents to the boys in Vietnam who are suffering privation, disease, and discomfort, and risking death. I wonder what they think about it, though I do not wonder too much, because I have a pretty good idea. I have been out in the field and have talked to them; and I am sure this is not the greatest morale booster we could engage in.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three alternatives available to us. The distinguished Senator from New York has pointed out that the critics of Presidential policy have hardly been constructive, but have, on the other hand, been destructive. They have not presented an alternative policy.

As I say, it seems to me there are three alternatives.

We can withdraw from southeast Asia. We can pull out all of our forces. But when we do so, we must understand that South Vietnam will surely be overrun by the Communists. It would, in very short order, be in the hands of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Now, South Vietnam, taken alone, is perhaps not of great geographic or strategic importance. But southeast Asia as a whole is of very great geographic and strategic importance. And if we withdraw from South Vietnam, we can expect that Laos would soon go, Cambodia would go, Thailand would be under severe pressures, and ultimately, unless we created a major troop buildup there, would fall under Communist domination, or at least suffer pressure to compel them

to make an accommodation with the Communists. The way would be open for Communist adventures in Burma and the Indian subcontinent. If the dominoes fell as they would like them to fall, they would eventually be free to work their evil will on Africa, and ultimately South America. That would be the consequence of withdrawal.

We would, further, destroy, I believe, the will and determination of peoples everywhere to resist Communist aggression by force.

There is a second alternative. We could stand and fight a war of attrition, determining, perhaps, not to lose, but lacking in the determination to win. We could draw static defense perimeters around the coast, and sit there and wear out men and machines and waste material resources, year after year after year, in a war of attrition that would be very, very costly over the long pull, that would do nothing to convince the Communists of our determination to deal with dispatch, decision, and resolution with so-called wars of national liberation. It would do nothing to discourage further military adventures by them.

Then there is a third alternative. We can resolve to do what is necessary to win.

I do not think we could win at the conference table right now, because I do not think that the Communists will be willing to make satisfactory terms as long as they are not convinced of our determination to use the very great military power we possess. They have rebuffed our peace offensive. We sent our emissaries all over the world, trying to find a means to bring Hanoi and Peiping to the conference table with something approaching a reasonable attitude, and we were rebuffed. All we got for our pains were belligerent speeches from Hanoi and Peiping, and the manifestation of their determination to keep the war going by infiltrating more troops and more supplies into South Vietnam.

Therefore, Mr. President, we must use the very great power that we possess. We must use our military muscle to destroy the will of the enemy to wage war against South Vietnam, by destroying his capacity to wage war. When we prove to him that war is a costly instrument of national policy, indeed so costly an instrument that it is one he cannot resort to, then ultimately we can negotiate a reasonable peace with honor, and we can, in the process, I believe, discourage the precipitation of any further so-called wars of national liberation, and we can convince the world that not only do we possess great power, but that we are willing to use it, if necessary, in the cause of preservation of the right of peoples everywhere to self-determination.

We hear a lot of claptrap about not having a popular-based government in Vietnam. Mr. President, I would like to know how we could really establish a popular-based government in Vietnam. There could not be a meaningful election in that unhappy country today. We could not send Dr. Gallup in to take a poll that would be meaningful.

What we must do, of course, is use our influence to make the government that exists there as responsive to the needs of the people as possible. That we are doing, and we are doing it far more conscientiously, you may be sure, Mr. President, than North Vietnam would do if she exercised suzerainty over the South Vietnamese today.

What is little known, apparently, about what is going on in Vietnam, is the fact that not only are our troops engaged in fighting there, they are engaged in constructive work, through civic action programs aimed at the rehabilitation of villages, the building of schools, the digging of wells for pure water supplies, the combating of disease and infection; and most important, our boys are helping to develop leadership in the local and provincial level there. They are trying to instill into these people a sense of responsibility of and a knowledge of the art of self-government. We are trying to do what we can to help create a viable, democratic society in South Vietnam today—a land which has great potential if it can ever be militarily secured.

Too many critics of administration policy have not proposed any constructive alternatives. I noted three alternatives a while ago, and I suggest that we follow the third, which I believe to be in harmony with the basic policy of the present administration.

So far, I have not heard anyone propose a realistic middle ground between withdrawal and victory which would assure the independence of the South Vietnamese, that would stop Communist aggression, and at the same time save the lives of our soldiers and the South Vietnamese who are fighting today. I have seen no such proposal.

There are those who say, "Well, we cannot be involved in a massive land war with Red China." There is an assumption that using our military might to combat Communist aggression in Vietnam today would automatically result in involvement of the United States in a massive ground war with Communist China—some even say a nuclear war with Communist China—which, to me, seems a little bit ridiculous. But, I believe that this reflects two things: One, a failure to understand the facts; second, a haunting fear of the specter of a belligerent Red China involved in a massive war with the United States, which fear is so great that men are moved to say, "Let us avoid any confrontation, even if it costs territory and the lives of human beings, even if it means that vital areas of the world must slip under Communist control!"

Mr. President, under optimum conditions, the Red Chinese could not send great masses of ground troops into South Vietnam sufficient in number to beat a determined effort by South Vietnam, the United States, and their allies. The problems of logistics, the problems of supply and communication, and the problems of transportation are too great.

We possess absolute air superiority. We could deny them any close air support. We could, with the commission of

great numbers of troops—and, of course, the necessity to increase the flow of supplies—interdict their supplies.

We possess absolute naval superiority. The enemy could be denied support from the sea. And, too, Red China, I believe, understands that if she did involve herself in a massive way in South Vietnam, we would not give her sanctuary, she would risk the loss of her embryo nuclear development through bombing, and we could blow her industries out of existence, industries which only now are recovering from the great leap forward. There is also the threat of a million and a quarter men under Chiang Kai-shek on her eastern flank. She would run the risk of getting deeply involved in a war that she could not win, to the extent that she would lose face and would lose ground in her rivalry with the Soviet Union for influence and power in the Communist bloc nations.

Beyond that, Mr. President, are we always going to check with Peiping and ask what they are going to do, before we resist Communist aggression?

The best way to avoid involvement with Red China, the Soviet Union, or any of the Communist-bloc nations, I would say, would be to withdraw to fortress America, to take all our forces in all parts of the world, where we might risk a direct confrontation, and bring them back to the United States and live with the fortress America concept, and return to primitive isolationism, return to a policy which was advocated at one time by men who were called rightwing extremists.

Mr. President, I reject the notion that we can have a fortress America.

It is incumbent upon us, if we are to preserve our own security, to maintain our defense perimeter as far away from our own shores as possible, and as close to the enemy's shores as possible.

We cannot do this by timorously withdrawing and avoiding a direct confrontation every time Peiping rattles the saber.

Mr. President, we are in Vietnam today because we must be there.

As the strongest nation in the free world, we are the free world's first line of defense.

In every era of human history, it falls to the lot of some great nation to emerge as the leader of the world. It has fallen to our lot, in this era, to do so. It is our responsibility. I trust that we will accept it.

We are in Vietnam because if we fail to meet Communist aggression with military force in this confined front, we will increase the likelihood that we will have to meet it on a much broader front later on, and at a greatly increased cost in human life and material resources.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the use of war as an implement of national policy, unless we are forced to do so by a belligerent enemy who is an aggressor.

I had the privilege of serving in the U.S. Navy in the Western Pacific during World War II, and I have had the opportunity to see the splendid work our boys are doing now in Vietnam. Believe me, this is an even better generation of

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

fighting Americans that America has produced than the one to which I belonged.

I do not like to see these boys wounded or maimed. I do not like to see life ebbing away from them.

We did not start this war, but if by our failure to meet aggression we convince the enemy that war is an altogether satisfactory and effective implement of national policy, then perhaps we are going to have to send another generation to be cannon fodder later on.

I do not believe that Woodrow Wilson was too visionary when he thought that eventually we could achieve peace, and that men could beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. I believe that it can be achieved, but it cannot be achieved if we appear to be weak. Regardless of how strong we are, we can appear to be weak if we show no willingness to use our strength, if necessary, even if we build up a mighty arsenal in an effort to deter war. We must think, Mr. President, in terms of the spectrum of deterrence. We need our missiles, our strategic bombers, and our Polaris submarines as a deterrent to global war, to thermonuclear war, but let us think in terms of the spectrum of deterrence—big conventional wars, little conventional wars, small brush fire wars—let us try to deter any kind of war which could ultimately escalate into a general conflagration.

I submit we should confine the war to the smallest possible front, by doing what is necessary to win it, by intensifying our effort, and not by "escalation"—which is a term opponents who have criticized the administration's policy use as a scare word—"escalation" implies broadening the front—using more sophisticated efforts. The efforts should be intensified to the smallest possible front.

Perhaps someday we can leave a little better legacy to the generations that follow us than has been passed on to my generation or the generation now in Vietnam, if we will show the determination to do so.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to the very able and reasoned speech of the Senator from Texas. I wonder if he would mind indicating more fully the meaning of his reference to the need to destroy the capacity of the enemy to make war in South Vietnam. Whom did he refer to as the enemy? I would like to have more precisely his meaning.

Mr. TOWER. The enemy in this particular instance are the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. Hanoi is actively waging a war of aggression against South Vietnam by infiltrating great numbers, in regimental and division strength, into South Vietnam. These are not shirttail militia; these are regulars. Hanoi is supplying them with the equipment necessary to wage an active war. This is the enemy.

Of course, in an indirect way, Peiping is the enemy, because Peiping supplies the hardware. Of course, Peiping is not directly involved so far as troops or

units of her armed services are concerned. By destroying the capacity to wage war, I mean to include specific military targets. This is to be determined after careful study by the military profession, who know what valid military targets are and what are not. By that I mean destroy supply depots and their ability to supply the troops in South Vietnam, their ability to manufacture armaments that might go into South Vietnam. In other words, by destroying anything that enhances their ability to make war.

I would like to make it clear, and I have made it clear, I do not think it is necessary to bomb the civilian population. I do not think it is necessary to destroy civilians in large numbers. Obviously, if a military target is hit, certain civilians are going to be jeopardized. The Vietcong have engaged in wanton killing of civilians merely for the purpose of terrifying those citizens. I do not advocate that, but I advocate attacks against their ability to wage aggressive war against South Vietnam.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is very helpful. He has just said the effort should be to destroy their capacity to manufacture weapons, to supply troops serving in South Vietnam, and he has also indicated that, indirectly, China is the enemy. He indicated, thirdly, that supplies of hardware were coming from China.

Now, adding those together, is the Senator advocating an attack upon the supply lines or factories in China?

Mr. TOWER. Let me hasten to assure the Senator I am not advocating any armed attack against China. What we should do is hit the lines of supply. The supplies manufactured in Red China should be destroyed after they get to North Vietnam, or South Vietnam, if that is possible.

No, I do not advocate destroying or waging an attack against Red China.

There are some neutral countries that are supplying certain materials to North Vietnam. I do not advocate that we bomb them. But certainly I advocate that we destroy the lines of supply—that is to say, if we are going to conduct the war. It seems to me that is basic to all military operations. Napoleon said that an army travels on its stomach. I assume this also applies to all logistical operations. It was our ability to destroy their sources of supply when we were bombing Germany that resulted in our winning the war. Of course, we were able to attack home industry, because we were then at war with Germany. The same is true of Japan. It was our ability to destroy their lines of supply that resulted in winning the war. I think it is going to be necessary in this war.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his elucidation. It is my understanding that the Senator is advocating a limited war—

Mr. TOWER. As a matter of fact, I have said let us confine the front. I do not want us to be involved on a broader front, but I am afraid we are going to

have to later on. The statement I was making is that if we allow the Communists to push us more and more, eventually we will have to resist them at some place, and it will be more costly than it would be now. This is essentially the line I take.

Mr. GORE. I am trying to discover where the line of demarcation would be, as compared to the views which the Senator from Tennessee has expressed. I have expressed the hope—

Mr. TOWER. I hope the Senator will state them, because I did not have the privilege of hearing his remarks.

Mr. GORE. I have stated, if I may briefly recapitulate, that I thought our goal would be to limit hostilities within bounds which I thought would be reasonably manageable and that our country's goals in this conflict should be the achievement of a tolerable political settlement which would permit the disengagement of combat forces at the earliest feasible time.

With that brief statement of the views I have expressed to the Senator, would he mind drawing some line of demarcation? I wanted to have an expression. I assume the words mean the same to me as they do to him.

Mr. TOWER. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is saying that the objectives are limited, that our goal is to achieve disengagement—

Mr. GORE. Achieve a political settlement.

Mr. TOWER. Achieve a political settlement.

Mr. GORE. Which would permit our own disengagement of combat forces at the earliest feasible time.

Mr. TOWER. I would be perfectly willing to if we could work out a political settlement that would result in a disengagement, provided such settlement comprehended what I understand to be the minimum condition of the President as expressed in his speech in Baltimore last year, and that is to guarantee the independence of South Vietnam.

I will settle for this by anyway we can achieve it. I believe that in the light of the failure of the peace offensive. It was not our fault that it failed, because we tried. I believe we allowed our passions to be sorely tried in the process. We restrained ourselves from bombing Vietnam in an effort to show good faith and that we genuinely wanted a peaceful result. All that we got was helligerent words thrown back in our teeth.

It appears we will now have to bring more military pressure to bear before we can achieve a climate that will result in disengagement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very much. He has added a great deal of clarity to the statement, so far as I am concerned. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. I thank my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that it is my fervent hope that the Senate will not delay this matter further and proceed to act on the supplemental authorization. This is the least that we

can do for the boys who are fighting a dirty, rotten war and at the same time, through their compassion, trying to help the people of South Vietnam. They are men who understand their mission probably more clearly than many men in public life in this country understand it; men who do not complain; who are proud of what they are doing; and who are reflecting so much credit on the United States.

It is more important in this world that we be respected than that everybody approve of what we do.

Our motives are honest. We do not seek to impose our systems of politics or economics on any country that does not want them. We do not seek territorial aggrandizement. We are trying to create a climate in this world in which all peoples can aspire to self-determination, social and economic progress, and freedom, and have some reasonable hope of realizing that aspiration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include certain documents to record the activities of our troops describing exactly what civic action is and how our troops are going about it in aiding and helping the people of South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[News release from U.S. Marine Corps]

PHU BAI: MODEL OF COUNTERINSURGENCY

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Marine activity in the vicinity of the Phu Bai airstrip near Hue is a model of counterinsurgency operations—a model being followed by marines in most village pacification activities. The pattern requires aggressiveness, patience, and understanding.

