

ested in bringing the matter to a quicker vote than will probably occur, the measure could have been considered earlier. I see no reason that the measure cannot be voted on next week.

The Senate debated the repeal of section 14(b) for many weeks. That debate was finally brought to a conclusion. If the administration had wanted to do so, they could have temporarily laid the repeal of section 14(b) aside and brought the pending measure up at an earlier date.

The Senate adjourned from Thursday, February 10, 1966, until Wednesday, February 16, 1966, in order that members of the opposition party could return to their homes and make political speeches. I do not deny anyone that right. However, if it were urgent that this measure be voted on this week, that certainly could have been done. An opportunity could have been afforded to those of us who want to express our thoughts and prayers. Certainly we should not be denied that right.

I believe one thing that has been accomplished by the present course of action is that this question has been finally removed from the cloakrooms and the corridors of Capitol Hill, and that some questions that many of us have been asking are now in the minds of the American people. The American people have a right to ask those questions. The American people are now receiving some answers, even if the answers consist of further questions. They are entitled to receive this information.

We do not live in a totalitarian society in which the voice of opposition should be stilled. I do not believe that the President would want this to occur. That was my reason for calling to the attention of the Senate the words of the President when he was a U.S. Senator.

I believe that if the President were here as a Senator at the present time, he would say:

Let us proceed with our business in an orderly fashion. Let us debate the issues and not personalities. Let us concern ourselves with the future of our country and with the future of our young people, rather than with words which will be hard to strike from the minds of some people if these words are repeated too often.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS TO WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, BOGGS, GRUENING, HARRIS, HART, INOUE, JAVITS, HARTKE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, McNAMARA, MONTROYA, MOSS, NELSON, RIBICOFF, RANDOLPH, TYDINGS, and YOUNG,

of Ohio, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, in order to improve and to make more effective the operations of that act.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 10 days, to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last year the Congress enacted the Water Quality Act of 1965. That legislation, which resulted from several years of work, debate, and deliberation, marked a major change in the direction and emphasis of the water pollution control and abatement program.

Its two key provisions, dealing with the establishment of a new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the program for water quality standards on interstate streams, made possible new and more effective attacks on the problem of providing the right quality of water in the right place at the right time.

The response to the Water Quality Act has been particularly gratifying in view of the strong opposition we had to overcome to obtain passage. As Senators may recall, it originated in the Senate as S. 649 in the 88th Congress. The Senate passed it in that Congress, but it did not receive concurrence in the House. We introduced the legislation in the 89th Congress as S. 4. As in the earlier Congress the reaction was mixed. The Senate acted quickly, and after several months the House passed a differing version. Protracted negotiations and a conference led to final agreement on the act which President Johnson signed October 2, 1965.

In the months since final enactment, I have been encouraged by the growing interest among public officials and industrial leaders in the comprehensive water improvement program initiated by the Water Quality Act. I believe that a fundamental change has occurred in the national attitude toward the water pollution problem. The discussion has shifted from the issue of whether or not we should improve the quality of our water to the issue of how best to accomplish our objectives.

The one disturbing factor in these months has been the delay in effectively establishing the new Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the appointment of a Water Pollution Control Administrator, as authorized by the Water Quality Act. Quite frankly, we cannot afford to lose momentum at this time as a result of delays occasioned by administrative uncertainty.

The new Administration was authorized by the Congress to upgrade the status of our water pollution control and abatement program and to broaden the emphasis of our water program to include more than health considerations. The States are now making plans to work with the Administration in the develop-

ment of water quality standards. Delay and confusion about the Administration and its status can only succeed in frustrating the intention of Congress in enacting the Water Quality Act of 1965.

The Water Quality Act was not the end of our efforts. It represented a new beginning. As President Johnson said when he signed that act:

This bill that you have passed, that will become law as a result of a responsive Congress, will not completely assure us of absolute success. Additional bolder legislation will be needed in the years ahead. But we have begun. And we have begun in the best American tradition—with a program of joint Federal, State and local action.

The proposed legislation we are introducing today is bolder legislation. It is the product of last year's field hearings by the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee. It is designed to implement the findings published in our report, "Steps Toward Clean Water." It will form the basis for hearings and the development of legislative recommendations which the Committee on Public Works plans to report to the Senate later in the session.

Briefly, Mr. President, this legislation would provide for a 6-year, \$6 billion program of grants to municipalities for sewage treatment construction, with the Federal Government paying 30 percent of the total construction cost. It would remove the present limits on individual project grants. If enacted, it would help us meet the estimated \$20 billion cost of municipal sewage treatment construction needed to meet our national needs between now and 1972.

In addition, the bill provides for incentives to the States to participate in the program by offering a 10-percent bonus on those grants in cases where the State matches the Federal contribution. We provide for a long-term, low-interest loan program to assist those communities in States where State funds and local resources are not adequate to meet the local share. We also include a provision for States to anticipate their allotments to help accelerate the construction program.

In order to assist the States in improving their own programs, we have provided for an increase from \$5 million to \$10 million in the grants for State programs.

Finally, Mr. President, we would authorize a \$25 million a year program of grants for the demonstration of advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of compatible joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes.

This program is designed to enable us to meet our primary and secondary sewage treatment construction needs, to upgrade State programs, and to launch us into the new and highly important systems approach to water pollution abatement and control and improved water quality development. This approach is adaptable to different conditions in all parts of the country. It is designed to take advantage of technological develop-

language describing the various statutes, how and to whom they apply, the functions of the appropriate agency in the Government which administers each law, the procedures for appearance and appeal within the Department of Agriculture, and other pertinent information which would be of use to practicing attorneys who are not specialized in agricultural law and to interested Members of Congress and the general public.

These two actions—codifying and streamlining titles 7 and 16, together with publishing a concise and accurate digest of agricultural laws, would go a long way toward dispelling the feeling of many people that Mr. Lubell described when he said: "The writing of farm legislation has become a conspiracy against public understanding."

TIME TO STOP OUR ALLIES FROM AIDING OUR ENEMIES

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to prohibit any vessel or shipping line doing business with the Communists in North Vietnam from carrying U.S. cargoes. The shocking fact, that in 1965 there were more free world ships than Communist ships engaging in trade with North Vietnam, makes the legislation which I propose today of vital concern to every American.

The bill I propose today amends the Merchant Marine Act by providing that no article shall be transported aboard vessels of any shipping interest which allows vessels under its control to be used in trade with North Vietnam.

The exact figures for free world shipping into Haiphong are classified information which the State Department will not release to the American people. Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, and Kosygin all know, but it is top secret information to be kept from the American people. But through the fog that surrounds the issue, it is clear that our allies are giving invaluable aid to the Vietcong—107 of the 119 allied ships known to have entered the port of Haiphong in 1965 flew flags of NATO countries.

The State Department claims that because much of the material traded is not strategic, this doubledealing by our allies is somehow all right. It seems to me that one does not have to be a trained diplomat to see beyond that argument. The more nonwar goods that are carried on free world ships, the more Communist ships are freed for war materials. It seems equally obvious that to a war economy such as North Vietnam's, the provision of any goods, whether they are war supplies or domestic necessities, is giving them aid and comfort.

Those shipping lines which pick up cargoes in American ports would either have to give up their Vietcong business or ours. Great Britain, probably the worst offender, claims that it has no control over its private shipping lines except in wartime. They have made no move to comply with the official requests of our Government that they cease their North Vietnam trade. My bill would take the problem out of the hands of the

diplomats and the British Government and let us deal directly with the offending shippers.

It is no wonder that Hanoi thinks it can scare the United States out of Vietnam. Although we fight on land, we make no effort to blockade or otherwise prevent our own allies from loading and unloading merchandise in Haiphong. If this would not convince Ho Chi Minh that our involvement there is a half-hearted one, nothing would.

We already have a similar cargo ban on those ships trading with Cuba, and we are not at war with them. Why should we not operate such a blacklist against ships aiding a regime that is daily killing our American boys?

I call upon the Johnson administration for immediate passage of this bill. We are engaged in a major war. We should take the necessary actions to conclude this war. This action is simple, easy, and long overdue. Let us do it.

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

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

THE REASON WHY THE UNITED STATES IS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States addressed the school administrators convention in Atlantic City and put into its proper perspective the whole question of why the United States is in Vietnam. He also stated unequivocally that the United States will not be driven out of Vietnam.

It is my hope that those who have been carrying on the vendetta against America's participation in the struggle for freedom in Vietnam will heed what the President said yesterday and will study carefully the testimony presented by General Taylor today before the other body.

The President quite properly pointed out that the issue in Vietnam is not a struggle over a piece of real estate known as South Vietnam but, rather, a struggle in support of a fundamental question as to whether we will give the Communists an opportunity to develop this entirely new type of warfare all over the world.

In order to understand our involvement in Vietnam we must understand several other things. This country has built up an awesome Defense Establishment, so awesome that it has made major war totally unthinkable for the world. There is no question that our fleet of Polaris submarines and our Strategic Air Command with its B-52's and our guided missiles; which are capable of sending nuclear warheads across continents and oceans, have certainly helped us finally to reach that point in the world's crossroad when the major powers realize that

any major military confrontation will be too costly and too devastating for all sides involved. We have made world holocaust too costly for anyone to seriously consider a major nuclear third world war. There can be no question that our vast Military Establishment is today proving itself the very deterrent it was designed to be against a third world war. The fact that neither the Soviet Union nor China have joined Hanoi on a major scale proves conclusively that major war would appear to be out of the question at this time.