Near Phu Bai, marines have gone to work in five village complexes to develop the combination of confidence in the security from the Vietcong, and confidence in the good intentions of the marines. Security from the Vietcong is, as always, the basic first step. Marines have swept the area, and now conduct patrols and ambush operations on the periphery of their main area of operations to keep the Vietcong off balance. Back in the villages, counterinsurgency activities are underway with vigor, and with good results.

Medical, education, and engineering and other civic action programs have been undertaken. In addition, local popular forces are being trained by the marines—including a marine lieutenant who speaks Vietnamese, and several squads of marine infantrymen who are learning the language rapidly. The Vietnamese and Americans live, work, and eat together in this training outfit. The marines provide the popular forces with tactical instructions; the marines in turn are given valuable information on the local situation—customs, language, religion, and terrain. There is a camaraderie among troops involved in this program based on mutual respect, and a sense of growing professional competence.

The rapid development of this popular force is of particular interest when it is recalled that, at Le My, a village near Da Nang, internal security of the village is largely handled by popular forces trained in that village since the marines' arrival in May. It is significant that the marines are accepted completely by the villagers and are accorded the same treatment by the local officials and merchants as the Vietnamese servicemen and local inhabitants receive. They confide information concerning Vietcong sympathizers and active Vietcong and willingly undertake

to find out useful information about Vietcong activities and intentions.

The good relations are not achieved at the expense of the Government of Vietnam, however. Marine civic actions are coordinated through the local and district officials, and relations with the Government and with Vietnamese Army units in the area are excellent. The indications are encouraging. Le My was a classic operation which brought a village in a mere 4 months from under Vietcong domination to a positive, pro-Government area in which the Vietcong are unwelcome. Near Phu Bai there are prospects of the same sort of achievement. There is no easy or quick path to success.

These Vietnamese villages are small and there are many of them near our bases. The orderly process of pacification, achieved only with patience, is being accomplished in the 3d Marine Amphibious Force areas. The problems of pacification are being identified and solved, and each day the Vietcong can move freely in less and less of the country. Each day they can impress a few less men. Each day peace, prosperity, and security loom up as a real possibility in Vietnamese villages where the meanings of these words have never been demonstrated to a child or teenager.

RECENT ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM

It's almost impossible for an American to visualize what the years of Vietcong terror and exploitation have done to the people of South Vietnam—the little people, farmers and fishermen—who have no thought of politics and who just want to live in peace. It's likewise almost impossible to realize how much our marines have done to bring them the security and peace that they want so badly.

Every day we hear about the tactics, the air strikes, the casualty rates, and other topics from Vietnam.

I'd like to spend a few moments discussing some less sensational activities in Vietnam. The Communists have repeatedly stated the importance of popular support for their so-called wars of national liberation. Without the active support of the people, or at least without their tacit support, a guerrilla movement can't hope to succeed.

As you're aware, the little people caught up in the Vietnamese war will support the Vietcong as long as the Vietcong can coerce them into providing such support, and coercion becomes a relatively simple process if the people are convinced that their government can't give them the security and protection they want so ardently. Once the people realize that their government is, in fact, protecting them from the Vietcong, their attitudes change dramatically.

Let me give you an example of how such attitude changes are brought about.

A few weeks ago, a Vietcong patrol forced a woman, in a village near DaNang known as Hao Lac, to serve as a guide for the patrol. She led them to a marine outpost and turned them in.

Hao Lac was once a Vietcong-dominated village in a valley which had been controlled by the Vietcong for years. When the marines first entered the valley, half of the people of Hao Lac ran for the hills. The rest hid their possessions. The children watched silently in doorways when the marines passed. The adults remained indoors. The Vietcong had told the people that the Americans would be their oppressors; and that of the Americans none were more cruel or terrible than the marines.

The marines cleared the valley of Vietcong and then set the stage for a remarkable transition among the people. What changed the people from fleeing the Americans to turning Vietcong over to them?

A few women put the health of their children above the influence of Vietcong propaganda and sought aid from our Navy

medical corpsmen. Soon sick call in the village and nearby hamlets was a common practice. One corpsman stayed in the village for 2 months helping the people, and in the process learning Vietnamese. It is a sad footnote that he was later killed in action. Once they'd cleared the area, the marines cooperated with Vietnamese agencies in a program to restore the area which years of Vietcong control had leached dry.

The marketplace, closed for 5 years, was reopened. The school was repaired. And most important, with the area protected against the Vietcong, native Vietnamese experts—nurses, a teacher, and others—could once again work in safety. Other United States and Vietnamese service agencies were able to work in the valley after years of having to bypass it because of the Vietcong. The marines serving in the vicinity of the village treated the villagers and farmers with the consideration and kindness which comes so naturally to Americans, and which is absolutely essential to successful civic action. When equipment or aid in a reconstruction project was requested by the village chief, the marines provided it.

The villagers of Hoa Lac who originally fled have long since returned to the valley. They have removed the Vietcong booby traps which were once everywhere. Once she had security for her home and children it's small wonder that the village woman turned those terrorists over to the same marines who were instrumental in bringing that security.

In a letter to a Marine battalion commander, the Hoa Vang district representative observed: "We have particularly noted that all the marines of this battalion are interested in their work and are very brave. They are very polite to the people of the area, and they haven't teased the girls." Courtesy has always been a military virtue but I don't really believe we've ever been in a war—before this one—in which "teasing the girls" had any military significance one way or the other. This is truly a different kind of war.

There are many agencies, both Vietnamese and American, ready to come into a secure area and pick up where the troops leave off to establish a better life for the people. Security and civic action programs are only the initial steps. Once these first steps are taken, the better life comes for the people. It becomes increasingly evident to the people that the Vietcong—who have taken their food, exposed them to war, impressed their sons into service—have also denied them access to the fruits of orderly government and a decent life.

We've enjoyed some modest successes in our programs to win the support of the Vietnamese villagers. In cooperation with Vietnamese armed forces we've instituted a program of protecting the farmers' produce and rice crop from Vietcong expropriation, and assisting the more isolated farmers in getting their crops to market.

In the four Marine coastal enclaves, about 5,000 civilian patients a week are treated by Navy medical corpsmen. Most of the patients are children who have never had any opportunity for treatment of any sort. The kids don't know about vitamins; but, like youngsters anywhere, they'll take anything if a candy bribe comes with it.

As the Vietnamese people—the little people in the hamlets and villages—come to recognize the marines as their friends and protectors, our flow of information about the Vietcong increases. As our intelligence gets better, we're able to eliminate more Vietcong. As Vietcong casualties rise we're able to bring a greater degree of security to the countryside which, in turn, once again increases the help we get from the people. So you see, all of our activities—from combat, through village rehabilitation and medical assistance, to not teasing the girls—are designed to help the Vietnamese win this war of northern aggression.

February 23, 1966

RECENT ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM

We're often asked about this thing called civic action in Vietnam and what our role is in the field of civic action and related activities. First of all, civic action, in its broadest sense, is any step taken by military units which contributes to social or economic development and, most importantly in a war of this nature, serves to improve the standing of military forces with the populace. Civic action is conducted at all levels, from an individual marine teaching a child to read, all the way up the scale to the use of large units on projects which are national in scope. An example of a really large project would be the development of the Ohio River Valley by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The extensive road not built by the Roman legions in the time of the Caesars is another example of a large-scale civic action project. Obviously, marines in Vietnam are not engaged in any such vast programs; however, I said that civic action is taken at every level and, in a campaign of the sort we're conducting in Vietnam, it's often those individual or group local projects which pay the biggest dividends. Let me give you a few examples of recent civic action projects and related activities of marines in South Vietnam.

About 2 months ago, Sgt. John D. Moss, a marine from Costa Mesa, Calif., who was serving with a photo-recon squadron at the Da Nang airbase, bought a horse. Since then he's been in the pony ride business. Almost any day of the week you'll find Vietnamese children waiting for him to appear with his horse. They don't know when, but they know he'll come whenever he has a little free time and then they'll have an afternoon of rides. As Sergeant Moss tells it, "They love the horse and for a little while each one of them is very happy. War is bad business, but taking these little ones for a ride makes them forget the ugly things for awhile. You know, when I get about 20 of these children laughing and arguing about getting on 'Willie,' I even forget the bad stuff myself." A big thing? Hardly. Just one marine's way of helping kids forget the realities of their world for a few moments. Contrived? Hardly. Americans are known the world over for their love of children; this is just another minor example. What benefit do we derive from activities like Sergeant Moss?

Who can tell? The Vietcong have done their best to paint us as invading barbarians. As long as the Vietnamese people believe these lies we can't hope to win their support. Sergeant Moss and his horse Willie are helping to prove them wrong.

Last June, the members of the 1st Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment donated \$200 of the battalion's Protestant church services fund to the villagers of Hoa My near Da Nang. The village had never had a Sunday school and the villagers wanted one. They were more than willing to provide the labor for construction, but they couldn't afford the small amount of construction material which had to be purchased. Today Hoa My has its Sunday school. This is just another example of marines helping the people of Vietnam to help themselves.

These activities aren't all conducted by individuals or small groups of marines. Many of them are conducted by units as a normal part of the unit's service in Vietnam. Last fall, a marine helicopter squadron evacuated an entire village of more than 1,500 Vietnamese who had been stranded by rampaging floodwaters. The crewmen not only had to face the normal hazards of flying during the heavy rains but Vietcong sniper fire as well. Marines throughout the Pacific contributed blankets and clothing to assist the hapless villagers. With helicopters always in demand, there are armchair tacticians who might say that using this vehicle for other than purely military purposes is

a waste of resources. We don't think so. We believe that no effort is wasted if it serves to impress upon the Vietnamese villagers that their government, with our help, is striving to bring security and peace to the countryside.

Few of these efforts have immediate, visible results. For this reason, it is difficult to assess their value in concrete terms. We've seen some results, though, which tend to support our view of the value of serving and protecting the little people caught up in this war.

One example of immediate results occurred in the village of Le My which is about 7 miles west of Da Nang. The Marines had a lot of harassment in this area—sniping, booby traps, punji pits—that sort of thing. The villagers and the Vietcong would scatter when our daytime patrols approached; then at night, the Vietcong would move back into the village and resume control. In May, the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment, moved into the area lock, stock, and barrel. As part of a program of rural construction, these marines removed all of the punji pits from the paddies and the paths leading to them, making it safe for the villagers to work their fields once again. Charts were drawn up showing the villagers where fresh water was located. After a few days the villagers started getting the message—the marines were there to protect and help them, not to suppress them as they'd been told by the Vietcong. Once they got the true picture they commenced giving active support to the marines in their efforts to flush out the terrorists. One aged, bearded elder saved us a casualty by pointing out a booby trap to a patrol. Later, two women assisted a patrol by identifying a Vietcong trying to evade the search party.

It's the single, isolated, little acts such as these that convince us that our efforts are worth while. The dominant theme of our patrol actions is: Capture or kill the Vietcong; make friends with and protect the South Vietnamese. In this sort of war, the use of friendship is often as important as the use of rifles.

Dr. Bernhard Fall, author of "Street Without Joy" and "The Two Vietnams," is fond of telling this story: an old sergeant was taking a training course in counter guerrilla operations and the standard quotation by Mao Tse-tung concerning the guerrilla being a "fish who swims in a friendly sea" was used. The instructor had spent all morning impressing his students with the importance of depriving the guerrilla of his base of support among the populace. Toward the end of the session, the instructor asked the sergeant to explain what actions could be taken by troops to dry up the friendly sea without which the guerrilla couldn't operate. The grizzled veteran thought a while, then answered, "Be nice to the goddamned people." Crude? Sure. True? Sure. That's what the civic action program is all about.

A question has come up in the last few weeks concerning civilian casualties as the result of Marine ground action in Vietnam. In its most common form the question is usually stated something like this: "If the success of the U.S. effort in Vietnam depends upon winning the support of the villagers for the Vietnamese Government, how can we hope to win this support if our troops cause casualties among the villagers and destroy their homes and fields?"

First, it's necessary to realize that we're in Vietnam to assist the Vietnamese Government in their efforts to eliminate the Communist Vietcong. In some areas the Vietcong have turned whole villages into fortified strongpoints. Our military actions in these areas lean more toward pure combat operations than to civic action operations. By combat operations, I mean the normal process of seizing the strongpoint and kill-

ing or capturing any Vietcong who have chosen to remain in their fortified positions. Because of the nature of the war, we often put ourselves at a military disadvantage by warning the populace beforehand of the impending attack. These warnings consist of instructions to the villagers to evacuate, the safe areas in which they may congregate during the attack; and the purpose of the attack. Every effort is made to spare the aged, the women, and the children during an attack. Even those who, through fear, choose to remain in the village are enticed from hiding, if possible, and evacuated. When the attack begins, there is no great artillery or mortar preparation as in normal combat. Marine infantrymen advance without the benefit of covering fire, often in the open. If no hostile fire is received, they conduct a house-to-house search for Vietcong, their weapons, fortifications, and supplies. When enemy material is discovered, it's destroyed; as are any buildings which have been fortified. Nothing is destroyed which is of no military value to the Vietcong. Marines do not destroy houses for the sake of punishment or the sake of impressing the villagers with the futility of assisting the terrorists. Since a great deal of effort is expended in village improvement once the village has been declared clear, our marines are careful about destruction of buildings.

Occasionally, a few terrorists will choose to remain in a fortified village in the hope of killing a few marines. When this happens, the village search often involves the exchange of small arms fire and the careful selective destruction of obviously fortified dwellings. Sometimes innocent villagers are flushed out by the shooting and are caught in the crossfire. Sometimes other innocent villagers who choose or were forced by the Vietcong to remain in the fortified buildings or tunnels become casualties during the course of the attack. These casualties are as rare as the Marines can possibly make them and still not hamstring their combat efforts. As the commanding general of the Marines in Vietnam has stated on this subject: "We are taking all possible steps to avoid such occurrences."

We're in Vietnam to win. Winning requires the support of the people. Every marine in Vietnam is aware of this fact. There have been civilian casualties in every war, sometimes massive casualties. This is not that kind of war and it won't become that kind of war through any action on the part of U.S. Marines.

[From Pictorial Living, Feb. 13, 1966]
LEATHERNECKS IN VIETNAM ARE WINNING
FRIENDS IN A "WAR WITHIN A WAR"
(By Doug Storer)

A few weeks ago, the mayor of Da Nang, the Vietnamese town where we have established our largest airbase, paid a surprise visit to a Marine field hospital there. With him was a local delegation laden with flowers, all come to thank the Americans for what they had done for Vietnam. Just as a formal speech was being made by the mayor, a little Vietnamese girl who was with the group broke away, darted up to the bedside of a wounded marine and placed in his hand a battered, much-loved plastic doll. Then, still without a word, the little girl ran shyly from the room.