So the Communists have now gone the other way. They have developed a new technique, a technique which they call wars of liberation but which are nothing more than wars of subversion and terrorism against the established order in nation after nation; small, dirty wars, but no less devastating to the institutions of freedom where they are not stopped.

Two weeks ago I described here on this floor—and my remarks appear in the Record of January 20, on page 822—the blueprint that the Communists have spelled out for similar wars such as they are waging in Vietnam today to be waged on three major continents of the world, that is, in Asia, in Africa, and in South America. The Communists spelled out their blueprint for world conquest through terrorism and subversion during their Tricontinental Congress which was held in Havana, Cuba, from January 1 through January 15.

Now, how foolish could we be to walk away from South Vietnam today when the Communists have publicly announced that they intend to proliferate this new concept of terror and subversion in every single nation on three continents if they get away with such subversion in South Vietnam?

How can anyone fail to see what devastating plans the Communists have for a whole series of "Vietnams," when they have boldly, brazenly, and arrogantly told us—in public—of their new attacks on the institutions of freedom on three continents?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to compliment the gentleman on the floor for the fine statement he is making.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the commendation of the gentleman from Illinois with just this one additional comment. We are getting quite a bit of mail now about pulling out of Vietnam and saying it is a grave mistake that we are there, because they want peace.

If I may contribute this much to the gentleman's remarks, I would say that I always write back and say, "Yes, we are yearning for peace, and I do not think that there is a Member of this

⁸ Ibid. 2, p. 140.

body that does not want peace as much as you do, but we have to ask ourselves immediately two questions: The first is what kind of peace? And the second question is, for how long?"

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for the fine statement he is making to the House here today. The President is eminently correct when he brings forcibly to the attention of the educators, the administrators of education in this country, the fact that there is more than a piece of real estate at stake in Vietnam; that there is a principle involved and that this issue is a phony one with the Communists. These so-called wars of liberation must not be allowed to succeed because they are subversive in nature and they do not serve the best interests of mankind either in this land of freedom or anywhere else on the face of the earth. Therefore, I congratulate the President and I commend him for his steadfast attitude. In turn, I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for reminding the House again of a position from which we cannot depart.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I think every single American and every single person in this world who wants peace and freedom ought to offer a prayer of thanksgiving that we have a President who has the courage and the wisdom to understand the global aspects of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I belong to that school which sincerely believes that the Communists are in more trouble in Vietnam today than we are. We are winning in Vietnam. Our American troops are scoring impressive victories every day. Those who have been imploring the President to pull out, to give in, to walk away are obviously blind completely to the fact that while we have had difficulty in fighting this very unusual war, we are still winning. We have never had a war like this to fight before. Here you do not know who the enemy is. You cannot find them. They work in the fields during the day and then engage in their terrorism and subversion at night. You cannot identify whose forces they are. So, admittedly, there are serious problems for our side in meeting this enemy, but our troops and the Korean troops and the Australian and South Vietnamese and other troops of all our other allies—and we do have allies in Vietnam—have finally found the winning combination.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the Communists who are in trouble in Vietnam. I believe one has the right to believe, without arousing too much optimism, that China is losing its effort to set itself up as the great spokesman of all of the Communists of the world.

I believe that the psychological and the diplomatic defeats which China has suffered in Africa and in Asia—and is now

suffering in South America—gives all of us hope that perhaps the war situation could change very suddenly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we can be proud of the American people. The American people want to see this war ended. But, I am certain, they want it ended with victory for freedom.

Earlier today we heard testimony before one of our committees by General Hershey, discussing the draft and what it is doing to the young people of this country. Of course, all of us are concerned about this. We all pray fervently that we can bring the entire Vietnam situation to the negotiating table, but pulling away some from North Vietnam, would only whet the appetite of the Communists and would only open the door for more Communist aggression, as the President so eloquently stated yesterday.

Retreat from South Vietnam would represent an open invitation to Communists over all this world to engage in similar subversion, and similar terrorism, in every country into which they can get.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that standing with the President is the only way to proceed. I believe Mr. Johnson has charted a sound course.

The President has held out the olive twig in one hand, but has not abandoned our responsibilities, from a military standpoint, on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and honest belief that with the victories which our troops are scoring in Vietnam today we have at least more reason to hope today than ever before that the war in Vietnam can take a very sudden turn and victory could be ours.

I should like to include at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times which points out China's setbacks. I believe this is an extremely important editorial and fortifies my belief that with all of her setbacks, China might very well stop coercing Hanoi to continue its aggression in Vietnam. We pray to God this might be so and the conflict in Vietnam terminated soon.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

PAPER DRAGON?

Red Chinese plots for subversion and revolt have recently been uncovered in the Middle East and in Africa, where a number of nations have broken off diplomatic relations with Peiping. Similar plots have been uncovered or smashed in other areas.

In Indonesia, a Red Chinese attempt to take over that government was met with force and destroyed. In Cuba, Premier Fidel Castro denounced Peiping as an aggressor after uncovering a Chinese Communist plot to subvert his army.

Russia is moving toward an open break with Chinese communism and even Albania, long Peiping stalwart in Eastern Europe, is now reported to be turning to Moscow.

It adds up to acute embarrassment for Peiping diplomats—and it raises a doubt that Red China's dragon is as fierce as it has been advertised.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of the help we are receiving in Vietnam, and the draft call upon Americans.

I want to say that outside of South Vietnam, the Australians—a token force of Australians—and a very few New Zealanders, as well as the South Koreans and the United States, who else is shedding any blood? Who else is getting killed in Vietnam?

Mr. PUCINSKI. May I say to my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], who is a member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and I respect him for his good and sound judgment—I know that the gentleman knows perhaps better than most Members of Congress, by virtue of the fact that he is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is privy to many things that perhaps the rest of us do not have—that this is a troubled world. There are many trouble spots. Our allies are making their contributions in various parts of the world. Perhaps they cannot be with us in Vietnam to the extent we would like to have them participate. Take the British, for instance. They are holding Malaysia. Also there are other places around the world in similar situations.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know there was a war going on in Malaysia.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is not, but there certainly would be war if we did not have the forces over there to maintain peace. Take, for instance, the Middle East, and take many other parts of the world. We have a peacekeeping force now in the Middle East. The gentleman from Iowa knows the situation is not that simple. One cannot say that we have a problem in Vietnam and, therefore, that we must concentrate every effort there on the part of our allies, because that in itself would be an invitation to other aggressors, other aggressions, and other upheavals which would only confront us to a greater degree at other places.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern is very clear. I certainly would like to see more of our allies assist us in Vietnam. I join the gentleman from Iowa in that expression, if that is what the gentleman is suggesting. I join him in that hope.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman well knows that from 139 nations in the world we are receiving no assistance, no help at all with reference to the war which is going on in North Vietnam. This is what requires the drafting of the youth of this country. I do not like it a bit.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will come to my office I will show the gentleman a complete rundown compiled by the Department of State in the last few days, showing just how little the rest of the world is helping us in North Vietnam.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman knows that I have taken the floor many times urging that our allies give us greater support. But, having said this, I am sure the gentleman is not

APPLAUDING RECENT ACTIONS BY BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

(Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed timely and fitting that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Hon. Charles Schultze, and his Deputy, Hon. Elmer Staats, be complimented on recent manpower management improvement actions by these able administrators.

I have been advised by Mr. Staats that the Budget for the Department of Defense provides for 58,000 additional civilian spaces for the military services to replace able-bodied military men now in such support jobs as: chauffeurs, carpenters, painters, office equipment operators, and budget analysts with civil service personnel. These military-trained men, by returning to their combat units, will not only bolster our defense posture but also in time this program will save the Government several million dollars annually. This action by Bureau of the Budget officials is in accord with a request of the Manpower Subcommittee last August to the Secretary of Defense and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Staats also indicated that the Bureau's personnel ceiling control policy has been revised so that temporary, part-time, and intermittent employment are no longer under a specific numerical ceiling. This change will give the Government's managers some greater flexibility in handling their personnel problems. In a request to the Director of the Budget last April, I indicated that a change in personnel ceiling controls would also save the Government money. Several departments and agencies have so indicated this to the Manpower Subcommittee.

The Deputy Director of the Budget stated that action has also been taken in Defense, Post Office, and the General Services Administration to use Federal employees in lieu of contracting out for personal services. The subcommittee has determined from the experience of several Government activities that the use of contractors to perform work normally handled by civil service workers is often more costly than in-house operations, but also the Government loses a definite control over the work. Frequently the subcommittee has been told by management officials of departments and agencies that limited civilian personnel ceilings have in the past been a major reason for contracting for work normally done by Government employees.

I applaud these progressive and realistic manpower moves by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LULAC

(Mr. WHITE of Texas (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, the organization popularly known as LULAC, the League of United Latin American Citizens, observes its 37th anniversary. Organized in Corpus Christi, Tex., February 17, 1929, the league has become one of the outstanding groups of our Nation for the fostering of good citizenship.

Because the national headquarters of the League of United Latin American Citizens is located in my city, El Paso, Tex.; because five of its past national presidents have been residents of my district; and because I have personally seen the results of this organization's many contributions toward good citizenship, I would like to call the attention of the House to LULAC's outstanding record.

The league carries on a constant program of citizenship classes, to aid prospective citizens of Latin American birth to become well grounded in fundamental principles of our Government before becoming naturalized. It conducts annual campaigns of voter registration and voter qualification.