A touching gesture of gratitude? Very. But more important still, it was a singular victory for the Marine civic action program in Vietnam.

I first heard of this remarkable program when I was in Vietnam recently. The Vietnamese war is a strange one. For us it is a counter guerrilla war, and success must be measured not only in land taken and Vietcong killed, but in gaining the trust and confidence of the people.

Both sides are battling for this same objective with the result that there is now a "war within a war" being fought in Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor recently described it as a "desperate war" make necessary because "there is more than a military victory to be won in Vietnam."

This victory is for the minds of the people. To achieve it, the Vietcong follow up their military attacks with Communistic propaganda and terrorism; we follow ours with civic action.

The strategy of civic action is simple. As soon as a village is occupied: help the suffering people, offer them friendship, bind up their wounds, provide them with what they need to get going again.

This direct, humanitarian effort has made friends quickly for the marines in some parts of Vietnam, but in areas where the Vietcong had previously been long entrenched, it has taken a lot of hard, patient work on the part of the weary Leather-necks to win over the villagers made hostile by anti-American propaganda. Although terrified by the Vietcong, the people have been taught by the Communists to fear the coming of the Americans even more.

"The Americans will steal your possessions," the Communists have told them. "They will kill, cripple, and torture your people. Even take food from your children. And remember, of all savage Americans, none are more cruel, violent, and treacherous than the marines."

Civic action "weapons" to win the people are food, clothing, and medical supplies, building materials, and tools. But there are many others, some measured by "heart valve" alone, such as a little girl's first doll—the joy of learning simple numbers on the gun-called hand of a big, kindly marine—a magical pair of glasses for an old man who thought dim eyes could never see again—a midwifery kit for an obscure hamlet where delivery and death, far too often, go hand in hand—the loan of a bulldozer to a poor farmer to help him break ground for spring planting.

Many of the "weapons" come from CARE packages—but they're CARE packages with a difference. These are specially put together by that famed organization of marines who know exactly what is needed to win friends.

These, and many more, are the varied "weapons" of kindness and compassion used by the marines in this humanitarian war—a war the marines are winning.

The signs of victory in this war are not always sensational and might pass unnoticed by us, but they are unmistakable to the marines.

They know, for instance, that civic action has achieved a victory when a Marine chaplain is invited to give the first service in a little mission church which, after being bombed out by the Vietcong, the marines have rebuilt with funds from their own slender paychecks.

In another case, a clinic which was set up under a thatched roof in a village square was ignored by the people for weeks; the medics waited but no one came. Then a young Vietnamese mother, wary still of the Americans she had been taught to hate, but desperate for her sick child, brought the baby to the clinic for treatment. A few injections worked wonders, the mother ceased to hate, told others of her child's recovery and in a little while the clinic was swamped with patients.

Occasionally, there is a very dramatic victory. Not long ago the marines finally occupied a village where the Vietcong had been in control for more than 2 years. The people of the village had been taught their lessons of hate and fear.

However, the marines put civic action to work immediately and waited patiently for the program to win over the people. But although the people accepted the food, the

supplies and the help, they showed no signs of friendship or trust.

One day, though, while five village women were out fishing on the Han River in a sampan they were hailed by a Vietcong, a former Communist inhabitant of the village, who asked their help in smuggling him back into the village.

Hoisting the man into the little boat the women slowly paddled back to the village. There they rowed along the bank until they spotted a marine sentry whereupon they boldly picked up the surprised Communist, dumped him into the water and signaled the sentry on shore with loud screams of "Vietcong, Vietcong."

The action of these women in delivering a Vietcong to the Marines was a great breakthrough and soon after the whole hard-core village fell to civic action and its humane program.

Wherever the war to free Vietnam is fought, successes for the marine civic action program are occurring all over that unfortunate country.

And the Vietcong are feeling the pinch. As friendship grows for the Americans among the Vietnamese people, the enemy guerrillas find fewer and fewer places in which to hide out.

Up until recently, civic action—which the marines created as a voluntary program—has been supported mostly by the marines themselves.

Now you can join these gallant men in this fight for freedom. All you have to do to help the marines help the people of Vietnam is send a contribution, no matter how small, to The Marines CARE, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036.

[News Release from U.S. Marine Corps:]

A WAR WITHIN A WAR

WASHINGTON, September 14.—A war within the Vietnam war is being fought by American Marines, armed not with guns but with simple, American-style kindness and understanding.

For the U.S. Marines, Vietnam is a new kind of warfare. It is a war like no other, but with rules as old as mankind. It is a war that demands the cold-blooded courage to storm into battle, then the warmhearted kindness to comfort the victims—the hungry, naked children caught up in the nightmare of conflict.

It is a war of frontline diplomacy where one careless act can have costly consequences. It's a war where words backed up by deeds are equally as important as good marksmanship and brilliant battlefield tactics.

Vietnam is a war where both sides are battling to win the minds of the people; where victory for either side depends on the good will of the people rather than the physical occupation of land.

There are no textbook answers for this kind of war. The Marines are writing the manual for problems as complex as human nature itself. It is often frustrating and the results are slow in showing. But it is beginning to pay off.

LeMy is a village complex which nestles along the south bank of the winding Ca De River about 7 miles north of Da Nang. The travelog narrator would describe it as a typical, sleepy little tropical community, graced by swaying palms and golden rice-fields.

A few weeks ago, LeMy was a Communist stronghold—well entrenched and well booby-trapped. LeMy was the major Vietcong supply center for the entire valley leading in from the Ho Chi Minh infiltration trails.

The Vietcong of LeMy were preparing for an all-out attack on the vital, bustling air-base at DaNang, just as other Vietcong had already hit Bien Hoa and Pleiku to the south.

President Johnson saw fit to call in the

marines. The village of LeMy lived in fear of the day American marines would come. The Communists had told them how brutal the Americans were. The marines, they said, were the worst.

As the point squad of the 2d Battalion, 3d Marines approached a single shot rang out. A marine, struck in the shoulder, buckled and fell to the ground. The sniper disappeared. Not one villager had seen him.

The guerrillas hid in bunkers as the marines came to give food and clothing to the villagers. One by one, the marines tripped mines and booby traps. One by one, the marines dragged the guerrillas from their holes.

The villagers were startled to find mines in their front yards. They were startled to find the guerrillas living underneath their thatched huts.

"Why can't we just round up these people and march them through in front of us?" asked one frustrated squad leader.

"That's not the way we do it," he was told. "We've got to win them over, then hope they'll point out the mines and the booby traps and the guerrillas."

Lt. Col. David Clement, commander of the battalion, decided to make his stand at LeMy. "Somebody's got to win the war," he said. "To do that, we have to win the people. We've won a few around here. We'll win some more."

Clement's marines patiently went on with the difficult task of making friends. It took time. And more than one marine died from a sniper's shot while giving out food. But the Vietcong, by his fierce anti-American propaganda, unknowingly made the job easier.

When the villagers got used to the smiling faces under camouflaged helmets; when their hunger was sated by the extra rice; when they saw their women were not raped; when their sores began to heal after the corpsmen doctored them, they began to change their minds.

LeMy Village today is the showcase of the Marine Corps. Clement's marines have rebuilt bridges destroyed by the Vietcong. They have reopened the school for the first time in 7 years; the marketplace, closed for 5 years, is now open.

Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt, the burly, quiet-natured Kansan who commands the Marines in Vietnam, believes the patience from the beginning is paying off.

"We're reaping rewards we never really expected," he says. "Just a few weeks ago, some 1,600 villagers west of here suddenly decided they wanted no more to do with the Vietcong. They wanted to leave their village and be resettled in a safe place. But they were afraid to start walking for fear the Vietcong would start shooting them."

"We took our helicopters out and they crawled aboard, carrying all they could, leaving most of their possessions behind. It was quite a sight."

"Then, just the other day," said Walt, "five women were out in a sampan when they were stopped by a Vietcong. He wanted a ride to their village. When they got to LeMy, they pushed him out and began screaming, 'Vietcong, Vietcong!'"

The success at LeMy is enabling the Marines to beat the Vietcong at his own game. When Clement's marines patrol the jungles around LeMy, they leave stackouts behind where the now friendly villagers have reported guerrilla activity. A fire team of three or four marines hides in the jungle for days at a time, waiting for the Vietcong to come out of his hole.

Students of guerrilla warfare have long declared the importance of the people to the overall victory. The marines are taking lessons from the masters.

Red China's Mao Tse-tung summed it up decades ago: "The people," he said, "are the water in which the partisan fish swim. The

February 23, 1966

3743

fish can flourish only if the temperature of the water is right."

Mao felt it important enough to admonish his guerrillas with "three rules and eight remarks" on dealing with the people:

"All actions are subject to command.

"Do not steal from the people.

"Be neither selfish nor unjust.

"Replace the door when you leave the house.

"Roll up the bedding on which you have slept.

"Be courteous.

"Be honest in your transactions.

"Return what you borrow.

"Replace what you break.

"Do not bathe in the presence of women.

"Do not without authority search the pocketbooks of those you arrest."

No successful guerrilla leader has failed to realize the importance of the people. One expert of another era, T. E. Lawrence (of Arabia), noted that the guerrilla "must have a friendly population, not actively friendly but sympathetic to the point of not betraying rebel movements to the enemy."

Another more recent expert, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Hanoi's defense minister and the victor at Dienbienphu, describes guerrilla warfare as "neither more nor less than the mobilization of the rural masses."

Giap, in the Indochina War, gained the will of the rural masses by giving them the land they worked, and by killing off the unpopular landlords and government tax collectors.

Point nine of the Vietcong "oath of honor" is "to help the people, respect the people, and defend the people in order to win their confidence and affection."

The Communist guerrilla goes a step farther to gain this all-important community support—terror. Communist leaders have written: "Where voluntary community support is not spontaneously forthcoming at the outbreak of the struggle or cannot be sustained at the desired level, the guerrilla movement must resort to terrorism to compel such support."

"Terror," they say, "is the guerrilla leader's most potent weapon." Then they add, "The use of terror, to be effective, must be absolute."

Vietcong terror has been absolute. Literally thousands of village chiefs, town mayors, tax collectors, schoolteachers, and other government officials have been beheaded by the Vietcong, usually in full view of the helpless community.

Even more peasants, farmers, fishermen, women, and children have died in terrorist bombings, on mined highways, and in wrecked trains.

The Asian Communist counts on one thing. The West, with deep-rooted humanitarian ideals, reacts to bloodshed and protracted violence with a troubled conscience. They will not meet terror with terror.

American marines believe the concept of terror to be false. In the long run, they have found, kindness is the most potent weapon against the guerrilla. The marines' war within the Vietnam war is one of friendship. And it works.

Maj. Ben Ferrell, a drawing, former Tyler, Tex., lawyer, is civil affairs officer for General Walt's 3d Marine Amphibious Force. His job is making sure that 30,000 marines make friends with the Vietnamese.

"We have no special setup for civil affairs," he explains. "We work through the chain of command. Unit commanders go see the village chief and determine what the needs are—medical, public works, food, clothing.

"While some marines protect the village against the Vietcong, others dig wells, make water points, build bridges, dikes, and roads.

"Most readily accepted, I suppose, is medical aid. The people are a bit reluctant at

first to come in for sick call. But give them a few days, and let a corpsman clean up a few dirty kids, and they come in droves."

The LeMy aid station, set up at almost the same spot where the first marine died in combat, is now treating some 200 Vietnamese patients a day.

"Our Navy doctors and corpsmen," says Ferrell, "are ambassadors with band-aids."

LeMy village near Da Nang is just one example of the marines' war within the Vietnam war. Walt's command of 30,000 men stretches out over 200 miles, in four enclaves along the coast of South Vietnam.

In the center of each enclave is an airbase, vital in the Vietnamese Government's war against the Vietcong. The airbases must be defended.

Around each of these airbases are battalions of young American marines living in the mud of foxholes with no more than a rubber poncho for a roof. Their conditions are hardly as good as the refugees of the war they are fighting. But somehow, between skirmishes, the marines find time and energy to help these refugees.

In the hills around Qui Nhon, 150 miles south of Da Nang, leathernecks of the Second Battalion, 7th Marines, have set up a roadside cafeteria offering free rice cooked to suit local taste.

Fifty yards away a tent has been erected. It is manned by two Navy doctors, three medical assistants, and an ambulance driver. A few of the people are reluctant to stop and be treated for fear of Vietcong reprisal, but the crowd increases daily.

Hospital Corpsman Kenneth Blackwell, of Fresno, Calif., says there were no people at all when the Marines first arrived. As the days passed, he said, the villagers started to reappear—curious and afraid at first. They found the Americans friendly and they responded.

At the Hue-Phu Bai enclave, 40 miles north of Da Nang, the Marines have added another orphanage to their long and growing list. Some 200 pounds of clothing, collected by Marine wives in Hawaii, has been delivered to the 500 children at the St. Paul de Charles Orphanage.

A Marine helicopter crewman who helped give out the clothes, said it is debatable who gets more satisfaction in the effort.

"This time yesterday," he said, "I was on a combat mission. Today, I'm giving clothes to kids. This job is more satisfying. Maybe it's more important, too."

At Da Nang, Sgt. John Moss, of Costa Mesa, Calif., has found another way to wage this war of friendship. About 4 months ago, he bought a small horse. Since that time, he has been in the ponyride business.

"When I show up with Willie, the horse," he says, "kids come running from everywhere. War is bad business, especially for the kids. Taking them for a ride makes them forget the ugly things for a while. For a few moments, each one of them is very happy.

"You know what?" he added, "I even forget the bad stuff myself."

The Marines are waging this war of friendship with every weapon they have. Friendship sometimes comes in a can—a can of C-rations in the outstretched hand of a marine—for wars have traditionally produced scared, hungry people—and big, friendly marines.

Friendship sometimes comes in a bottle of pills or sirup—a bottle of modern science to treat such things as pneumonia where a pack of herbs on a victim's chest had been the remedy.

Friendship comes in the battle-scarred hands of a marine infantryman, teaching a Vietnamese boy to count in English; or hands giving what is probably the first real doll to a little girl destined by the fate of

guerrilla warfare to spend her youth in an orphanage.

Friendship, the marines have learned, is the weapon to win this war within the Vietnam war.

"The Vietcong," says Lt. Col. David Clement, "have neither the firepower nor the reserve to counter us. When we can swim in the sea of people as well as they can, then we're going to win."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in addition I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement by Adm. Arleigh Burke, of the Center for Strategic Studies, which is pertinent to the matter under discussion today.

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

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC BY ARLEIGH BURKE, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

The North Vietnamese have failed to give any indications whatever of a willingness to negotiate the conflict in South Vietnam except on terms which would essentially require the withdrawal of U.S. forces and influence from southeast Asia, and specifically South Vietnam, and thereby abandon the free people of southeast Asia to eventual Communist domination.

These conditions are, of course, unacceptable to the United States because they are inimical to our national interests and security as well as to the interests of the free people of Asia.

And yet the North Vietnamese battalions which have been sent into South Vietnam have been badly mauled by the military power of South Vietnam and the United States. The Vietcong, controlled by Hanoi, have had most of their terrorist operations thwarted, although they have been successful in some of their terrorist activities against both the South Vietnamese and the United States and allied forces.

North Vietnam is a small country whose war effort is supported by both the Soviet Union and Communist China. North Vietnam could not continue its aggressive penetration into South Vietnam without this heavy support.

An examination of the relative power available to South Vietnam and the United States, and that available to North Vietnam and its Communist allies, clearly indicates that North Vietnam cannot hope to succeed in its efforts to conquer South Vietnam as long as both sides continue to fight.

Under these circumstances, then, it is desirable to examine why it is that North Vietnam continues in her efforts to take over South Vietnam when her prospects for success appear to be so small.

It is evident from the events of the past several months that the North Vietnamese have not been convinced that they cannot be successful.

There are three possible reasons which Ho Chi Minh and his advisers may have for their conviction that if they fight hard enough and long enough, they will be successful.

The first is that they may hope for a spectacular military disaster to some elements of the United States and allied forces now in South Vietnam. If military disaster should occur to our forces in South Vietnam, the North Vietnamese might expect that the people and the Government of the United States would be so shaken that they would withdraw our military forces in support of South Vietnam.

This possibility, I believe, is remote.

The second and more probable possibility is rooted in the history of Vietnam. The

Vietnamese fought against the French for years. In the first 7 or 8 years the Vietnamese were defeated time after time. After years of this seemingly hopeless struggle, they eventually defeated the French on the battlefield at Dienbienphu.

Dienbienphu has great significance. In this battle a European army was defeated by an oriental army. In this battle a modern European army equipped with modern weapons was defeated by indigenous forces largely equipped with obsolete or captured weapons. In this battle an army of a nation which had both air and naval support was defeated by an army which had neither.

The significant point of the campaign terminating the battle of Dienbienphu was that the persistence, stamina, and will to win of the Vietnamese forced an ignominious defeat upon a powerful Western nation.

But as has been pointed out by many writers, the French campaign in Indochina failed not primarily because of the combat conditions in Indochina, but because of the conditions in Paris. The French Government and the French people had lost their will to resist the Communist takeover of the Far East. The sacrifice of many gallant French soldiers was in vain because the French people and the French Government withdrew their support of the campaign in Indochina, and France was again defeated.

The gradual reduction of the will to resist communism in France was not an accidental event. There were at that time many Communist organizations in France, the principal one being the Communist Party, which continuously conducted psychological warfare on the French people and the French Government. They were ably supported by Communist-sponsored organizations in other countries. They were also supported by non-Communist organizations and people in France who unwittingly accepted the Communist propaganda as being true. Important segments of the French mass media supported for one reason or another the Communist-front groups in the manipulation of public opinion in order to reduce popular support of the Government's resistance to Communist aggression. It is interesting to note that the insistence of the French Communist Party on giving in to the demands of Ho Chi Minh led to their complete ouster from the French Government under Premier Ramadier. The French electorate apparently had enough of the Communists in 1947, but the continual governmental paralysis served to weaken the French commitment in Indochina. The ultimate result was that as far as France was concerned, she eventually surrendered southeast Asia to the Communists.

The important point here is that the North Vietnamese proved to themselves that if they continued aggressive military and terrorist operations against France, and at the same time the whole Communist apparatus conducted psychological warfare in France against further resistance to Communist domination of Indochina, they would drive out the French. At first they failed. Eventually they succeeded.

Therefore, it is possible that Ho Chi Minh and his advisers are convinced that if they do fight hard enough and long enough and conduct a sufficient number of terrorist operations, and if at the same time the worldwide Communist movement conducts a global psychological warfare campaign directed at the United States and other free world nations, they will be able to repeat their victory over France, and the United States will eventually withdraw, with the consequences of their victory over the most powerful nation being inspiration for further aggressions with good chance of success. In short, they may believe that they have greater stamina than the United States, and that the losses they will surely suffer will be more than counterbalanced by the tremendous gains accruing to the Communists if

the United States suffers military or diplomatic defeat.

The third possibility is that the North Vietnamese may be convinced that the United States will eventually negotiate on their terms, with perhaps some face-saving device for the United States and our allies. The United States has made extraordinary and unprecedented efforts to negotiate in South Vietnam. The United States has made many suggestions as to how these negotiations could take place, and all of them have been rudely rebuffed by Hanoi. The North Vietnamese may believe that if they continue their aggression and if the heavy propaganda is continued, the time will come when they can offer to negotiate under such conditions that South Vietnam will come under complete Communist control through negotiation. They may believe that the public demonstrations and many statements of prominent U.S. citizens indicate that eventually the majority of the people of the United States and the U.S. Government will be willing to accept Communist domination of all of southeast Asia in the name of peace.

Although the split between the Soviet Union and Communist China has been widened and intensified, it behooves us to be realistic about the reasons for the split. Both Communist hierarchies intend for communism to dominate the world, and as Hitler did, they have repeatedly said so. The Soviet Union believes that the most efficient way to accomplish this is through a détente and boring from within. The Chinese Communists believe that the only way is through violent revolution.

It is probable that these differences of opinion will continue to intensify, and there may even be border clashes and actual combat between the Soviet Union and Red China. But as long as Russia and China are ruled by Communists, they will both attempt to destroy all non-Communist nations and to extend their control and domain over the world. Therefore I do not anticipate that the Soviet Union will, in any meaningful way, help us out in the long run. The Soviets may try to create conditions in which Red China and the United States are locked in direct conflict, in the hopes that we both will wear ourselves out, and the Soviet Union could then, in our weakened condition, both take charge of the worldwide Communist movement and dominate most of the world.

If this be true, then the Soviet Union, as one of the principal patrons of the Vietnamese war, will be interested in keeping us embroiled in Vietnam for as long a period as possible.

Grave choices now confront the United States, but so they have for a number of years in Vietnam. If we withdraw from South Vietnam either because of a military defeat or by means of negotiation, and South Vietnam comes under the control of the Communists, we will soon have lost our leading position in the world.

What if we escalate slowly, as has been advocated? Slow escalation means protracting the war—not, only timewise but costwise. If there is any one lesson of past cold war crises, that is to act swiftly before the Communists compound and complicate the crisis. On the other hand, if we follow escalation a bit at a time, the total cost to the United States for eventually freeing South Vietnam from the Communists most likely will be greater in both men and resources.

What is the alternative? It is to take the difficult step of not only increasing the intensity of the war on the ground, but also blockading North Vietnam, mining Haiphong harbor, destroying all the military installations in North Vietnam regardless of their location, and using whatever means are necessary to prevent Communist supplies from coming into South Vietnam through Laos and Cambodia.

Some say this course of action runs the risk of direct conflict with Red China. It does, but the present course does too. The new course would make it Red China's clear-cut decision to initiate or not to initiate that conflict. The military operations can be suspended at any time if the North Vietnamese simply withdraw from their aggressive actions to take over their neighbor to the south.

The present course of piecemeal escalation, however, runs a greater risk of bringing in Red China by piecemeal decisions on her part.

Finally, there is one overwhelming conclusion about the war in southeast Asia: until the North Vietnamese and their sponsors are convinced that we really intend to prevent their takeover of South Vietnam, they will continue their aggression.

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 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 Forces, 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 broad, butter, and guns bill is out of the way? Would the sacrifice we would be

February 23, 1966

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 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 life-giving support.

I cannot believe that any Member of this body would want to accept the snuffing out of an American life because a marine ran out of ammunition or an infantryman could not be given sufficient air cover.

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 warplanes 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 South-east 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 merged 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 Harkins 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 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 thrust 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 upon 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. CANNON. Mr. President, the current debate on our Vietnam policy which has been continuing with increased confusion and dissent, demands, I believe, that all Senators carefully assess the case that has been laid before us

and reach that judgment which is required of the Congress.

We have pending a bill designed to provide the military means through which the thousands of American boys in southeast Asia can pursue our objectives there. Indeed, the funds sought involve their very safety and the success of their dangerous mission.

It seems to me that there could have been a more appropriate vehicle for this debate. We could discuss a new Senate resolution rather than a supplemental military appropriation which involves the safety of our forces as well as the success of a military venture which will have a lasting effect on our global policies and effectiveness.

I do not wish to leave any doubt of my own position, which is based on expressions I have heard from my constituents, my work on the Armed Services Committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee, and my personal observations of the situation in southeast Asia.

Our commitment spans the administrations of three Presidents. It is based on our sacred pledge to an ally, and is bolstered by the southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964.

My own conclusions are drawn from many factors, most important of which was my inspection of the critical points in Vietnam where we have constructed powerful installations, provided excellent facilities, and made plans for carrying this war to a successful conclusion. From what I saw there, we are making great progress in aiding a people determined to preserve their freedom and in providing a situation which will lend itself to the long-range political stability of the country.

I believe the President has exhausted every honorable and peaceful recourse available to him in recent weeks.

The 37-day moratorium on bombing North Vietnam was virtually unprecedented in the history of warfare. It made the alternatives crystal clear to the enemy and demonstrated our desire for negotiations to all the world.

There were those who suggested to the President that there be additional delays in resumption of hostilities and additional emphasis on our peace offensive. At that time I wrote to the President stating my views and commenting on the damage that was being done to our position by what seemed to be an indefinite but one-sided cessation of hostilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President of January 28, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 28, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been widely publicized that some Members of both Houses of the Congress have made written and verbal appeals to the Commander in Chief to continue the cessation of bombing in North Vietnam. These critics maintain that there are hopes for a peaceful resolution of the conflict at this time, and that stoppage of bombing raids can further these

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3747

hopes. If this would accomplish the desired results I would be in complete agreement.

But every shred of responsible testimony that I have heard and studied and every observation I have made personally in that part of the world, convinces me that these advocates of a soft approach in South and North Vietnam completely misread Communist intentions, strategy, and the will to continue a war which they believe—perhaps rightly—they are winning.

Our policy has suffered in South Vietnam, just as it suffered in Korea, from a too heavy reliance on civilian advice and a reluctance to permit the military commanders to accomplish our limited military objectives.

In my view, the opinions of virtually every responsible U.S. military commander are contrary to our present policy. They recognize, and I agree, that the present experiment in halting the prosecution of the war can prove extremely expensive in terms of American casualties. I strongly believe that we should resume bombing of targets more strategic than those that have thus far been hit, and that you give serious consideration to a port blockade of Haiphong which will partly seal out aid to North Vietnam from the outside world.

It is my further view that we cannot face the other alternatives, which to date have included suggestions which translate only into surrender and/or appeasement.

Again I urge you to pursue strategic bombing policies which will increase the pressure on the enemy to a degree sufficient to bring him to the conference table.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD W. CANNON.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, what has happened since those 37 days? How confused our forces in Vietnam must be to hear at this late date that the very reason for their sacrifices and risks is being strongly questioned at the highest responsible levels in Washington. How late an hour for some of us to rediscover the basic truths of the cold war and the basic nature of our adversary.

The truth is that we are indeed facing a determined and capable adversary whose defeat will require far greater effort and far greater sacrifices here at home and in the field than have been ventured to this date.

This is the nature of the challenge to our will in Asia. We were tested in Berlin and in the Cuban missile crisis. Now our determination is again being tested. The stakes are different, but the game is the same. I believe that our response must continue to be firm if we are to continue our role in world leadership.

I believe that, in the implementation of these policies, the course the President is following is correct and inescapable. Furthermore, in my judgment, the majority of the American people are behind the President. Americans are

unwilling to write off the freedom of Asians to determine their own destiny.

Our task for the present, then, should continue to be one advising the South Vietnamese in their drive to suppress aggression and to build their nation and their life as they choose. Concurrently, we should continue our initiatives to bring about the peace which is so essential to progress in all of southeast Asia and the rest of the world.

What we ask of the enemy in Vietnam is clear and simple. Secretary Rusk has put it aptly:

We are not asking them to surrender a thing except their appetite to take over South Vietnam by force.

Our objectives in Vietnam are limited. But our hopes for success are unlimited, for they reflect our hopes for our own people and for people everywhere.

So, I urge my colleagues to suspend the argument of how we came to be in Vietnam and instead vote on the bill at hand to provide our valiant fighting men who are giving their blood and their lives, the material and equipment necessary to do the job.

I urge the Senate to take immediate action and pass the pending legislation, thereby supporting our American fighting men and affirming our support for the policy being followed by the President.

Mr. President, I submit we have reached the point where this debate—at this point in time—no longer serves a useful purpose. Let us be done with talking and get on with the more urgent, immediate need of supporting our military men in convincing our adversary that their aggression must be abandoned and the dispute settled by negotiation.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY GIVES POVERTY PROGRAM GRANT TO MARY HOLMES JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Mississippi has been shocked over an announcement from the Office of Economic Opportunity that the Mary Holmes Junior College has been given a poverty program grant of over \$5 million for a so-called child development group.

Mr. President, this is particularly shocking to Mississippi because this is the same organization, the same personnel that so thoroughly discredited the poverty programs over the Nation in 1965. Out of a grant of \$1,400,000 approximately one-third was called into serious questioning by the U.S. Government auditors and has not yet been accounted for.

Mr. President, I understand that this

Mary Holmes Junior College is a shadow organization that is being used as a front to evade the necessity of consulting the Governor of my State upon those programs. It is also widely thought that this is a device to funnel funds into the extreme leftist civil rights and beatnik groups in our State, some of which have definite connections with Communist organizations. Mr. President, education of children is the furthest thing from their minds.

The Senate Appropriations Committee investigated this and made recommendations that these irregularities be thoroughly explored. It is my understanding that the irregularities have not yet been resolved. Moreover, this apparently is a rival organization to other grants that have been made in Mississippi to reputable leadership.