In the field of education, the League of United Latin American Citizens did some important pioneering from which the whole Nation is today reaping rewards. In 1956, the LULACS initiated what was called "The Little School of the 400"—to teach a basic 400 English words to 5-year-old children whose native language was other than English. The Texas State Legislature made the program statewide and appropriated funds for its financing. Today, a similar program, nationwide in its scope, is known as Project Head Start.

In the 1950's, the LULACS also launched their nationwide campaign against the high school dropout problem. Coupled with this, they initiated an impressive program of college scholarships for promising youth of Latin American ancestry. The roll of young men and women who have completed college under this program is long and growing.

The LULACS, through their many cultural events, fiestas, concerts, and folk dances, have taught all of us the graceful charm of Spanish America; and in doing so, have enriched our own culture to the benefit of all.

Mr. Speaker, the League of United Latin American Citizens, through its actions, has proved that racial prejudice disappears as education and good citizenship advance. For 37 years of solid progress in promoting these worthy aims, the League of United Latin American Citizens deserves the gratitude and respect of this great Nation.

HOWARD K. SMITH'S COMMENTARY ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent commentary on the war in Vietnam and the role of the United States in this war. Howard K. Smith,

internationally noted news commentator, reporter, and author, substituted for ABC Commentator Edward P. Morgan on February 11, 1966, and gave one of the finest interpretations I have yet to read in cogent form of the role of our country in Vietnam—why we are there, and why we must be there for our own good and that of the free world. It is truly a superb presentation, and I am pleased to offer it to my colleagues.

Mr. Smith, a native of my State of Louisiana and a fellow student at Tulane University 30 years ago, takes up the oft-quoted cliches of the opponent's of our policy and actions in Vietnam, and refutes them with logical clear analysis—analysis based on the experience of history.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD this fine news commentary by my good friend, Howard K. Smith. The commentary, broadcast on February 11, 1966, follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS,
FEBRUARY 11, 1966

(Howard K. Smith substituting for Edward P. Morgan)

The chief event in Washington this week has been the hearings on Vietnam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The committee, and the public, have heard two witnesses fairly critical of what we are actually doing in Vietnam. Next week, Secretary of State Rusk and Gen. Maxwell Taylor will appear before the committee and refute some of the points made this week by Gavin and Kennan. But a long weekend will have passed. The North Vietnamese will have time to nourish a little more the only belief sustaining them—that America is seriously split; and the administration has no answers to critics' points. As many of the points made by critics are extremely doubtful, I beg to suggest the case against them.

One statement, made so often in the hearings, that it is becoming an accepted cliché is—America is trying to police the whole world, and we can't do it. The truth is, America's actions have been highly selective. There was for some years a war in the Congo. We took no part. There was a severe crisis in Cyprus that nearly sent our allies Greece and Turkey, to war. We took no leading part in it. The Rhodesian crisis is being left to Britain, though as a loyal ally we give moral support. There is a threatened crisis between Israel and Jordan over use of Jordan river waters. We have said no word and are in no way planning to intercede. The list could be lengthened. There is simply no evidence whatever for the cliché that we are being the universal policeman.

Another proposition stated so often that people are tired questioning it is—It was a tragic blunder to get committed in South Vietnam in the first place. Well, take your mind back to when we did, 1954, and think about it. A war by a minority of Communist guerrillas was raging in Malaya, south of Vietnam. Nearby in Burma guerrilla raids from China were being made. Had we refused to intercede and give South Vietnam help, Malaya might well have gone Communist, Burma as well—and the small, weaker countries in Asia. India would be in much greater peril and the world situation much more unstable and dangerous than it is. And, incidentally, an American administration that refused to face up to a responsibility that important would have had a hard time from the American voters.

Both General Gavin and Mr. Kennan questioned that South Vietnam is an important commitment at all. They are certainly right

February 17, 1966

that it does not rank with, say, Japan, or with Berlin. The loss of either of those would truly carry the cold war to dangerous new dimensions. But South Vietnam remains very important indeed. The struggle going on is actually for all the southeast Asian peninsula, which is of great importance.

Next to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are both riddled with guerrilla bands, passive, waiting for victory in South Vietnam before they take over those countries. In Thailand, south of them, the Vietcong are not hiding their preparation. Peiping radio announces once a week its plans to secure the takeover of Thailand. If we were not resisting in Vietnam, we would certainly soon have to fight in those other places, deep inland, with long supply routes, and at every disadvantage. By resisting where we are we have the 7th U.S. Fleet, the world's strongest, able to give constant artillery and air support to troops—which it could not do inland—and we have short and well-protected supply routes from the coast. There is no doubt that we have chosen the, for us, most advantageous, least costly, place to make the stand. So, Vietnam is a very important commitment indeed.

Both witnesses have vigorously disagreed with the domino theory—the idea that if one nation falls, the others topple in a long line. But nobody has refuted the facts of political life: Success at conquest is infectious among greedy dictators. They need foreign success to divert attention from the fact that they do very badly at home. There is no doubt that a triumph in one place stimulates the urge to try it elsewhere, and if we leave Vietnam to them, it can lead to setbacks nearly as great as China turning Communist in the first place.

One of the strongest myths of the time is—let South Vietnam go to the Communists. It will not be China's puppet. It will be as independent of China as Russia's satellites are of Russia. The answer to that is—do not overestimate the independence of Russia's satellites. Hardly one of them can fire 10 rounds without ammunition from Russia, or fix a tank or plane without parts from Russia. What independence they have is very modest and very limited.

In the one important case where a satellite flouted Russia outright—Tito—the prime condition for success was—America was nearby, dominating the Mediterranean and would equip Tito for a mountain war of infinite duration. Those who assure us if we let Vietnam go it will be independent, also insist that we eliminate the one condition that makes a degree of independence possible—American resistance.

Senator FULBRIGHT's office announced today he had received 5,000 letters due to last week's hearings. He interpreted that to mean a vote of confidence in him. In a nation of 195 million, there is a different way of interpreting that. It may mean there are 194 million plus votes that he isn't getting.

This is Howard K. Smith in Washington.

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. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on February 23; and to revise and extend his remarks and in-

clude extraneous matter, immediately following Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 1 hour, on February 24; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter immediately following Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. WAGGONER, for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 21.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. GROSS) for 5 minutes, February 21; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and 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. DORN.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. DE LA GARZA) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer not to exceed \$260.

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

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

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

Mr. RACE in two instances.

Mr. TODD in two instances.

Mr. COOLEY in four instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. WHITENER in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.

Mr. CASEY in three instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

Mr. MILLER in five instances.

Mr. MORRISON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2053. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report showing quantities of commodities on hand, sales and disposition methods used, and quantities of CCC commodities moved into consumption channels, pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2054. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Navy Material (Procurement), transmitting the semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2055. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of proposed amendments extending the concession contracts of several applicants, pursuant to section 5, Public Law 89-249; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2056. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2057. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the restrictions on charges for certain narcotic order forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. S. 774. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 736. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12752, a bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 12888. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3215

the ground that the sentence, although lawful, is excessive. On review, the court of appeals would be empowered to reduce, increase or otherwise modify the sentence imposed by the district court. The bill would also allow the court of appeals to make rules providing for the availability on appeal of any presentence reports or other evaluations made of the defendant prior to the imposition of the sentence.

Any person who wishes to testify on March 1 and 2, or who desires to submit a statement for inclusion in the record, should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6308, New Senate Office Building.

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. MONRONEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by former Representative Brooks Hays at the National Interfraternity Conference.

Article entitled "TV and America's Conscience," written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and published in the Washington Star of February 12, 1966.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address delivered by Irving H. Dale to the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, New York City, November 30, 1965.

Citation to Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc.

Editorial entitled "To Fight Alcoholism," published in the Washington Post, February 14, 1966.

By Mr. COTTON:

Article entitled "Title I School Program Causes Dover Confusion," published in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader of Tuesday, February 15, 1966, and an article entitled "Swanzy Woman Who Quit OEO Blasts Setup," published in the New Hampshire Sunday News of February 13, 1966.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

An article entitled "He Weds Americans to Latin Development," in tribute to Jim Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, published in the Miami Herald of February 6, 1966.

Newspaper editorials and articles paying tribute to the late Will Clayton.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Article entitled "It's Uncle Who Pays," written by Richard Starnes, dealing with the war in Vietnam, and published in the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1966.

Editorial entitled "Our Senator Becomes a Statesman," dealing with U.S. policy in Vietnam, published in the Bloomington, Ind., Star-Courier of February 3, 1966.

SUPPOSE—OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there has come to me from Mr. Tedis Zierins, of Chicago, Ill., a copy of a poem written by Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship 3 days before he was killed in action in Vietnam. The poem was sent to the Chicago American by someone in the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing in Da Nang in Vietnam. It will certainly give anyone who will take time to read it pause to think about our responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the poem be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUPPOSE

(By Pfc. Robert E. Blankenship)

Suppose this Sunday morning
The church bell didn't ring,
And as you paused upon the step,
The choir didn't sing.
Suppose the door was padlocked
Or maybe nailed up tight.
Suppose a guard was standing
There to stop you day or night.
Suppose you saw Old Glory,
A dirty, tattered rag.
And floating high above your town
Another country's flag.
Suppose the only sound you heard
Was soldiers' marching feet
Suppose the army near your home
Was of some foreign power
Sent to march along your streets
Instead of boys of ours.
Suppose your friends were carried
Off to prisons or their deaths
And all their pleading for a trial
Was just a waste of breath;
You say this couldn't happen here,
We'll pray to God it can't
For if everyone prays earnestly,
We must believe it shan't.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM COMBATS MALNUTRITION IN THE YOUNG

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the administration's recent decision to cut the school milk program by 80 percent is going to have a serious effect on teenage America. The morning and afternoon milk breaks which are so common in schools across the Nation will largely be a thing of the past.

Many of my colleagues may say that malnutrition among teenagers is not a serious problem in this, the most prosperous Nation in the world. Yet an article published in 1960 in the New York Times indicated that "6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies." Research showed at that time that more than 5 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19 exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, French fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles. I seriously doubt that this problem has solved itself in the interim.

This is the principal reason for the existence of the school milk program. The Federal Government encourages young men and women to drink milk—nature's perfect food—by helping them to pay the costs of morning and afternoon half-pints. But now the administration has decided that this school milk program is not necessary for young people unless they are selected by the school administrator as charity cases.

The Times article goes on to point out: Starving teenagers come from rich, poor, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here [Washington], morning hunger headaches are common and valuable class time is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse. At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys fainted at early-morning cadet drill, authorities began a better breakfast campaign.

Mr. President, that morning milk break under the school milk program is a

way to combat this malnutrition. However, unless Congress decides to reject the 80-percent cut proposal put forth by the administration, morning milk breaks will be the exception, not the rule.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the Record.

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

YOUTHS SUFFERING FROM POOR DIETS—SCIENTISTS FIND MOST ARE MALNOURISHED AND NEED ADVICE IN EATING HABITS

WASHINGTON, March 26.—While Mom and Dad are setting the world's best table and running up a \$78 billion annual food bill, 6 of every 10 teenage daughters suffer serious diet deficiencies.

Most of the future wives and mothers in the United States are so poorly fed that scientists call them malnourished.

Teenage boys are close behind in this deficiency. But nutritionists worry mostly about 9 million girls between the ages of 13 and 19. More than 5 million exist mainly on snacks, soft drinks, french fries, pizza, candy, hamburgers, and waffles, research shows.

Americans are taller, live longer and eat 15 percent more than they did a half a century ago. But unless the younger generation learns about nutrition and fills dangerous diet gaps with milk, meat, fruits, and vegetables the pendulum could swing backward.

BENSON CITES NEEDS

"Never have young people been more in need of wise advice and guidance on food," Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson said this week.

"Replacing their present faulty food habits with good ones will take the full cooperation of parents, teachers, and teenagers themselves."

Schoolwork and alertness suffer when the teenage body is lacking in vital food elements. It shows up in bad temper, acne or loss of stamina. Too often pimples are borne patiently as "part of growing up," when they are a sign of poor diet.

A teenage girl, obsessed by beauty, may cut her intake so drastically that her authentic long-range glamour is undercut.

"In her concern for a slim figure," a nutritionist said, "a girl may gamble with her health by making total war on calories. She plunges into a hippo-to-slimmo routine, inventing her own reducing diet."

"Too often she skips valuable potatoes, bread, and milk, bypassing entire meals, then cancels it out with gooey sweets. A low-calorie diet, if properly planned can include every nutrient. If it doesn't, it's dangerous."

CRITICAL YEARS

The long-term results are impaired health and a weakening of future generations. Malnutrition is sometimes connected with juvenile delinquency.

At about 11, a girl's growth spurts, and for the next 9 years her body burns a lifetime high in food energy. By 16, she should reach her maximum height. By 18, her weight probably will level off as nature turns to firming muscle, bones, and tissues—in short, building an adult body.

The food she eats must fuel this growth, at the same time providing teenage energy for jitterbugging, softball, hockey, and a hectic school calendar.

But at the time her body demands a peak intake of calories, vitamins and minerals, her parents relax discipline over her food habits. Even if they did not, the young lady, proudly wearing her first pair of 2-inch heels, would issue her declaration of diet independence.

"No time," she shouts sprinting past the breakfast table, or "not hungry."

The starving teenagers come from rich-, poor-, and middle-class homes. At a junior high school here, morning hunger headaches are common and valuable classtime is lost when youngsters are sent to the nurse.

At a senior high school, when breakfastless boys, fainted at early morning cadet drill, authorities began a "better breakfast" campaign.

The food habits of these youngsters mirror a nationwide teenage famine amid plenty. For lunch a girl selects a luscious wedge of pie from the cafeteria line. Watching the trays go by, dietitians who plan balanced hot meals see many nutritious, energy-packed dishes ignored.

"They'd eat three desserts if we didn't have a rule against it," one commented.

Arresting this trend which is rooted in ignorance, indifference, or poverty, will take a shift in food habits. In the average home a nutritious diet may be had for much less than the family spends, but it takes know-how.

FEDERAL ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM EXCELLENT TAXPAYER INVESTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been one of those Members of the Senate who has criticized wasteful Government spending. I have introduced amendments to reduce proposed spending programs in the past. I intend to do so in the future.

But when the Government can show that its programs not only achieve social results in improving human welfare, but also save money for the taxpayer, they deserve our audible and enthusiastic support.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Wirtz proved that the Government's on-the-job manpower development training program has helped do a superb job of putting unemployed, unskilled workers back to work. By itself this is a worthy goal; but the program has also succeeded in paying back to the Government and the taxpayer its total cost in full within 2 years—simply based on the Federal income taxes paid by the newly employed workers.

Of course free enterprises which employ these workers in partnership with the Government program deserves great credit too.

Here is an example of Government and business working together through training unskilled workers to achieve three mighty important goals: First, to put unemployed unskilled men and women to work in skilled jobs that pay well; second, to reduce the inflation threat by hitting the toughest inflationary problem—our shortage of skilled workers; and, third, to return to the Government the full cost of the program within 2 years with the taxpayer reaping rich dividends in subsequent years.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from Secretary Wirtz' testimony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In my considered judgment now, however, the controlling consideration is that the on-the-job training program has supplied us—as a lesson of proven experience—with the answer we were looking for.

It puts the training almost entirely in the employer's hands.

It has become an effective instrument for implementing national policies which employers share with the entire community.

And it is proving to be an almost historically economic program.

Let us look at this program in hard-headed, dollars, and cents terms—in terms of who the trainees are, what it costs to train them, what their earning power becomes, and what the Government (which is the country) gets back on its investment.

Here are some of the key facts:

Most of the OJT trainees (about two-thirds) were unemployed before they joined the program.

We estimate that the average Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job trainee earns \$59 a week during 19 weeks of training, and \$80 a week as a full-time worker after his training. Thus the average trainee earns \$3,761 the first year.

The cost to the Government of on-the-job training averaged about \$495 a trainee in 1965. Some cost more, some less.

According to the Internal Revenue Service the average Federal income tax for married workers with one child who earn \$3,761 a year is \$211.

Thus, in the first year, a typical on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government about 43 percent of its total investment in him. Before the second year is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

It is difficult, of course, to find the "average" illustration. Programs vary from the most expensive, during which 52 weeks of training is provided, to those lasting only 3 weeks.

Those trainees already approved will earn almost \$392 million during their first year of training and work. Their training will cost the Federal Government \$51 million, of which about \$20 million will be repaid in taxes during the first year, and the remainder the second year.

On-the-job training programs are a sound investment.

These programs have been warmly received by American employers, who, in the long run, must provide the jobs for American workers. The business community, along with American labor, has cooperated in making Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training an exciting and successful program.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS WOULD ELIMINATE TEACHER SHORTAGE IN LOW-INCOME AREAS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, few appropriation requests will come before us during this session, of greater importance than the President's recent request for funds to support the National Teacher Corps.

Today, our national shortage of elementary and high school teachers is estimated at 100,000 a year, and there are about 80,000 teachers in the Nation's school systems with substandard credentials.

In the Nation's poverty pockets, where there are 5 million schoolchildren whose families earn under \$2,000 a year, the teacher situation is even more grave. School budgets in these poverty areas cannot be stretched to attract or hold enough talented, or even qualified, teach-

ers. Competing with the wealthier school districts for the limited number of new and replacement teachers available each year, the poverty schools inevitably lose out. Each fall, slum schools open with too few good teachers, too many substitute teachers, too many temporary teachers, and too many teachers whose qualifications are far below minimum standards.

The very youngsters who are culturally handicapped to begin with—those who come from families where parents, brothers, and sisters make up the one-fifth of America that has not finished elementary school—are being educated today by some of our least gifted teachers. No wonder that, after 6 or 8 years of listless schooling, these boys and girls join the ranks of the undereducated unemployables—the underprivileged of our Nation—who contribute little to our society or our economy.

Teaching children of the poor takes dedication, talent, and training. To reach a child whose concept of books is limited to the comic strips, whose ear is attuned only to the simplest verbal exchange, requires a very different approach from that used in our schools today, where every child, regardless of his background and abilities, is taught according to standards suitable only for the middle-class child whose home is comfortably furnished with books and art and conversation. The need, then, is not simply one of numbers, but also of kind.

To break out of the tradition of poverty, disadvantaged youngsters must receive the best—not the least—in education. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is a giant stride. But although it provided over a billion dollars in aid to low-income areas, it does not provide the means to attract the thousands of men and women with the enthusiasm, the dedication, the understanding, and the talent that are essential to make effective use of the newly available Federal funds.

The National Teacher Corps will do this.

If we had to single out the most important available tool in combating poverty, it would have to be education.

This program is perhaps not nearly as dramatic as Vietnam, but it is equally essential to the well being of the country.