It is my opinion that if this grant is not recalled it will discredit the entire program not only in Mississippi but over the Nation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23, 1966:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Ralph S. Garrison
Stewart W. Hopkins
States M. Mead
Chester H. Taylor, Jr.
Edelen A. Parker
John H. Hoefler
Jim K. Carpenter
William S. Mailliard
Alvin A. Peterson
Dallas F. Jordan

MEDICAL CORPS

Robert A. Conard, Jr.
Richard H. Kiene
Robert E. Switzer

DENTAL CORPS

Francis J. Fabrizio

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles W. Shattuck James E. Gay
Leslie T. Maiman Paul N. Howell

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ray C. Tindall

to the United States are a vital, contributing group of citizens. They know, as few can who have lived in freedom all their lives, the speed and ease with which liberty can be stolen and the suffering endured until it is regained.

Most of all, on this day we look to the future and resolve that we will never recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and we will never forget the true Estonia which must one day again be free.

Section 14(b) Battle Just a Prelude?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News on H.R. 8282, a bill which proposes sweeping changes in the unemployment compensation program, discusses some of the possible dangers of the legislation and cautions the Congress to examine the proposal with great care.

There is increasing concern among employers in the Chicago area about these suggested revisions, and I join in urging a thorough analysis of the proposed legislation by the Congress before action is taken.

The editorial follows:

SECTION 14(b) BATTLE JUST A PRELUDE?

We are glad to see the Senate kill the proposed repealer for section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—the section that enables States to make their own laws regarding compulsory unionism. Labor leaders' main interest in the repealer has been, we are convinced, to have the Federal Government relieve them of the need to persuade workers to join their unions, and to augment their own strength.

That strength has been amply demonstrated in the last few years, in strikes affecting the entire economy, as well as the survival of whole cities. As the New York transit strike made clear, the need is not to augment that power, but to bring it under some kind of discipline when it menaces the public welfare.

Now Charles Nicodemus of the Daily News Washington bureau reveals that the repeal of 14(b) was, in the eyes of at least some labor people, a secondary target at best, and perhaps only a smokescreen. What organized labor really wants from Congress this year, he concludes, is far-reaching changes in the structure of the Federal unemployment compensation program.

Changes already proposed would:

Broaden coverage and greatly extend unemployment benefits.

By setting up Federal standards and imposing tax penalties for noncompliance, whip into line those States whose own laws lagged behind the Federal norms.

Here is a framework for establishing a guaranteed annual income by indirection and opening doors to grave abuses. Ultimately such measures could produce a condition in which the employer had the responsibility for supporting the employee, whether he worked or not, until the Federal Government took the dependent off the company's hands with an old-age pension.

This involuntary largess would steeply increase taxes on employers while encouraging

incompetents to ride free, and the unscrupulous to cheat.

Before this train of consequences is invited, we look to Congress to examine with utmost care each proposal and the whole package of proposals to be laid before it this year.

For the entire system of free, private enterprise depends upon the employer's ability to maintain a balance between efficiency and costs—a balance already sorely threatened in many cases by soaring taxes and wages. If a new set of laws is now to increase both ends of the burden—undermining efficiency while sharply raising the costs of production—the results could be ruinous.

On a Theme From Kennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop, when he is in the field, writes excellent articles from firsthand knowledge. I do not know of anyone who has put the issue in a more straightforward fashion than Mr. Alsop as he has in his February 23, 1966, column, "On a Theme From Kennan."

ON A THEME FROM KENNAN

(By Joseph Alsop)

BANGKOK.—Nearly 16 years ago, George F. Kennan, working at fever heat, dashed off his first draft of a famous policy paper. On the basis of the arguments therein set forth, President Truman made his magnificently courageous Korean decision, and a long chain reaction of Asian disasters was thus averted, albeit at heavy cost.

If one can trust the transmitted versions of Kennan's recent Senate testimony, he has by now forgotten just about all the arguments he assembled for presentation at the Korea meetings at Blair House. But with regard to this country, he is at least quoted as admitting that an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would have an "unfortunate" effect.

"Unfortunate" is a pretty mild word for the reality. The Chinese Communist Foreign Minister, Chen Yi, has quite openly described Thailand as "next" on the agenda after Vietnam to at least one Western visitor in Peiping. And the preparations for an assault on Thailand's independence are quite plain for anyone to see.

In order to grasp the nature of these preparations, it is first of all necessary to grasp the basic facts of Thailand's geography. Briefly, the mountainous northeastern part of the country and the southern provinces on the Malay Peninsula are both fairly inaccessible from the center, and both regions have non-Thal populations.

The northeast, with its Lao and Vietnamese inhabitants, and the extreme south, with its Malays, have therefore been selected as the prime targets by the Communist planners in Peiping and Hanoi. In the southern provinces, a base was provided by the Communist guerrillas who fled into the Thai jungles after the failure of the assault on Malaya. In the northeast, the Vietnamese who fled to Thailand during the French war also offered useful human raw material.

A good deal has already been published about this Communist effort in Thailand. But its coldly calculated character has never been well conveyed. In the southern provinces, for instances, secret jungle camps were

organized, where recruits from the villages were intensively trained by the refugees from the Malayan war.

Many scores of recruits from the northeastern provinces were also conveyed in secret into the parts of Laos controlled by the North Vietnamese army (from which solemn treaty obligations of course required the North Vietnamese troops to be totally withdrawn 4 years ago). A hundred or so of the most important agents were even taken by sea to Hong Kong, and thence into China, for advanced training.

In this manner, quite serious though still limited guerrilla movements have by now been organized in both the target areas. The ruthless terrorism that is such a characteristic feature of "liberation" movements, has begun on a considerable scale. In short, the pattern is clear, down to the last detail.

As of now, it is not an especially alarming pattern, since the Thai Government has organized energetic countermeasures. But let the United States take the advice of George Kennan and his friends. Let the Vietnamese war end in a retreat and a surrender. Then anyone with the smallest knowledge of Asian affairs can foresee that the effect in Thailand will be quite dramatically "unfortunate."

To be sure, Senator FULBRIGHT's antiadministration witnesses do not seem to have included many persons with any knowledge whatever of Asia. If one may judge from this distance, a good specimen witness was Prof. Hans Morgenthau, whose errors of basic historical fact concerning southeast Asia have been so crude and glaring that his pose as an expert is in the nature of a comic turn.

Yet the double standard that now prevails is still a bit bewildering. Think, for instance, of the outcry that would be heard from people of Morgenthau's stamp, if the CIA were discovered to be attempting in North Korea, or even in North Vietnam, anything comparable to what the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are quite openly attempting here in Thailand.

Even more bewildering, one must add, is the total carelessness of consequences and the flat refusal to face unpleasant facts. For these preparations for an attempted takeover in Thailand, please remember, are undoubted, well-established facts. And there can be no doubt that the shock of an American retreat and surrender in Vietnam would open the door wide for this attempted Communist takeover.

Hon. Fred E. Busbey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened to hear of the passing of our former colleague from Illinois, Fred E. Busbey. Mr. Busbey served with great distinction in the House for four terms and was recognized on both sides of the aisle as an extremely conscientious, knowledgeable legislator. He was also cherished for his warm personality and the genuine respect which he had for his colleagues here in the House.

During his service, Mr. Busbey represented portions of the district which I am now honored to serve. He was always respected and remembered in

week, the League of United Latin American Citizens, commonly known as LULAC. I know, from personal experience, of the fine work they are doing in promoting the welfare of U.S. citizens of Latin American ancestry. In my district, there are several active LULAC chapters which are especially distinguished for their efforts to increase voter registration and participation among their members and in the community at large.

The members of LULAC in my district are also noteworthy for the strong social conscience which they manifest. They have often given voice to their concern about the general welfare at the local and State level, promoting not just the cause of their own members, but of all their fellow citizens. Their participation in Project Head Start in many communities is one example of their concern for all the members of our society.

I would not want to forget, Mr. Speaker, the fiestas which the LULAC's sponsor, which highlight the life of many communities and which not only entertain, but educate us all to the heritage which they possess. Such occasions serve a highly valuable function in promoting goodwill and respect among the peoples of differing ancestry who live together in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of Congress in stating that the League of United Latin American Citizens is to be commended for the activities of the past 37 years and wished all possible success for their future efforts.

Aaron J. Racusin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks which I have prepared concerning the recent elevation of Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS: AARON J. RACUSIN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT

Recently an appointment was made in the Department of the Air Force elevating Mr. Aaron J. Racusin to the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Procurement Management. This appointment results from recognition of experience, dedication, and unusual ability as demonstrated by a most deserving public servant.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Senate Committee on Small Business, I have been aware, for many years, of Mr. Racusin's contribution to the small business community. With Mr. Racusin in this new position, I am certain that the Air Force small business program will

continue to grow and the small businessman's interests will be carefully safeguarded.

It is heartening to note that Mr. Racusin, a career civil servant who has worked at all steps of the procurement ladder and whose experience and knowledge have made him particularly accredited, has been elevated to this high post. I am equally pleased that the Air Force has shown unusual wisdom in selecting a man of Mr. Racusin's caliber to implement the congressional mandate in behalf of the small businessman.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in these times when freedom is being tested throughout the world, our country continues to lead in the fight for liberty.

Miss Eva Harris, of Dayton, Tenn., recently won first place in a Jaycette sponsored Americanism essay contest at Rhea County High School. Her paper clearly links the future of our Nation with the historic past and points to patriotism as the cement that binds our country together.

I have unanimous consent that her essay on Americanism be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AMERICANISM

(By Eva Harris)

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot, will, in this crisis, shrink away from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness that gives everything its value." So were the thoughts that Thomas Paine expressed in his famous works, "The Crises." These were written during the Revolutionary War in which Americans were fighting for their freedom from England.

People came to America from England because they desired freedom—complete freedom that they were not getting at home. After settling here, the people were still controlled by the mother country and were not given the "rights as Englishmen" as had been promised in their charters.

The Americans declared their independence on July 4, 1776, in the formal petition sent to the King. This petition being refused, they then resorted to arms to prove to the mother country that they were determined to be free and have all political allegiance dissolved. Through hardships and toll, cold of winter, and unequipped soldiers was the Revolutionary War fought. But happy was the day and long to be remembered when King George finally had to yield and grant independence to our country.

A young nation developed, a constitution—the greatest document in history—was adopted, and a strong central government was established.

As time passed on and additional States were developed, there arose differences between the commercial North and the agricultural South. So great grew these differences that war resulted—another long, hard war to prove further the liberty on which America was founded.

Our Nation has been in other wars, civil and worldwide. All of these have been to

prove that Americans love liberty so much they cannot let go of it.

The Englishman, Thomas Paine, who came to America to fight for the colonists in the Revolutionary War, said that God planned the war; that He intended for America to become a democratic country and an example to all the world. Truly it does seem that God has always led our country to victory, not only in the Revolutionary War, but in other wars as well. America has been blessed until today it is the richest Nation of the world, economically speaking.

Today almost 200 years later are we still in the "times that try men's souls"? Do we, as Americans of the present day, really love and appreciate our country as our great men of the past, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and others have done? Are we the summer soldiers and the sunshine patriots shrinking away from service and esteeming it too lightly? Can we fully realize the price the early leaders of our country had to pay for the liberty we enjoy so much today?

Never will words be powerful enough to express the debt we as Americans today owe to the Americans of the past. This debt can never be paid, even in fraction, but it is the duty of every American to try every day of his life by showing his love and patriotism. Our motto should be the words of the familiar song "America": "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing."

Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 24, 1966, Estonians all over the world are recalling the re-creation of their free independent nation. Forty-eight years ago on this date the people of Estonia constituted the Republic of Estonia, and thus reestablished their national independence which they had lost in the course of imperialist Russian expansion toward the West.

But the Estonian people were able to enjoy their freedom for merely two decades. The new masters of Russia—the Communists—with their Red army overran and occupied the country during World War II. This flagrant assault against her peaceful neighbor initiated Soviet Union's westward march for world domination. Thus, in it the beginning of today's international tensions and threat to peace may be found.

Since this event, the Estonian people have been suffering under the oppressive yoke of their Communist taskmasters. Their lot under the Soviet neocolonialist rule has been of the vanquished; but they still have held fast to their confidence that Estonia will regain her freedom and independence. Their hope for that rests in the main on the United States as the acknowledged leader of the free Western World.

We recall Estonian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support of the people in Estonia for whom freedom is still a memory and a dream. The Estonians who have come

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

governmental circles and in the various communities he represented in south suburban Cook County, and his untimely passing was noted with great regret by his constituents who still considered him to be an outstanding gentleman and warm friend.

Johnson Inscrutability Sparks FlapEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have wondered how the decisions at the White House are made in regard to Vietnam and perhaps the attached column by Charles Bartlett, which was published in the Evening Star of February 21, sheds some light on the methods used by this administration in arriving at their decisions, especially the operation followed by the President.

JOHNSON INSCRUTABILITY SPARKS FLAP
(By Charles Bartlett)

President Johnson would agree with Sophocles that "quick decisions are unsafe decisions" but the long uncertainty on his strategy for the next phase in Vietnam is responsible for generating the flap which has enlivened the Senate and unsettled the country.

The decisions have now been made and the flap will soon subside. But the uncertainty, stirred by the bombing pause, by the jet flights of the President's emissaries, and by signs that the war may be expanded if it cannot be negotiated, has somehow scarred and presumably weakened Johnson's leadership.

His rapport with the public, Congress, his own officials, and the press has been diminished by the inscrutable isolation in which he has labored to reach his conclusions. If his decisions prove to be sound, the damage done by his methods of reaching them will disappear.

Inscrutability is the earmark of this style. Summoning Robert McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, and Dean Rusk to Texas on November 11, the President asked each man to examine the usefulness of a bombing pause. When they met again on December 7, they thrashed through the pros and cons of the step. Johnson, by one count, asked 176 questions. As the meeting broke up, Bundy said to Bill Moyers, "I'll bet you \$5 that he'll never go for it."

The President maintained his ambiguity down to the day on which the Pope gave him an opening to prolong the Christmas lull. He had special polls taken to learn where the public stood. He talked to friends outside the administration like Abe Fortas, Clark Clifford and Arthur Dean. But no one, even at close range, could be certain where he was headed.

This exercise is hard on officials. The President questions them severely, often unpleasantly, to shake their advocacy. He tries to get them off balance by misleading them on his own attitude. He is prone to call them late at night or when they are resting on weekends.

The relentless process is so informal that no one is certain where it begins or ends. Three weeks ago those at the top level of Government believed that Johnson was set to escalate his bombing to hit crucial targets

near Hanoi and Haiphong and to increase his troop force in South Vietnam to 400,000 men. Today the more dramatic targets have apparently been eliminated from his bombing plans and the signs point to a lesser troop buildup, perhaps to no more than 300,000 men.