Our survival in this world depends heavily on how well our citizenry flourishes. And this, clearly, is one of the most effective devices we can employ toward the conservation of this Nation's human resources.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS LIBERALIZATION AND EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a distinguished member of the economics department of Michigan State University and a noted scholar in the field of anti-trust and monopoly, Dr. Walter Adams, has called to my attention a petition signed by 100 members of the American Economic Association.

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3221

A native of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., Alexander Francis Jones attended the University of Wisconsin from 1911 to 1914, and began his newspaper career as a reporter on the Madison State Journal. One of his early assignments was to travel with Senator Robert (Fighting Bob) La Follette, the elder. He joined the staff of the Minneapolis Journal in 1916.

Casey volunteered for service in World War I and was an Army stretcher bearer in France.

STAR UP REPORTER

After the war, he was a star reporter for the "night side" of the old United Press. He covered the Black Sox scandal that shook organized baseball in 1919, and he used to recall writing about the little boy who approached Shoeless Joe Jackson, the great outfielder, and pleaded "Say it ain't so, Joe."

In 1923 Casey returned to the Minneapolis Journal, where he served as sales and promotion manager and city editor.

The late Eugene Meyer, who bought the Washington Post at auction in 1933, hired Casey as managing editor in 1935. The paper, although bearing a famous name in journalism, had gone into a serious decline. Jones pitched in to help publisher Meyer rescue and rehabilitate it.

"UPHILL YEARS"

When Jones left to go to Syracuse in 1950 after 15 years with the Washington Post—12 as managing editor and three as assistant to the publisher—the paper said in an editorial:

"It is hard for us to lose the services of a man who has endured the heart and burden associated with the creation of an institution out of a bankrupt property. Most of his 15 years were uphill years. His devotion to his responsibilities was catching, his interest in his work unflinching."

When Casey first came to Washington in 1935, he was introduced to the late Sir Willmott Lewis, distinguished correspondent of the London Times. Lewis, on being told that Casey was the new managing editor of the Post, shook his head and said: "Don't you know, old boy, that Pennsylvania Avenue is paved with the bones of former managing editors of the Post?"

"JUST A GYPSY"

But Casey stayed around a long time. His brown hair turned gray, and then white, as he guided the news department in the Washington Post's great comeback period. When he left, after 15 years, he said he guessed he was "just a gypsy."

He was managing editor throughout World War II, and many stories were told about him in that tumultuous period. On the day the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Sunday, he rushed from his Wesley Heights home to his office, and began rounding up reporters, desk men, printers, and pressmen so that the Washington Post could get out an extra.

The extra was about to go to press when Robert Tate Allen, then the paper's church editor and known to the staff as "Bishop," burst into Casey's office.

"Hold it, hold it, Mr. Jones," Allen cried, "The Reverend * * *, pastor of the Georgetown * * * Church has resigned."

MURROW "SCOOP"

Later that night Casey dropped in on a party at the home of Harry Butcher, who was to become an aid to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in the war. Among others at the party was Edward R. Murrow, the radio commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Murrow had been a dinner guest of the Roosevelts at the White House earlier in the evening. He had heard of the terrible damage done at Pearl Harbor—the sinking of the *Arizona* and the *Oklahoma* and all the rest—but he couldn't use it in a broadcast. He

had been a guest, and therefore he felt that he was "sewed up."

Casey Jones was under no such inhibition, and he saw to it that what Murrow picked up at the dinner table got into the Post's news columns next morning. Murrow used to carry the clipping of the story in his wallet. It was a sad reminder of how he got the biggest story of his career and could do nothing about it.

FLAG-WAVING PATRIOT

Fortune magazine once described Casey as "cyclonic, convivial, incurably romantic about his profession."

He was all these, and also an unabashed patriot—the flag-waving kind. In 1942 he became impatient with what was being called the "war effort," especially with what the Government was doing or not doing.

In 1943 Casey was elected to membership in the Gridiron Club, made up of 50 Washington newspapermen. He became one of the club's most accomplished performers, being possessed of the necessary ham quality.

Some of his reporters who never saw him in a Gridiron skit agreed that he had great ability as an actor. He used to put on his most dramatic performance when a reporter hit him up for a pay raise. He would slump in his chair and a look of pain would appear on his face, causing the reporter to feel that he had landed a foul blow.

Jones is survived by his wife, the former Edna Schultz, a daughter, Mary Will of West Palm Beach, and two sons—Richard, of Orlando, Fla., and Compton, of Bethesda, Md.

RITES IN SYRACUSE

A funeral service will be held in the Park Central Presbyterian Church of Syracuse at 11 a.m. Saturday, after which the body will come to Arlington Cemetery.

Katharine Graham, president of the Washington Post Co., said yesterday that Jones was "a valued friend and colleague," and added:

"For 15 years he shaped the news policies of the Washington Post under my father and, later, my husband in an original, aggressive and exciting manner. He was the model of the tough reporter with a heart of gold."

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat of New York, said that Jones represented "the quest for excellence in American journalism," and added that his "imprint will long survive."

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post and president of the Gridiron Club, asked the club members to form a committee to be at the chapel in Arlington Cemetery at 10 a.m. Monday.

VIETNAM REPORT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in a February 9, 1966, column published in the New York Times, C. L. Sulzberger supports a point which I made in my Vietnam report. He argues that American liberals have been much more inclined to make concessions to the Communists in Europe than in Asia, without realizing that the main thrust of the Communist threat today is in Asia and that this threat must be met where it is posed.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Sulzberger's article printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1966]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ROOTS OF BEFUDDLEMENT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—International opinion is quite as bewildered as American opinion concerning

U.S. policy in Vietnam. This is as true for adversaries of the United States as for friends. Senator FULBRIGHT was referring only to Americans when he said he had never seen "such dissent, reservation, groping and concern." But he might just as well have been referring to the outer world, choosing Russia and China for a start.

The Chinese proclaim our Vietnamese policy is part of a Russo-American global conspiracy to encircle China. Moscow's friend Castro throws the ball back into China's court, likening Peking's actions to those of "Yankee imperialism." No wonder the average American gets mixed; Uncle Sam can't win.

NUCLEAR ESCALATION

The southeast Asian conflict is the first since 1945 that contains an implicit danger of nuclear escalation—which was never a serious threat in Korea. This implicit danger adds a muddled element to political thinking on Vietnam.

Since Hiroshima many U.S. liberals and intellectuals have been increasingly reluctant to endorse Washington's diplomatic actions, especially if they are tough. Such groups have unconsciously developed a mood of appeasement especially in Asia, that contrasts with the attitude of liberals and intellectuals toward Europe before World War II.

This pattern is confused by the traditional U.S. policy conflict between "Asia first" and "Europe first" schools. Broadly speaking, American liberals have always tended to belong to the latter group. Following World War II, U.S. foreign policy focused primarily on European matters; Korea being an exception.

The "Europe first" school has never been happy about accepting risks in the East. It took dramatic aggressions like Pearl Harbor or the invasion of South Korea to produce a consensus on our foreign policy between liberal "Europe first" and conservative "Asia first" groupings. The gradual intensifying of the Vietnam crisis by disguised aggression never achieved the same result.

Foreign opinion is bewildered for different reasons by American involvement in Vietnam. When the United States was firmly wedded to a "Europe first" policy it spurned General de Gaulle's request for a three-power committee, the United States, Britain, and France, to coordinate global strategy. This request, made in 1958, was never seriously pondered in Washington although De Gaulle made it clear that if no such arrangement were devised he would reduce French participation in NATO.

We have come full circle. The United States now urges its allies to help us in Vietnam but Europe, stripped of its Asian colonial possessions, is content to pursue its own version of a "Europe first" policy. Europeans want to avoid taking sides in communism's intramural dispute between Peking and Moscow. They are more concerned with the problems of German unification than that of Vietnam; the present emotional atmosphere of the United States is not felt here.

DOUBLE SWITCH

Many Europeans, led by the French, were once extremely eager to attract Washington into Far Eastern commitments and an "Asia first" policy, a prospect then welcomed by American conservatives and opposed by liberals. But now that Washington has moved in the direction formerly desired by such Europeans, they in turn have shifted to our own previous position.

The "dissent, reservations, groping, and concern" noted by FULBRIGHT can thus be detected abroad also—but for entirely different reasons. The odd thing is that when American policy shifted from "Europe first" to "Asia first," those Europeans who origi-

nally wished to bring us into the East objected most.

Both Americans and Europeans who now criticize us have been on the same side of the policy fence—in fact on both sides—but at different times. Each has managed the strange feat of simultaneously reversing its position.

AMERICAN LIBERALS

For a third of a century American liberals and intellectuals have been more inclined to endorse appeasement in Asia than in Europe. The nuclear danger in Asia has only reinforced this traditional position. But the U.S. Government has shifted the emphasis of its policy interests from West to East.

Some 20 years of hegemony in world power politics have apparently persuaded Washington that its views always represent the general interest—even when such views are switched. Trouble comes when some Americans can't get used to the switch and some foreigners can't get used to its timing.

THE PEOPLE'S WAR LAND REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a series of four articles which were published in the Washington Star, written by Richard Critchfield, explaining the war for land reform and the problems of pacification.

Critchfield details the Saigon land reform program, its failures, and most importantly its importance for the masses for Vietnamese peasants. Critchfield also argues convincingly that the key to future elections in Vietnam and the success of democratic institutions hinges upon land reform and the need for a pacification program that educates and cares for the people and gives them a sense of participation as well as protects them. Mr. Critchfield's analyses in these respects confirms my own observations from my recent trip to Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Critchfield's articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star]
THE PEOPLE'S WAR: PEASANTS' TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT
(By Richard Critchfield)

(NOTE.—This is the first of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—“This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods * * *”

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's “The Good Earth,” is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac, and Saigon rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajamas and pointed strawhats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster, and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going on in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs. Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon, here only 1 of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is Central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by “squatters” and 300,000 acres where free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution

from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about \$50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between \$150 and \$200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

U.S. GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating \$150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of \$350 million this year—by giving the Saigon Government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as “a people's war,” and not “a war of attrition.”

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of \$150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing \$16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent \$4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And \$1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland, or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montagnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The landownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is “perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have.”

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigoneses is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta Province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963-64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple.

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3223

70,000 tons of sugarcane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as \$40,000 in a single-year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of \$25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important, perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects these political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grassroots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointless slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear ready to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist-held zones that the peasants will come over to the government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly pro-government by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Jan. 25, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: MILITARY ACTION VERSUS LAND REFORM

(NOTE—This is the second of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TANAN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A respected Vietnamese journalist, when asked why Saigon's generals temporized on enacting the kind of land reform that most people agree is needed to win the war, replied:

"They're still convinced it's winnable their way, and if not, it's not worth winning."

This harsh judgment may have more than a grain of truth in it.

Here in Long An Province, in the rice-rich heavily populated upper Mekong Delta, the Vietnamese officials and Army officers seem as fiercely determined as ever to defeat the Vietcong eventually.

The Vietnamese still are fighting their own war here.

But local leaders become curt and evasive when questioned about land reform or other innovations to improve the peasant's lot.

"All the land we can distribute in secure areas, we have distributed already," said one senior Vietnamese official.

Most of these local leaders are reserved, sensitive, French-educated men, generally respected by their American advisers as "very competent" and "fine people." All have lived amidst war and violence since 1939.

Yet most of the higher ranking ones see South Vietnam's salvation in terms of military action rather than political remedies.

A typical response on how to win the war came from a civilian administrator in his midthirties:

"We don't have enough troops. If the free world would go to war with China, then OK. The unique way to win is to attack North Vietnam and China. If not, the war of subversion will last another 5 years."

Asked about the fate of the 3,000 Vietcong of South Vietnamese origin in Long An in the event of a cease-fire, the official said, "They all must go back to Hanoi."

His opinion was seconded by a Vietnamese officer, "Once the fighting stops, it will take us another 2 years to pacify Long An. We must throw the Vietcong forces out and destroy the Communist infrastructure."

A year ago, the U.S. mission in Saigon agreed to finance grievance committees in each of Long An's six districts in an attempt to analyze and then to right the wrongs that turn the peasants into Communist guerrillas.

One Vietnamese officer explained how the committees were working out:

"Each cadre has a small room. Everybody must come in for 5 minutes so as to keep security for the man who seeks to tell something. The cadre asks, 'How is your family? How is your life?' In this way, we get information on the Vietcong political organization and make our intelligence net. The grievance committees are the eyes of the Province chief."

Other officials praised the committees as a good way of learning the peasantry's education needs, getting military intelligence, controlling the population's movements and detecting secret Vietcong cells.

No one mentioned the genuine grievances that the peasants presumably voiced.

ATTITUDES DIFFERENT

Going down the ladder one rung to the district officials, however, there seems to be a distinct difference in attitudes.

While most senior Provincial officials are from Saigon and make no secret of their personal ambition to be transferred back there some day, the district officials seem to identify themselves much more closely with the local peasantry.

Typical of this group is Nguyen Van Dhien, in Long An's most pacified district, Thu Thua. A goateed former Vietnamese ranger with a reputation as a tough fighter, Dhien writes poetry and has let his fingernails grow half-an-inch long to show he has risen above manual labor.

Dhien does not think that an invasion of North Vietnam would solve anything—and he is a strong advocate of land reform.

Asked what might happen if there were a free election contested by the Communists and the Saigon regime in Thu Thua, he said that if the Communists promised land reform, they might get the votes of 85 percent of the 45,000 who are landless peasants. In contrast, he said, the 8,000 refugees who have poured into Thu Thua in recent weeks from Vietcong-held territory probably would vote for Saigon since most are bitterly anti-Vietcong after experiencing Communist rule.

Twenty percent of Thu Thua's land, he said, is owned by rich absentee landlords who live in Saigon and Tan An.

Unlike the provincial leaders, Thien does not think the protracted guerrilla war will last long. "There is a big flame in the lamp just before it goes out," he said.

A third distinct Vietnamese attitude is moral indifference to the war, typically expressed by the bonze superior of Tan An's towering Nguyen Thuy Pagoda.

During a conversation marked by long silences, distant gongs, and burning incense, the bonze, a shaven-haired intelligent-looking man in his midthirties, had no opinion on land or any other concrete reform to help the peasantry.

"The Buddhist doctrine is tolerance, not violence," he said. "People move to town because they are afraid of bombing and artillery. I hope it is possible you can cease the bombing and shelling. Even where there is no engagement made with the Communist forces, the Americas still bomb, causing much harm to the people."

Most of the refugees, however, do not associate airstrikes with the Americans since they have seen few foreigners.

One refugee, Mau, a 49-year-old tenant farmer who fled to Tan An with his wife and five children a month ago, said his hamlet, An Nhut Tan, had long been under Vietcong control.

"At home I rented a hectare of rice land from a landlord who lived in Lac Tan village. The VC promised to give us land; they called the village chiefs together last year to make a land reform plan, but they didn't do anything."

Asked what he thought of the Vietcong, Mau stuck his tongue out and made a face as if he had bitten into a sour pickle.

"They usually shoot artillery around my house so I must move. Too much bombing also since November."

Since he had no identity papers, he said, he could not qualify for refugee relief and instead was earning 50 cents a day as a construction laborer in Tan An. "It's easy to get work now; many rich men building houses."

Asked what he thought of Americans, he had to ask the interpreter what Americans were.

After a pause, he shrugged, "The Government used to help more with rice and money. Why doesn't Mr. Diem come back? When he was there we got bank loans."

A 25-year-old Vietcong defector, who used to lead a 37-man guerrilla platoon, explained why peasants like Mua were turning against the Vietcong.

In his area, he said, the Vietcong initially redistributed land. But now they have raised taxes 300 percent.

"The more air strikes, the more people moved away and the heavier taxes became," he said. "The National Liberation Front (the Vietcong's political arm) failed to solve anything. There was no security to work in your field. An F-105 jet got there too fast, there was no time to run for cover. Those and 250-pound bombs were most feared."

He said it he were directing the war in Saigon he would intensify air and artillery attacks on the Vietcong villages, and then would offer the peasants amnesty and safe harbor elsewhere.

He suggested the offers be broadcast via helicopter loudspeakers by people who previously had left the Vietcong held villages.

He said he had joined the Communist Party 2 years ago.

"Everyone wants to join because it is an honor. You are known everywhere."

His platoon, he said, was assigned the military mission of "destroying strategic hamlets, building roadblocks, and encircling and inflicting casualties on the enemy" and the political task of "visiting farmers to inquire about their poverty and ask about their sufferings."

He said the Vietcong's motto was "Eat together, live together, and work together," meaning the soldiers and peasantry.

"The people liked us until our presence began to attract bombs and artillery to their villages," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: THE BATTLE TO WIN PEASANT'S LOYALTY

(NOTE.—This is the third of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"Vietcong?" said the teenage American corporal, shoving a magazine into his carbine. "Hell, half the people walking by could be Vietcong. How you gonna tell Charlie from the friendlies?"

Here in Long An Province in the densely populated Mekong Delta, as most everywhere else in Vietnam, it is impossible to tell "our side" from "their side." A grin or a wave means nothing at all.

The corporal is one of about 60 Americans who are spending a year in the province, advising its military officers and civil servants on how to destroy Vietcong units, counter political subversion, and win over the loyalty of the peasantry.

It is no easy task, since an unrecognizable minority of the people the advisers are trying to befriend are trying to kill them.

And unless they befriend and convert more people than they kill, the fighting accomplishes nothing.

"This is the basic difference between the 'people's war' in Vietnam and more familiar 'wars of attrition' elsewhere.

AWAKENED BY MORTARS

That night the Americans at Tan An were awakened at 1:30 a.m. by incoming mortar bursts. For some minutes the night was full of whirring, shrieking explosions.

Then the Vietcong firing stopped as abruptly as it had begun.

Out along a fence where men in pajamas and underwear and others in full combat fatigues had taken their positions, everyone listened.

When the night stayed quiet, someone muttered, "Well, I'll live to see another day."

A garrison radio crackled to life and a voice reported two 30-man Vietnamese militia posts had been attacked, one less than 2 miles away.

Flareships and "razorback" armed helicopters were soon circling the northern horizon; the tracer bullets looked like a man on a rooftop sprinkling firewater from a hose.

The commanding officer sent word from the province command post, telling everyone to go back to bed and get some sleep. They would need it in the days and weeks ahead.

SUSPECT BIG ASSAULT

The night mortar barrages have become a routine in Long An Province. Either Tan An or one of the six district capitals gets hit at least once a week.

And many of the American advisers, airmen, and technicians suspect a big assault on one of the district towns sometime this winter. Most are convinced such an assault can be turned back with Saigon's armed hueys, jets, flareships, and Long An's artillery.