A terrible vacuum is created by the absolute isolation in which Johnson makes decisions like these. He doesn't bring his own people along except by the halter of official loyalty. Deprived of guidance from the President or his officials, Congress and the press are left to flounder in uncertainty, a state which leaves them little poise.

No President has found a way to satiate Congress' eagerness to be consulted on key decisions. John Kennedy stirred indignation by convening all the leaders in Washington before he announced the Cuban missile crisis. He asked for their judgments but he made the mistake of letting them realize that he had already decided what to do. Lyndon Johnson has briefed, wined, and flattered the Members of Congress but he still cannot share with them his right to decide.

Johnson's decisionmaking process would gain shape and dignity and even glamour if it were more formally tied to the National Security Council or to the Kennedy offshoot, the top-level informal grouping known as Ex-Comm. There is an aura about deliberations by these Olympian bodies which breeds confidence in the decisions that emerge from them.

Johnson is unlikely however to change his style. He does not like large meetings. He suspects that they foster hypocrisy and he knows that they breed leaks. The Kennedy-Johnson era has reduced the National Security Council apparatus to a highly fluid state, which seems likely to persist.

One change is in the offing. The President feels now that the war's course has been set and that the time has come to handle it as an affair that must be managed efficiently into the future and not as a crisis problem centered in the White House. This means a man to run it and a more formal approach to its conduct. This step could help to stabilize the atmosphere.

Social Security LegislationEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would provide for social security increases based on factors combining increases in the cost of living and the gross national product.

I have long urged humanization of our social security system. The benefits we pay are just not enough. Sometimes the Congress just cannot keep up with changing needs.

My proposal is that we link social security benefits to both increases in the cost of living and increases in the gross national product. The link to increases in the cost of living is obviously important to insure that our senior citizens are not hurt by inflation and declining purchasing power. I don't believe it is enough just to guarantee senior citizens the status quo in purchasing power.

I want to go beyond a cost-of-living

rise. I want to have social security annuitants share in the American boom. I want them to share in the soaring American economy of the space age. The work they did in the thirties, the forties, and the fifties is an inseparable part of the soaring sixties. We should not forget our senior citizens. They laid the foundations for our present economic level.

The best way to have senior citizens share in the prosperity they helped create above and beyond maintaining their purchasing power is to link social security pensions to the rise in the gross national product. The factor I would use is a 1-percent social security rise for every 2-percent increase in the gross national product. This is because not all of the GNP translates into purchasing power increases for our people.

I think that humanization of our social security structure along the lines of my legislation is an important aspect of creating a brave new tomorrow.

President Has the ResponsibilityEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. JACK BROOKS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in an excellent column appearing in the February 22, 1966, Washington Evening Star, pointed out clearly the difference between critics who appear to have missed the main point in Vietnam discussions and the President who has the responsibility for acting.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this reflective column by David Lawrence.

CRITICS SEEM TO MISS MAIN POINT
(By David Lawrence)

Recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—particularly the comprehensive statements by the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk—produced questions and answers which undoubtedly clarified the thinking of many citizens about the Vietnam war. The critics, however, appear to have missed the main point, which is that a President has the responsibility for acting on the basis of information available to him at the moment of decision.

The President has at his side Cabinet officers and military men. Always at hand are up-to-the-minute reports from our representatives abroad—Ambassadors and intelligence personnel, civilian and military. It is easy enough for a Senator to come out, for example, with the advice that bombing shouldn't have been resumed after the recent truce. Such a critic cannot know all the facts, and, moreover, he doesn't have the responsibility for making the decision itself. If the critic is wrong, no serious harm is done. But the President is every minute responsible to the people and a mistake on his part could be fatal.

Johnson happens to be a master politician and knows very well that it's popular to call for an ending of the war, as some Senators are doing. But he knows also that to give the enemy what it wants would only lead

A904

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 23, 1966

to a larger war. Statesmen have been fooled by appeasement before. Johnson can't take chances. That's why reckless critics appear unwittingly to be giving comfort to the enemy and causing its resistance to be prolonged.

Criticism of domestic policy is one thing, but criticism of foreign policy is quite different. Almost everybody, for instance, knows the meaning of an internal policy, and the disputes are not likely to prove dangerous to the immediate life of the Nation. But foreign policy sometimes involves the risk of losing some lives in order to forestall a larger conflict in which sacrifices would be enormous.

No President would ever purposely or deliberately lead the American people into a large war. But misguided and careless critics can help to do it. They have a feeling that there's no harm in airing their views, sometimes to satisfy exhibitionist tendencies. They regard as a mere exercise in academic debate the discussion of ways and means of getting out of the war at any price. The enemy, however, construes this as a sign of weakness and irresoluteness.

The President has been firm, but cautious. In the main, he has upheld the principles for which America fought two world wars and the Korean war. The "peace offensive," for example, which he undertook has been sneered at by some of the critics as mere showmanship. Yet, it has had a good effect. The other nations of the world, large and small, are now slowly but surely veering toward the American viewpoint and are beginning to ask themselves what they can do to help, even though it might in some cases be token aid.

On the whole, the United States is making progress, both in the war and in the mobilization of world opinion. Cautious criticism at home encourages the enemy to think the American people are not behind their President. Maybe it is time, after all, for a "vote of confidence." And Congress can do this by reaffirming the joint resolution passed in August 1964. This authorized the President to use whatever armed forces are necessary to safeguard the freedom and independence of a nation which is under the protection of the Southeast Asia Treaty. The resolution was overwhelmingly ratified by both houses of Congress with only two dissenting votes.

American foreign policy has had its setbacks. But it still stands for the concept of a universal alliance of peoples, based on the right of each nation to determine its own form of government and to be immune from aggression. If this principle is stanchly maintained in southeast Asia, the Americans who have been lost in the wars of the last half century will not have died in vain.

Commemorate Armenian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the revolt of the Armenian people against the Soviet Union. In 1921, there was an uprising in Armenia against the Soviets who had a few months earlier taken the country into protective custody, so to speak. Unfortunately, the strength of the uprising was not suffi-

cient to overcome Soviet power and it failed. Since then, Armenia has been subject to the rule of the U.S.S.R.

It is always unfortunate. Mr. Speaker, when the aspirations of any people for self-government are denied expression. Surely in a democracy, we must always salute the efforts of those who seek freedom and mourn any failures which occur. In that spirit, I join my fellow Congressmen in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Armenian uprising and in looking forward to the day when self-determination will be a reality for all peoples.

Pushing Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO), has distinguished himself in his home State as a leader to provide recreation areas for the growing numbers of tourists. Such leadership is important not only from a standpoint of economic interest, but also as relief to the already overcrowded conditions which existing parks and recreation areas are experiencing. There is a growing awareness, I am sure, in Wyoming, as well as my home State of Wisconsin, of the desirability of preserving for future generations a small part of natural and historic areas.

Recently the Casper Star-Tribune commended Congressman RONCALIO for his leadership in this field. To acquaint all Members of this body with that endorsement, under unanimous consent I insert the following editorial at this point in the RECORD.

PUSHING RECREATION

Representative TENO RONCALIO hopes for favorable action at the coming session of Congress on four pieces of legislation which he has introduced with the objective of advancing Wyoming recreational interests.

RONCALIO reports that the House Interior Committee is considering his bills to establish the Big Horn national recreation area, Flaming Gorge national recreation area and to make South Pass City a national historic site and Fossil Butte in Lincoln County a national monument.

Proposals for the two recreation areas should face no great obstacles, since they are tied in with water development and already have been considerably advanced. Efforts to establish the national historic site and national monument conceivably could run into some delay although they have much to recommend them.

"Wyoming has already garnered a good share of the recreation traffic," RONCALIO says. "The 1964 statistics reveal 538,000 visits to camp grounds in Wyoming, 230,000 visits to hotels and resorts, 42,000 visits to recreational residences, including summer cabins and dude ranches, and 50,000 visits to wilderness areas, compared to 43,000 for Utah, 48,000 for Montana, and 53,000 for Colorado."

Persons who live in Wyoming may not require the statistics, since the importance of tourism and recreation is evident on every hand. Any steps which can be taken toward expansion of facilities will be welcomed.

The Other Side of the Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have been somewhat surprised at the statements that have been made either in press conferences or on the floor of the Senate with reference to Vietnam.

I attach herewith an excellent article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak dated Wednesday, February 23, 1966. This article probably should be entitled, "The Other Side of the Coin."

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The ironic aspect of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY's stunning, self-damaging break with President Johnson on Vietnam is the fact it was precisely what he has been seeking to avoid.

KENNEDY had not wanted a complete break with the administration on this key issue. Thus, it came as a shock to his own inner circle that he is now aligned on the extreme edge of the Senate peace bloc for proposing a Saigon government with Communist participation—that is, a coalition government. The fine print on pledging guarantees to block a complete Communist takeover was lost in the shuffle.

Here then is one of those rarities of big league politics: A major miscalculation with long-range ramifications. For ever if KENNEDY did not intend to go into open opposition against the President, he has done so nonetheless. "This is something we'll have to live with for a long time," asserts a Kennedy intimate.

Barely 2 weeks ago, KENNEDY was strenuously avoiding intimate identification with the peace Democrats. He toned down anti-war references proposed for his speeches by peace-oriented young staffers. He refused to condemn resumption of bombing in North Vietnam. His reasons were multiple.

Basically, KENNEDY is not in tune with key precepts of the peace movement. He does not see the U.S. commitment in Vietnam as a blunder (and to do so would repudiate the foreign policy of John F. Kennedy). Nor does he view U.S. bombings as immoral.

Moreover, unlike many peace Democrats, KENNEDY realizes that strident Washington opposition to the war encourages Communist belief that decadent Americans won't or can't stick it out. In a recent private interview, KENNEDY disabused Soviet United Nations Ambassador Nikolai Federenko of any notion that the Democratic Party is divided into a Johnson wing (prowar) and a Kennedy wing (antiwar).

But watching last week's Foreign Relations Committee hearing as a spectator, KENNEDY decided everybody was missing the point: That the Communist Vietcong, under growing pressure from Peiping, never would negotiate unless assured of participation by a new South Vietnam Government.

Still hoping to steer clear of the peace bloc, KENNEDY made his statement at a press conference—not on the Senate floor, where peace Senators could heap encomiums on him.

KENNEDY and his friends failed to realize that his procoalition stand was more extreme than the public position of peace Senators (even though many in the peace bloc, but not KENNEDY, would like to get out of Vietnam tomorrow.) "Bobby's out in

the House Committee on Un-American Activities will soon be before the House of Representatives. The gravity of these charges impels us, as Members of the House, to take the greatest care and study in their consideration.

Under unanimous consent I am inserting these editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post—certainly among the Nation's leading and most respected newspapers—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I recommend thoughtful reading of these articles.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1966]

SHORT SHRIFT

"In the past 17 years," Representative DON EDWARDS pointed out to the House of Representatives on Wednesday, "the House has voted some 136 times to cite an individual for contempt of Congress; 129 of these citations were from the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Of this number there were only nine final convictions, 7 percent." Nevertheless, the House once more—unreasonably and unthinkingly, in our judgment—voted blindly to uphold the committee in its determination to punish certain recalcitrant witnesses. It makes no difference that these recalcitrant witnesses are unpleasant, unpopular men, allegedly officers of the Ku Klux Klan.

The House supported the committee's spleen, moreover, without knowledge of what was involved, without even an opportunity to acquaint itself with the facts. It did it on the basis of a lengthy, complicated record deliberately withheld from it until an hour and a half before the motion to vote for the citations was introduced. This is not an exercise of congressional deliberation or judgment; it is, at best, an expression of congressional solidarity and, at worst, an expression of prejudice against individuals suspected but not convicted of atrocious crimes or odious opinions.

Besides, there are a pair of important constitutional questions involved in HUAC's investigation of the Klan. One is whether the committee's demand for all of the Klan's records was a valid one. The Supreme Court held in connection with the State of Alabama's demand for the records of the NAACP that it is a violation of the first amendment guarantee of freedom of association to compel the production of membership lists. And there is also a serious constitutional question of whether the committee's acknowledged practice of summoning witnesses for the sheer purpose of exposing them is a valid exercise of the congressional investigating power.

Violations of law by the Klan are matters for the FBI and the Department of Justice to investigate. New legislation to protect civil rights, if it be needed, is a matter for the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate to study; they have performed very well in this respect during the past few years. Respect for civil rights and civil liberties is unlikely to be promoted by continuing the power of a committee which has blatantly ignored them for nearly 30 years.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

LOYALTY TO WHAT?

The House of Representatives once again must decide whether contempt for its Un-American Activities Committee necessarily constitutes contempt of Congress. We think it does not.

The current contempt citations raise a special problem. They involve Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, a renowned heart specialist who is director of the Heart Disease Control Program of the Chicago Board of Health, and two of his professional associates. They declined, on advice of counsel and on asserted

grounds of principle, to answer some abusive questions put to them by the committee. They also filed an action in a Federal district court—dismissed there but now pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—challenging the committee's constitutionality and seeking an injunction against enforcement of its authority.

Deferring all judgment on the motives and merits of this action, we think the House of Representatives ought to await a decision by the court of appeals—and by the Supreme Court, too, if it should come to that—before citing these persons for contempt. For the questions they raise are important and cry out for judicial determination. Moreover, this kind of civil action is a far better way to find out if a witness is obliged to answer committee questions than a criminal prosecution putting him in jeopardy of a prison sentence.

Years ago, Kenneth Keating, when he was in the House of Representatives, introduced a bill which would have required the House to go to a Federal court for an enforcement order in the case of recalcitrant witnesses; this would have given the witnesses an impartial judicial decision as to the validity of the committee's questions and a chance to answer in the light of this knowledge. A witness refusing to answer after being ordered to do so by a court would, of course, be in contempt of court and punishable accordingly. This is at once more sensible and more civilized than a contempt citation by Congressmen blindly supporting one of their own committees.

In the Stamler case, HUAC violated its own rules by releasing the names of subpoenaed persons in advance of the hearings and causing grave injury to their reputations. It asked questions redundantly, although it was clear that the witnesses did not intend to respond, in an obvious effort to pillory them. And it refused their request to testify in executive session. These circumstances and tactics have led more than 100 eminent law school professors to join in a letter to all Members of the House urging them to reject the contempt citations.

Congressmen owe a measure of loyalty, of course, to the committees they have established. But they owe loyalty also to the good name and the high traditions of the House of Representatives. For the sake of loyalty to the Un-American Activities Committee, they have voted contempt citations in more than 130 cases since 1950; and only 9 of these have resulted in final convictions. And they have allowed this committee, exercising the majestic investigating power of Congress, to browbeat, torment, and intimidate witnesses in a manner reminiscent of the Court of Star Chamber which was abolished in 1641. Now would be a good time to call a halt to this tyranny.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1966]

WHERE DOES THE CONTEMPT LIE?