It is rough for the five-man American advisory teams stationed in the six district towns.

One major said that everytime his garrison has been mortared, he has gone out and found the outside gate open, unlatched from inside the compound.

"If the Vietcong ever get inside that gate there's no place to go but down. At that point, I take off my flak vest, 'cause if they're going to get me, I don't want it to be alive."

A captain in Tan Tru, Long An's hottest district since it straddles the main Vietcong supply route between the South China Sea and base camps along the Cambodian border, says the morale of the Vietnamese militia he advises is "the damndest thing I've ever seen. I don't see how they can continue to smile and joke all the time; but they do."

He said his 2 months at Tan Tru has felt "like a lifetime; something happens every night."

He added, "We also have to keep the 12-mile road to Tan An open three times a week and it seems like every time we go to clear it we lose one man, either killed or wounded."

One major described a recent daylight operation to clear a Vietcong roadblock off Highway 4. He said his driver, while waiting in the jeep, was shot between the eyes by a sniper.

HARASSMENT RISING

After nearly a year of comparative peace and quiet in Long An, the Vietcong moved a second mainforce battalion into the province in November and the pace of ambushes, attacks, and mortar harassment has risen steadily ever since.

This climaxed at 1:30 a.m. on December 26 when the Vietcong chose to break the United States-South Vietnamese Christmas truce by firing 40 mortar shells into Tan An, while simultaneously laying down mortar barrages on all six district towns.

They inflicted heavy casualties and eventually overran two company-sized outposts and beheaded one Vietnamese soldier's wife.

Twenty-five militiamen were missing after the attack; an American captain speculated they "either bugged out, were carried off or directly hit by a mortar shell and blown to bits."

Many of the ill-equipped militia, or popular forces, as they are officially called, fight with only carbines and shotguns while

wearing floppy hats, swimming trunks, pajamas or a scrounged uniform.

Recently a four-man outpost held off a company-sized Vietcong attack for 6 hours; when morning came two militiamen were dead and two were wounded, but the post had not fallen and they had managed to capture six Vietcong weapons.

One hamlet of 300 people, deep within Vietcong territory, recently pacified itself by erecting fortifications and passing the hat to buy a 60-mm. mortar to scare off the Vietcong. So far the Communist guerrillas have let the village alone.

Many of the American advisers believe the pattern of Vietcong attacks on isolated outposts and newly fortified hamlets along Saigon's defensive perimeter and Long An's northern boundary suggests that the Communists may be trying to sever Highway No. 4, and cut off Saigon from the rice-rich Mekong Delta.

COUNTER STRATEGY

To counter this strategy, Long An's Government forces, composed of two South Vietnamese regular army regiments and several thousand more locally recruited militiamen and police, have tried to fix the two Vietcong battalions with ground action and destroy them with heavy artillery and airstrikes.

Long An is so short of troops, however, that most operations must be stopped at sunset so the militia and police can return to guard their homes and families.

Despite this troop shortage, both the American advisers and Vietnamese commanders oppose bringing American combat units into the delta where the war is still almost entirely a Vietnamese fight, except for U.S. air support.

The Americans seem to feel that moving more U.S. troops into the delta would lead to a put-down-tools attitude among the Vietnamese forces. Vietnamese officers emphasize that the local economy would be disrupted and that the Vietcong could exploit a foreign invasion propaganda campaign among the local peasantry.

American combat soldiers in Vietnam are always amazed to hear the U.S. advisory teams live in scattered groups of four and five, wholly defended by Vietnamese troops.

The advisers themselves often wouldn't have it any other way.

Says Capt. Maurice H. Krause, 31, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., Long An's pacification adviser:

"This is an extremely nice country. What happens if you get assigned to a big unit is that you're close to a conventional war environment, moving with the troops. Down here in Long An we see people getting schools and medicine, see the spontaneous expressions of loyalty to this side and dissatisfaction with the Vietcong."

Two enlisted men in Long An have extended their tours for a second year and one will marry a local Vietnamese girl next month.

The biggest problem for the advisory team, as the fighting intensifies in Long An, is how to avoid inflicting casualties on the civilian population.

"HAVE TO GET CALLOUS"

Half of the patients at Tan An's new 155-bed hospital are civilians wounded in the fighting.

"Usually you can count on receiving at least a couple a day," says an American doctor on the hospital staff. "They mostly step on grenades or mines or get shot by stray bullets. But we do get some bombing and napalm victims. You have to get callous or you'd drive yourself crazy worrying about it."

A U.S. Air Force forward air observer, one of a team who flies reconnaissance and combat support missions over Long An every day and knows it terrain by heart, says, "If I go

over a village and see women and kids, I flatly refuse to call in an airstrike."

Another American, after many months in Long An, says, "No one who goes to indemnification meetings where they pay war victims can be morally callous. No one can say a 2-year-old child or a 90-year-old grandmother is a Vietcong. But I think we should and must continue the bombing.

"It's effective. It kills Vietcong and interdicts their movements. I think care is taken. There are instances where American forward air controllers have refused to call in strikes or when the province chief has ordered helicopters back home that were ordered out.

"What you've always got to remember, though, is that the people are the key to winning the war. There's no reason to go out in the woods and kill lots of people unless it helps in pacifications."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1966]

THE PEOPLE'S WAR: AND NOW ANOTHER TRY AT PACIFYING LONG AN

(NOTE.—This is the last of four articles on the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam's rice bowl. Critchfield recently completed an extensive tour there.)

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—After months of reappraisal and careful preparation, South Vietnam has launched its fourth pacification plan since 1961 to win back the loyalty of the Vietnamese peasantry.

It differs hardly at all from the old plans on the two key issues involved—land reform and military against civilian rule in the countryside.

As a result, many observers fear it will be no more successful than former President Ngo Dinh Diem's Operation Sunrise, Gen. Nguyen Khanh's Chien Thang plan or Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's Hop Tac plan.

Nor is anybody predicting spectacular success.

After a brief tour of Vietnam recently, David Bell, Director of the Agency for International Development, said, "We don't expect large areas to be cleared, but they will be significant."

It has never been so much a question of devising a successful pacification program as applying it and redressing the genuine political grievances of the peasantry.

In essence, all the programs have been derived from the tache d'huile or "oil slick" or "ink blot" theory, first developed by the French Foreign Legion in Morocco in the 1920's. It was a method of securing some solidly held, key centers from which "pacification" forces could spread out in an ever-widening perimeter against rebellious natives.

PHILIPPINE SUCCESS

After being humanized and refined with civic action, most notably land reform, the method worked against Communist insurgents in the Philippines. And by added emphasis on promises of independence, police methods, strict population control, and fortified villages, the British made it work in Malaya.

Land reform or the promise of independence, however, provided the psychological impetus in both of these successful efforts.

As U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge puts it, the people "must adhere to the government because they like it before it can win."

It was not until March 1962 that Diem, with the help of Malayan-experienced British advisers, launched the first attempt at Vietnamese pacification, Operation Sunrise.

Diem misused the program by making it an instrument of his personal rule. But even so, it was far more successful than any of the efforts that followed it.

For instance, here in Long An Province, Diem succeeded—in just a little over 1 year—in regrouping 1,000 hamlets into 220 strategic hamlets and isolating the Vietcong into the remaining 35.

Diem had three things his successors lacked—a functioning countrywide rural administrative system, an efficient, tightly controlled political apparatus, and a civilian chief in each Province whose authority was absolute and who superimposed a political judgment over military actions in his Province.

DIEM AIDS PURGED

The wholesale purge of public servants and other Diem appointees, whatever their personal record or reputation, and the destruction of his Can Lao Party left the Vietnamese Army as the only countrywide organization.

Colonels and captains took over the job of running South Vietnam's 43 Provinces and 240 districts.

It soon became apparent, however, that these men were not subject to Saigon's direct administrative control, rather they were responsible to the commander of the nearest Vietnamese Army division and through him to the local corps commander.

Seen in retrospect, the three successive military coups of Minh, Khanh and the Young Turks were in large part supported by the officer corps to enable them to consolidate the administration in the countryside.

Thus, beginning with Diem's fall, government was made incidental to waging the war.

On the Provincial level, meanwhile, the army, jealous of its powers, exempted Vietnamese soldiers from the civilian penal code, even in crimes involving civilians.

Since the army lacked the judicial apparatus and military police to control its troops, the net effect was to turn loose in the countryside 550,000 young soldiers who had little reason to fear being arrested or prosecuted for crimes such as rape or petty theft.

The Vietcong leaders, meanwhile, were concentrating on getting their men to "eat, live and work" with the peasants. The Vietcong helped the peasants till their ricefields and sweep their houses, while through terrorism, they were eroding law and order in government-controlled areas.

Two months after Diem's overthrow, an American-Vietnamese factfinding team, was sent to Long An Province.

The team uncovered an alarming Communist advance. By then the Vietcong had overrun and burnt down all but 6 of Diem's 220 strategic hamlets.

After interviewing 1,500 peasant families, the team concluded the war against the Vietcong "cannot ever be won" unless Saigon carried out drastic reforms at the village level.

Its conclusions were:

Land must be distributed. The local militia must be paid regularly. The use of artillery and bombs against villages must be limited.

Forced labor had to be stopped. Army extortion and food thefts must be prevented.

Corruption and bribery must be eliminated among local officials. District and provincial forces must send reinforcements when they were sought by village outposts under attack.