The House of Representatives votes tomorrow on a resolution to cite three Chicago residents for contempt of Congress for their refusal to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee wishes to cite Dr. Jeremiah R. Stamler, who has won awards for his research as head of the heart disease control program of the Chicago Board of Health, and two of his associates. They were subpoenaed to appear before the committee last May 25 as part of a series of hearings on communism in the Chicago area. The U.S. District Court refused to enjoin enforcement of the subpoena, but an appeal is now pending. More than 100 law professors have signed a letter stating their opinion that there is a reasonable prospect that the Supreme Court may uphold Dr. Stamler and his associates.

A contempt citation at this time would in

no way clarify the important constitutional issues nor would it provide information for a committee of the House. A contempt citation is a serious action. Like a grand jury indictment, it is not definitive, but it begins a process of judicial action that can lead to fine or imprisonment and, at the very least, it damages one's personal reputation. When it cites for contempt, the House is exercising one of its gravest powers against a private citizen.

In the past 15 years the Un-American Activities Committee has asked the House to cite 129 individuals for contempt and the House—routinely, mechanically, irresponsibly—has acceded to every request. Yet only nine of these citations resulted in final convictions.

Last week's action against seven leaders of the Ku Klux Klan was typical. Members of the House freely admitted that they had had no opportunity "to study all these citations, the statements of fact, or the hearings from which these citations have come," as one Representative expressed it. Yet the Members shouted down a sensible proposal to refer the cases to a select committee for review and voted instead to send them on their way to the Justice Department.

There is neither necessity nor sound historical precedent for such conduct. The House runs the danger of bringing itself and its own procedures into contempt. That is a far deeper wound on the body of free government than any recalcitrant witness could inflict.

Social Reform Next in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News, in an editorial on February 10, sounded a warning which should be noted by every Member of this Congress. Commenting on our attempts to find a peaceful settlement to the problem of Vietnam, the News pointed out that social reform is a pressing necessity in that war-torn country.

Without such reform, the News declared, "the guns, however effective, will leave only a vacuum after any possible cease-fire."

The newspaper praised the idea of escalation in social reform, or, as President Johnson phrased it, "the struggle against social injustice, hunger, disease, ignorance, political apathy, and indifference."

I found this editorial most interesting and thought provoking. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and under unanimous consent include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOCIAL REFORM NEXT IN VIETNAM

The newest jet set roves the diplomatic circuit with statesmen, Cabinet officers, and generals in orbit all over the Pacific, either chasing after each other or crisscrossing each other's trails. And all because of Vietnam.

Vice President HUMPHREY now takes over where President Johnson left off at the Hawaii conference. He is in Saigon to see that the counterrevolution gets off the ground.

If words in communiqués mean what they say and hope is not wishful thinking, the United States and the South Vietnamese are

February 23, 1966

now not only determined to repel the Red armed terror. We are going to escalate in a new dimension, committing ourselves, as Mr. Johnson puts it, to "a struggle against social injustice, hunger, disease, ignorance, political apathy and indifference."

"This newspaper believes the key words there are "political apathy and indifference." For 20 years the South Vietnamese have known little but war. The Vietcong, which formerly often got away with pledges of land reform and all the other lures of the Red utopia, is now having to use force and terror on the peasants almost everywhere as the tide of war shifts and the easy Vietcong victory is no longer in sight.

But the peasants didn't like what they experienced under the late President Diem either, and they still distrust Saigon and what it pledges to do for the rural areas. The only remedy is to clear out the terrorists, keep them out and then follow through with the kind of reforms Mr. Johnson talks about.

HUMPHREY'S mission also includes talks with other free Asian nations to see what they can contribute militarily or technically to the Vietnam effort. It won't be easy. People who haven't got the tiger directly at their gates don't relish action that might entice it there.

In part, the 1954 SEATO pact came apart because only three of its eight members were nonwhite Asians. The most rewarding substitute would be some form of agreement that would get the free nations in Asia whose frontiers and security depend on the outcome in Vietnam to realize that no nation is any longer an island unto itself.

Interdependence—which was the magic formula for postwar Europe—should be the goal in Asia today. In Vietnam it's back to the drawing board of social reform. Otherwise the guns, however effective, will leave only vacuum after any possible cease-fire.

Tax Private Colleges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8282, now being considered by the Ways and Means Committee, will make several basic changes in the unemployment compensation program. One of these seems to me to be particularly onerous, and this is the provision that compulsory unemployment insurance would be levied on nonprofit institutions, including private colleges. This same tax would not, however, be imposed on tax-supported schools. This unequal treatment would result in an unfair burden on the very colleges and universities that are today relieving government supported institutions of higher learning.

In Tennessee where there is a large number of non-tax-supported colleges, such a tax would place them at an unfair disadvantage and hamper the tremendous accomplishments now being made. A recent article in the Chicago Sun-Times forcefully points up this proposed inequity. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities has called our at-

tention to a bill now before Congress that would seriously impair the operations of not alone private colleges and universities but other nonprofit institutions.

This is House bill 8282, which would impose compulsory unemployment insurance upon nonprofit institutions. One curious aspect of the bill is that it does not impose the same tax upon tax-supported schools. This omission, as the federation points out, "would place the privately supported colleges and universities at an unwarranted disadvantage in their efforts to provide higher education for a large percentage of the students attending Illinois institutions."

The private colleges are too important to Illinois, and to the Nation, for them to be burdened with this disadvantage and expense. Preliminary estimates indicate that private institutions have enrolled 42.8 percent of the 312,180 students attending colleges and universities in Illinois, and the percentage is even higher if you deduct the numbers in tax-supported junior colleges who are not studying for academic degrees. It takes no slide rule to demonstrate that an insufferable tax burden would be created if all the students were enrolled in State schools.

Furthermore, the employees of the colleges do not need the protection of unemployment insurance, which is designed to protect workers during periods of depression or in seasonal or erratic industries. Colleges and universities offer steady, permanent employment that is not radically affected by season or business cycles. And other nonprofit institutions, such as the YMCA and the Goodwill Industries, which employ workers under very special circumstances, would be irreparably disrupted by the imposition of the tax.

The plan, in a word, seems to be a thoroughly unfortunate one that Congress should kill once and for all. It would create many problems and solve none.

War Is War, Debt Debt—by Whatever Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT McCLORY OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in considering the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966—H.R. 12752—today, designed to increase revenues for the next fiscal year by more than \$5 billion, it is most appropriate to appraise the budget policies and practices of the administration. Above all, there would seem to be a duty to be candid and straightforward with the Congress.

A serious question about the integrity of the Executive budget is raised by an article which appeared in yesterday's—Tuesday, February 22, 1966—edition of the Chicago Tribune by Dr. Melchior Palyi. The article follows:

WAR IS WAR, DEBT DEBT—BY WHATEVER NAME

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

Is falsifying the balance sheet to improve its public image a prerogative of the Government of these United States?

If your household spends more than it earns the difference may be covered by the proceeds from the sale of your home.

Would you say that there was no deficit? Just who is to be fooled?

If a corporation covers its current loss by the proceeds from the sale of equipment, without allowing in the balance sheet for the loss of capital—I submit that a criminal case would be in the making.

But the Government can indulge in such deceptive practices and get away with them. In the budget for 1966-67, expenditures are scheduled to rise ahead of tax revenues by many billions of dollars.

Yet, the overall deficit will be reduced, allegedly, from \$6.9 billion in the current fiscal year to a virtually negligible \$500 million. The biggest single chief item that will produce this fiscal master stroke in the sale of Government-held loans to private borrowers. The deficit shrinks by \$4.7 billion, thanks to the unloading of \$4.7 billion worth of assets—as if net spending had been cut by that amount.

BORROWS TO FILL GAP

A deficit means that the Treasury has to borrow to fill the gap between expenditures and revenues. Who is so ignorant as to believe the claim that the \$4.7 billion is no part of the deficit because they will not be borrowed openly?

This claim is a deliberate distortion of the Treasury's forthcoming position, camouflaging the assumption of liabilities and the simultaneous loss of assets. Selling loans held in its portfolio is no different in essence from issuing its own bonds. The Government has to guarantee capital and interest on the loans it liquidates.

Money is to be raised by offering guaranteed obligations in lieu of incurring a direct debt. But a debt is a debt, by whatever name it goes. The guarantee obligates the debtor exactly as the direct borrowing does—except that the cost is higher.

WILL LOSE REVENUE

The Treasury will lose the revenue it was earning on the loans in its possession. And it will have to accept an additional loss.

Interest rates have risen above the artificially low level that prevailed at the time it had bought the same loans; the debt instruments will have to go at values below their purchase prices. Moreover, guaranteed obligations being less popular than the direct ones, they have to yield a higher return. It costs the taxpayer less if the Government markets its own securities than if it raises money the indirect way.

But what does a difference of some millions of dollars in annual cost mean along the Potomac? The item was conspicuous in the President's budget message by its absence. The faked image of having reduced the deficit while fighting a war and building a Great Society is what counts, and let the extra cost hang.

As to the financial effect, there is no difference either between the Treasury borrowing outright or selling its holdings of mortgages and Export-Import Bank loans. In either form, the appeal to the capital market will contribute to tightening it and to boosting interest rates.

OTHER MONKEY BUSINESS

There is nothing wrong about the Government getting out of the business of lending money. It should not have been in it to begin with. What is wrong, and indeed shameful, is to use a perfectly legitimate procedure for a legerdemain. Nor is this the only "monkey business" contained in the next fiscal year's budget, as presented last month.

Revenue estimates are based on the most optimistic assumptions; or on the shifting of tax collection dates, an exercise in financial futility. Expenditures are understated irresponsibly, relying on supplementary requests—which then will be excused as emergency requirements. It is assumed, as an example, that the monthly cost of the Viet-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

To many of you, this may sound extreme and unwarranted. Right now, the blossom of prosperity and well-being seems full-blown. But, even now, there are clouds in the sky that are hard to explain away. Why, in these lush times, should the home foreclosure rate for the first half of this year be the highest since 1935? Why should total installment debt be rising at a much greater rate than disposable income? Perhaps there's a point to the old story of the motorist who stopped just over the crest of a long winding hill to ask a native if the hill was dangerous. "Not here it ain't," the old man replied. "It's down at the bottom where they all kills themselves."

Perhaps even more significant than the possible economic consequences of the Great Society are the spiritual, the moral effects on our American citizens. Throughout most of our almost two centuries as a Nation, our people have earned an enviable worldwide reputation as dynamic, hard-working individuals with almost limitless initiative and with a consummate faith in our ability to win the battle of life against any and all odds. We refused to limit our horizons by seeking the cushion of security. We loved our freedom with a passion and our Government was the servant, not the master, of its people. We were known, too, as a people who worked together for the common good and to whom the unsolicited and unconditional helping hand was a way of life. This was our formula for both greatness and human dignity. And how well it worked.

In more recent years, we have seen a gradual change in the composite American, away from those traditional characteristics and attributes. The new American is a more selfish individual, more security-conscious, less self-reliant, and more demanding of others. He seeks to avoid responsibility and feels little compulsion to practice the virtue of human charity. He has sought successfully to transfer his erstwhile responsibilities to his Government, the caring for the poor, the sick, and the elderly, the guaranteeing of his own security, the development of his community, his protection against the buffeting of the world, the education—even the raising—of his children, his economic insulation against the consequences of his own excesses and stupidity.

In return for this paternal benevolence, he has been willing to trade measure after measure of his personal freedom. He has become willing to conform to the master plan to become a number in the computer of life. He has surrendered his freedom of choice to a dominating government which prescribes the exact method by which he may seek the type of welfare and happiness which that government feels is best for him. It is becoming the same sort of welfare and happiness that is available to everyone else—no more, no less. Each new milestone in the path toward the Great Society takes more from the "haves" and distributes it to the "have-nots", places more burdens on the "can-do" individuals in order to give more benefits to the "couldn't-care-less" boys.

We haven't reached the end of this parade. The regimentation is only beginning. The longer we fail to realize what we are doing to ourselves and to our Nation, the more difficult it will become to lift ourselves by the bootstraps from the mire of personal and national mediocrity.

What is needed to alter this collision course with a fate of collective insignificance? The motivation must come from us, the people, millions of people inspired by the memory of their forefathers, those great Americans whose blood still runs—albeit weakly—in our veins. Fired by that inspiration, we must dedicate ourselves to a rebirth and remodeling of the great American image, pledging our efforts and working tire-

lessly to enlist the efforts of others in the task of transforming our Nation once again into a land of industrious, responsible citizens who neither need nor want to live by Government handout. Until we break the shackles of Government subsidy—and the attendant shackles of Government control over our most private decisions and actions—we will not restore the priceless American freedom which we are now unwittingly selling—piece by piece—in return for the shoddy security of public charity.

Not Everyone Wants Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when so many individuals and communities are out to get all the money they can from the U.S. Treasury, it is good to know that there are some who prefer to solve their local problems without help from Washington, D.C.

I recently received a copy of a petition which was signed by 1,500 residents of Maine Township High School District No. 207, which is located in my district. The petition, which was addressed to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, urged that he deny the school district's application for Federal aid.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the petition:

FEBRUARY 7, 1966.

Mr. HAROLD HOWE, JR.,
Commissioner of Education,
U.S. Office of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that high school district 207, Dempster Street and Potter Road, Park Ridge, Ill., is about to apply for a planning grant under title III of Public Law 89-10 for the purpose of planning for a center for diagnosis and remediation of reading and communication problems of children in the area it serves.

Your attention is called to section 304 (b) (2) of title III which expressly provides that applications for grants under this title may be approved by you only if the application is consistent with criteria established by you, which criteria shall be developed on the basis of a consideration, among other things, of the relative needs of persons in different geographical areas and "their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and * * * the relative ability of particular local educational agencies within the State to provide those services and activities."

We are advising you of the foregoing because in our opinion high school district 207 may be misleading your office by implying that the area concerned does not have the financial ability to teach its children to read. A review of the most recent census report concerning this area will quickly reveal that it is a stable and financially sound area, with the residents of the area enjoying an income substantially in excess of average.

We believe the filing of this application for a grant on the part of high school district 207 constitutes a typical example of people trying to get something for nothing, "as long as the money is there anyway."

We strongly urge you to deny the application of district 207 and to utilize the limited funds available for the purposes described in title III for more unfortunate segments of our State.

Respectfully yours,

Social Revolution for Vietnam *JN*

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent talks in Honolulu were directed toward a primary emphasis upon a program of social revolution in the Vietnam countryside.

Social reform must be an integral part of our efforts in Vietnam because the elimination of Vietcong terrorism can be of no permanent usefulness unless the people are able to rebuild their lives and their economy.

The Los Angeles Times, on February 10, discussed the urgent priorities involved in this social revolution. Their perceptive editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOCIAL REVOLUTION FOR VIETNAM

Whatever new military steps might have been secretly decided upon at the Honolulu conference of top American and South Vietnamese leaders, the public emphasis of the talks—and thus the public commitment—was focused upon an ambitious program of "social revolution" in the Vietnam countryside.

This is the "other war," the war of reform, which has the dual aim of bettering the lives of the people and of eradicating the accumulated grievances upon which the Vietcong have built so much of their success.

It is a war we have not been winning.

President Johnson made it clear in his Los Angeles remarks that he knows how hard are the tasks the United States and South Vietnamese Governments have set for themselves. Officials in the field whose job it is to carry out the planned programs of social, economic and political construction know even better the enormous obstacles to be overcome.

Even assuming total dedication on the part of South Vietnamese leaders and the ready availability of U.S. dollars, the going will be slow at best. The new programs, in fact, probably won't reach more than 10 percent of the village population by the end of the year. Nor will simply sending cadres into these villages of itself assure progress.

The first requisite, of course, is to clear areas of the Vietcong and to provide enough protection so that the Communists won't come back. Without security, peasants will have no incentive to cooperate and without cooperation there can be no reforms.

Next the Saigon government must find and adequately train the more than 40,000 teachers, health workers, technicians and administrators needed to start and carry out the social revolution. Without well-prepared and highly motivated personnel, reforms cannot even be talked about.

Recruiting these workers won't be easy.

Since the rebellion began, 20,000 of them have been murdered. They are Vietcong targets because they represent the govern-

ment and because they carry the promise of improving life for the people, thereby undercutting the Vietcong appeal.

Those in this country and elsewhere who pretend to see the Vietcong as a movement against repression have yet to explain how killing nurses, doctors, teachers, and agricultural workers serves this end.

Finally, there is the task of overcoming deep-rooted attitudes which stand in the way of reform. Cynicism, corruption, suspicion, class prejudice, a reluctance to adopt new methods—all will be working against the new programs.

General Ky, his prestige bolstered by the Honolulu talks—the first time a Vietnamese Premier has met an American President—gives every public indication of being behind the reform program. It will take his full support, and much more besides, if there is to be any hope for success in this overdue but still vital revolution.

Pacification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, to bring pacification in South Vietnam—and a sense of identity on the part of the people with the Saigon government—will not be easy. Premier Ky could hardly have been more frank when, in describing to President Johnson the new rural pacification teams, he said:

They will seek to instill in the rural people a sense of unity with our Nation, a feeling which I am sorry to say, Mr. President and gentlemen, has not always been prevalent in our country.

I feel that the difficulties and the challenge of the pacification program were well illustrated in a recent editorial in the *Hartford Times*. It stated:

Reduced to particulars, President Johnson's official conference in Honolulu is intended to review and amplify the means to consolidate military gains made or expected in South Vietnam.

And it added:

Such action is required if we are to eliminate the tidal waves of success and failure in establishing territorial control under conditions of guerrilla warfare.

The editorial is somewhat long—and extremely enlightening. Because I am certain that some of my colleagues will want to read it in its entirety I herewith make it available to them by inserting it in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Hartford Times*, Feb. 7, 1966]

PACIFICATION PROGRAM

Reduced to particulars, President Johnson's official conference in Honolulu is intended to review and amplify the means to consolidate military gains made or expected in South Vietnam.

Such action is required if we are to eliminate the tidal waves of success and failure in establishing territorial control under conditions of guerrilla warfare.

In military operations designed to wrest territory from Vietcong dominance, pacification has been tentative and temporary. As our troops have moved on or as their direct grip on an area has been relaxed, there usu-

ally has been a reinfiltration of Vietcong influence. Territory once secured and returned to South Vietnam administration has often become a no-man's land, insofar as the firm loyalties of the local population can be measured.

Our troops crush Communists or force them to flee, but behind is left a vacuum of physical chaos and disorganization of life not easily repaired under present circumstances.

What contribution to stability can be expected of perpetual refugees, abandoned in a contest that grinds them again and again in the jaws of war? Uprooted and tossed about by repeated violence, they are maneuverable by the enemy for his purposes.

In the President's mission are included Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner.

Their task will be to devise ways to fill the aftermath voids of war with rural development and reconstruction programs aimed to encourage the return of production and confidence, if not of complete tranquility, to those parts of South Vietnam from which the Communists are expelled.

On several occasions Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has urged the adoption of effective pacification programs of an economic and social nature. He has held these to be inescapable adjuncts of successful military action to free South Vietnam of its Communist subversives.

The President says that a substantial part of the Honolulu session is being devoted to a pacification program that will improve military security. "We want to be sure that we have our best planning and our maximum effort put into it," he explained.

Certainly it will be most difficult—if it becomes necessary—to wage more extensive war beyond a line of increasing rearward sabotage and terror.

It has been said that the American experience in Vietnam is militarily and politically unique for us. That is not quite so.

At this stage there exist in South Vietnam some remarkable resemblances to the conditions of the Philippine Insurrection, an almost-forgotten struggle that embroiled the United States in the islands from 1899 until 1902.

The operation involved 100,000 men. It was a guerrilla war with a "disappearing enemy" in which a majority of the engagements occurred within 50 miles of Manila. Our casualties were heavy. The insurrectionists seeking independence under Aguinaldo were well supplied with foreign arms. There was deep division of sentiment in this country concerning the propriety of U.S. military and political policy in the Philippines.

Eventually the United States prevailed and put down the internal revolt, but importantly contributing to that was a pacification program of rural aid, education and health services to reinforce the military campaign.

In character and in purpose the proposals for South Vietnam now under study in Honolulu recall measures that previously proved effective in the same area of the world and under comparable conditions.

A 4-Year House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of *Newsweek*, Walter Lipp-

mann discusses the proposal for a constitutional amendment that would extend the term of Members of the House from 2 to 4 years. Mr. Lippmann thoughtfully points out that many of the reasons for the establishment of the 2-year term in our Constitution are still valid and important. He argues, correctly in my judgment, that the way to improve the effectiveness of the House is to streamline its organization and procedures.

I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Lippmann's column in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*.

[From *Newsweek*, Feb. 28, 1966]

A 4-YEAR HOUSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has recommended a constitutional amendment to lengthen the terms of Members of the House from 2 years to 4. This amendment would not go into effect before the election of 1972, until President Johnson himself is sure to have retired. Mr. Johnson proposed that election to the House be held in Presidential years, and he would therefore abolish the midterm election.

The main argument for the amendment is, in the President's words, that Members of the House would be "free of campaigning for a period sufficiently long to enable them to master the work of the House." In addition, a 4-year term would "reduce the cost—financial and political—of holding congressional office" and in general would, it is hoped, make the office more attractive to "the best men in private and public life."

The purposes of President Johnson's amendment are excellent. But it raises, so it seems to me, problems which are at least as serious as those which it proposed to solve.

Thus, as proposed by the President, the House of Representatives would be elected only in presidential years, and the term of each Member of Congress would coincide with that of the President. This would mean that the only consultation with the voters during the President's 4-year term would take place in the third of the States where there was a midterm election of a Senator.

THE PRESIDENT'S MEN

This would, as I see it, reduce greatly, if it did not destroy entirely, the function of the House as the organ of government which is closest to the voters. The Members of the House who belong to the President's party would tend to be the President's men. For since a President is usually renominated for a second term, the Congressman elected with a President would be under heavy pressure to follow the President obediently. Instead of the House being close to the voters, as the Constitution intended, the President would be interposed. This would leave a haphazard one-third of the Senate to exercise the role intended for the House by the Constitutional Convention.

I myself am a firm believer in strong presidential government, and I believe that Woodrow Wilson was right in his denunciation of congressional government. But the proposed amendment would remove the main check upon presidential government, and in the electronic age the President in office with his well-nigh monopolistic control of television would acquire undue and excessive power.

In order to cure this defect in President Johnson's proposal, it has been argued that the term be lengthened to 4 years but that only half the House be elected in a presidential year, the other half in the midterm. Though this is better than the President's proposal, it too raises great problems. The seats in the House would have to be divided in two parts, one-half being elected in the presidential years and the other in the midterm. It would be virtually impossible under such an arrangement to know whether or not the House reflected the views of the vot-

February 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

ers in the middle of the President's term of office.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 the discussion turned on whether the terms should be 1, 2, or 3 years. The 1-year term was rejected on the ground that it was too short, considering how slow was travel from the constituencies to the Capital. The 3-year term, which Madison supported, was rejected also—on the ground, I suppose, that it would call for the election of a third of the House each year, and that this would prevent or at least obstruct the election of a House which supported the President who was elected. If the voters want so-and-so to be President, they should be able also to give him a majority in the House. If, on the other hand, the voters have become seriously opposed to the President's conduct of the office, they should be able to express their disagreement by depriving him of a majority in the House.

So, the Constitutional Convention settled on the 2-year term, and it seems to me that no sufficient case has yet been made for reversing its decision.

The substantial argument in favor of the 4-year term is that Congressmen from close constituencies do not have time to "master the work of the House" owing to "the inexorable pressures of biennial campaigning for reelection." This argument should be examined closely and thoroughly with a view to determining whether the real trouble is the shortness of the term or whether it is not, as Mr. Joseph W. Sullivan has pointed out in the Wall Street Journal, that the Congressmen have to devote too much time to such tasks as interviewing candidates for West Point and running errands for their constituents. This might well be remedied by providing them with a bigger staff of competent assistants.

This is the line on which we ought to begin to study the improvement of the quality of the House.

New Tactics in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Portland Oregonian of February 10 stated editorially that Vietnam "must be revitalized politically and economically before it can stand alone."

The President's announcement that there must be social and political reforms, as well as battlefield victories, was noted by the newspaper, which said:

Mr. Johnson's new tactic would appear to be the result of the sudden realization that the rehabilitation of South Vietnam may be more important, in the long view of things, than the immediate problem of driving out the Red invaders; that the economic aid aspect of the overall effort is in more urgent need of escalation at the moment.

The paper believes that if we can convince more South Vietnamese that they have a better prospect of future peace and happiness under the Saigon government than under Red rule, then it might not be so difficult to clean out Vietcong strongholds and keep them clean.

I offer this thought-provoking article for the RECORD, convinced that others will find it as worth while as I did.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 10, 1966]

THE OTHER SHOE

The declaration of Honolulu marks a significant change of emphasis in U.S. policy in South Vietnam. No longer will the United States appear to the rest of the world merely to be stubbornly fighting on in southeast Asia while attempting, through various stick-and-carrot techniques, to lure the enemies of the Saigon government to the conference table. Now President Johnson has declared his intent to export the Great Society to South Vietnam, to create conditions in which, once the shooting ceases, it may hope to survive as an independent and largely self-sufficient nation. It is an idealistic and possibly unattainable goal, but at least the approach is bold and positive. And it gives real meaning at last to the phrase, "peace offensive."

The shortcomings in our previous policy have become evident. It is not enough to seek a military solution, with a peace conference and inevitable compromises which probably would lead in time to the very situation we are battling to prevent—the ultimate Communist takeover of South Vietnam. Yet that weary and battle-torn country is in no condition to defend itself politically any more than it can do so militarily with its present resources. It must be revitalized politically and economically before it can stand alone.

The United States has of course been carrying on a civilian aid program, trying to better the lot of Vietnamese in areas not wholly dominated by the Vietcong. But it has been a relatively minor effort, subordinated to the seemingly more vital U.S. military objectives.

Mr. Johnson's new tactic would appear to be the result of the sudden realization that the rehabilitation of South Vietnam may be more important, in the long view of things, than the immediate problem of driving out the Red invaders; that the economic aid aspect of the overall effort is in more urgent need of escalation at the moment. Looking at it another way, we may not need so much manpower to clean out Vietcong strongholds and keep them clean if we can do a better job of persuading more South Vietnamese that they have a better prospect of future peace and happiness under the Saigon government than under Red rule.

Characteristically, having reached this conclusion, L.B.J. has moved suddenly and dramatically. The sending of Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and top members of the White House team to Saigon may not contribute much to the effort from a practical standpoint; the real work must be done by those on the ground, with a better understanding of the Vietnamese peasant society. But the official presence of top Government officials cannot fail to have a beneficial effect in impressing anew on both our allies and enemies that we are determined to give South Vietnam her opportunity for freedom and independence, and we will not leave the field while a realistic hope of this remains.

Hear that thump, world? That was President Johnson, dropping the other shoe.

Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1965, two Peace Corps volunteers—Miss Karen Ann Hiner and Mr.

Arthur G. Webster III—celebrated their wedding ceremony while on duty in Eastern Nigeria. The bride is a constituent of the Honorable WILLIAM S. AYRES, of Ohio, while the groom resides in the Second District of Michigan, which I am privileged to represent in this House.

The couple met in training last summer at West Michigan University in Kalamazoo, where their contingent spent 11 weeks preparing to teach in Nigeria.

The wedding was conducted in Enugu, the capital of Eastern Nigeria. The wedding party was dressed in traditional Nigerian attire for the ceremony.

Following completion of their Peace Corps service in 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Webster plan to pursue university teaching careers, and hope to return to the University of Nigeria after further study in the United States. Both are enthusiastic about the stimulating atmosphere of the new university, built with U.S. aid. The University of Nigeria is presently a partner school of Michigan State University, and participates in the international exchange program of American and Nigerian students and faculty.

Karen and Gary have expressed their hope that more projects of this type will arise as part of America's program of aid-in-self-development to the new African States. I am proud of their service; it symbolizes the dedication of some 9,000 Peace Corps volunteers, serving in every quarter of the globe. I know that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Webster a long and happy life together.

Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am bursting with pride because the great National Music Camp is located at Interlochen in the Ninth Congressional District which I am honored to represent. This cultural center, founded by Dr. Joseph Maddy, has become an institution and a way of life for many hundreds of talented young musicians from all parts of the world.

Last Monday evening, February 21, several hundred people were privileged to attend a concert of the Interlochen Arts Academy Orchestra held in the Department of State Auditorium. For all who were there, it was an experience that will be long remembered.

Set forth below is a review written by Cecelia H. Porter for the February 22, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, as well as a review by Wendell Margrave which appeared in the February 22, 1966, issue of the Evening Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 2, 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