These conclusions were pretty basic, yet today most of the troubles remain largely unremedied.

Local militia are a little better paid and housed, but still not adequately. Forced labor has been eliminated in most of the country. The introduction of more armed helicopters, flareships, high-speed jets and more artillery has reduced the need for ground reinforcements.

But there has been no serious land reform.

Bombing and shelling of villages has multiplied tenfold or twelvefold. Army extortion and food thefts as common as ever and corruption is still endemic.

LODGE SHOCKED

When the report on Long An was originally published in early 1964, it had the impact of a bombshell in Saigon. Lodge, shocked at the seriousness of the situation, urged General Khanh to launch a crash pilot pacification program in the province. If the Communists could be turned back in Long An, Lodge argued, it would be shown they could be turned back everywhere.

Khanh agreed. Economic aid was stepped up, U.S. helicopter flights deployed for stop attacks, the military advisory team was expanded and more men were assigned to district and mobile units operating in the Province.

A Vietnamese airborne brigade was flown in to start operations to clear lost territory.

Major Gen. Richard Stilwell, now U.S. Commander in Thailand, told newsmen Long An would be "pacified" and cleared of Communists within 6 months.

But the following July, 6 months later, the government held only 25 hamlets, mostly clustered around Tan An and the six district towns. Khanh's "Chien Thang" plan had been a fiasco.

Partly, this was because Khanh's heart was never in pacification. He weakened pacification efforts from the start by leaving it up to his province chiefs to proceed as best they saw fit in their own bailiwicks.

After Maxwell Taylor arrived in Saigon that summer as Ambassador and surveyed the wreckage of years of costly trial and error, he developed a pacification philosophy calling for giving the peasants military security while demonstrating to them the revolutionary idea in Vietnam, that Government exists for the people.

By then, one of the main Vietcong slogans had already become: "The government exists for the people."

URGES CONCENTRATION

Taylor pushed for concentrating the government's resources on a small area, the seven provinces encircling Saigon, hoping for visible results. This was the "Hop Tac" plan (which roughly means "togetherness.")

Taylor also urged a return to civilian government. This was not simply to have Vietnam's leader a man in mufti instead of uniform, but because Taylor saw it was the way to restore a workable administration and law and order in the countryside.

Lodge's strong advocacy for a return to civilian rule, no matter who the man on top is, is based on the same reasoning.

Yet now, almost 18 months since Hop Tac got underway, Long An still has only 76 of its 252 hamlets anywhere near pacified.

The cost of men and material has been heavy; four of the young American officers who pointed out shortcomings in the pacification effort to me on previous visits since have been killed in action.

Since June 1964, there have been four different American province advisers and eight different American pacification advisers in Long An, although the Vietnamese provincial officials have stayed the same.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAY CRAIG

Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. President, at the time of her retirement last December 31, May Craig was one of the most widely known women in America.

As a journalist for more than 30 years, Mrs. Craig gained the confidence of five Presidents.

As a panelist on more than 250 televised broadcasts of "Meet the Press"

and other public affairs programs, she became a national personality.

As a columnist for the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., she gave Maine newspapers a refreshing and perceptive view of Washington and the world.

As a correspondent, she circled the world in war and peace. She witnessed the most exciting and trying events of our times. She spoke with the wisdom of experience and the optimism of youth.

Throughout her unparalleled career, she was a voice of decency.

To the Maine congressional delegation and to two generations of official Washington spokesmen, May Craig was a tireless and impartial reporter. She also was a lady whose charm and character won our hearts. We will carry our respect and affection for her always.

Earlier this week, President Johnson and 400 other friends honored her at a reception at the National Press Club.

When May Craig's retirement was announced, her newspapers in Maine outlined the highlights of her career and reported the many tributes she received.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post story on her National Press Club reception, and the Guy Gannett Publishing Co. stories on her retirement be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, Dec. 4, 1965]

NEWSWOMAN MAY CRAIG SLATED TO RETIRE
DECEMBER 31

WASHINGTON.—May Craig, one of America's most famous newspaperwomen and for more than 30 years the capital correspondent for the Guy Gannett Newspapers of Maine, will retire at the end of the year.

Mrs. Craig, who combined penetrating questions with pert hats, for more than 3 decades has been the most widely read columnist in Maine. She covered Washington and the world for Guy Gannett newspapers in Portland, Augusta, and Waterville.

For thousands of Maine families her daily column "Inside in Washington" was must morning breakfast table reading. Although little read outside Maine, Mrs. Craig became nationally famous as a panelist on the radio and television program "Meet the Press."

Millions of Americans came to know her as the Washington reporter who could be counted upon to enliven Presidential press conferences with the pointed question, the incisive query.

Yet, though her questions occasionally ranked the famous, she was a close friend of every President from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson.

And, though she asked literally thousands of questions, "I never asked a question I later regretted," she noted as her retirement neared.

Her column reflected the same penetrating quality that punctuated her questions. One column in 1964, "Decline of the United States—And Fall" attracted nationwide attention, was reprinted in U.S. News & World Report as well as newspapers throughout America.

Her travels in search of the news took Elizabeth May Craig around the world, as a war correspondent in World War II, as the first woman to fly the Berlin airlift, as a correspondent during the Korean war, and to Africa as the continent merged during the early 1960's.

Maine readers followed her byline around the world as she reported the great events of more than 3 decades.

Yet May Craig also kept a close finger on the pulse of the Maine delegation in Washington as she furnished readers with the news that most closely affected them.

Mrs. Craig said that, when she retires at the end of the year, "I'm going to take a little time off to do nothing," but few readers will believe that she'll remain inactive long. She's been under contract for some time to write a book, so there's the strong likelihood that the typewriter, which for a third of a century had recorded the events that shaped the world, will not long be stilled.

Millions of Americans who have seen Mrs. Craig on "Meet the Press" and at Presidential press conferences, have come to think of her as a Maine native. It comes as a shock to learn that she's a native of Coosaw, N.C., who moved to Washington as a young girl.

No matter. She remains Maine in Washington to many. She knows Maine intimately and news of a postmaster's appointment in Waterville received the same close attention as a Washington national story.

Now in her seventies (although she maintains that she'll be 50 until she dies), Mrs. Craig never slowed down. Her columns from the beginning reflected her intense interest in almost everything and anything, from renovations of the White House to the war in Vietnam.

For years she was up and on the go at 6 a.m., and Maine Senators and Congressmen quickly learned to become accustomed to a telephone call from May Craig long before they had risen from bed.

She became in time almost as famous as some of the officials she covered; more famous than most.

Married to a newspaperman, the late Donald Alexander Craig, the Washington bureau chief for the New York Herald, as well as for the Guy Gannett newspapers, Mrs. Craig became the Washington correspondent for these newspapers in the early 1930's after the death of her husband. She has two children, a son and a daughter, and several grandchildren.

She maintains a home in Washington close to the Capitol.

During her career Mrs. Craig covered the V-bomb raids in London during World War II, the Normandy campaign, the liberation of Paris, and the Korean war. Her travels for these newspapers have taken her to almost every point on the globe.

She was made a doctor of human letters by the University of Maine in 1946. She is a member of the Women's National Press Club, the Overseas Press of America, and Theta Sigma Phi.

—
PRAISE FROM L.B.J.

President Johnson, learning in Texas of May Craig's retirement, sent her the following telegram Friday:

"It's a long time from May to September, but May will always be May to me."

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Dec. 3, 1965]

—
TRIBUTE FROM PUBLISHER

Mrs. Jean Gannett Arnzen, president and publisher of the Guy Gannett Publishing Co., issued this statement of tribute to May Craig:

"May Craig has for many years been as inseparable from our papers as their nameplates. She has made them known, not only in Maine but in the Nation. Competing in an environment of top talent and strong personalities, she has had the vigor and the ability to be outstanding.

"Obviously her retirement, so richly deserved cannot be treated casually. It will leave a lonesome place in our columns. Her departure is too close to me, personally, to be dismissed in the course of business.

"She was employed by our papers by my father, the late Guy P. Gannett, when he

was establishing them and laying the foundations for their success. He always believed that one of his most important contributions was employing May Craig to represent his papers in Washington.

"I shall always remember my father's great pride in his Washington correspondent and the delight he had in her success."

[From the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram, Dec. 19, 1965]

"NATION IS BETTER FOR THIS OUTSTANDING WOMAN"—FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TRIBUTE TO MAY CRAIG

(By Donald E. Hanson)

To imagine a presidential press conference without May Craig is like imagining the Capitol without the Washington Monument.

For May Craig, to thousands of Maine newspaper readers, is Washington. For more than three decades she's been an indelible fixture on the Washington scene.

Presidents came and went. Elections changed the faces in the city and altered the complexion of the Nation. May Craig remained.

Now that too changes, for May Craig, who with pert hat and pointed question became one of America's most famous newspaperwomen, retires at the end of the year.

Presidents from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Lyndon Baines Johnson came to know and respect—and occasionally chafe at one of her barbed questions—the little and unquestionable First Lady of the Washington press corps.

Although for thousands of Maine readers her column "Inside in Washington" has been daily must reading for years at the breakfast table, Elizabeth May Craig was comparatively unread outside the State, except on occasions when her comments were reprinted in other newspapers and magazines.

Her face, however, became almost as famous as those of the personages she covered.

Visitors to Washington have, after viewing the landmarks of the city, often inquired of their host: "All this is fine, but where's May Craig?" And a Sunday Telegram reporter, traveling in California, had only to mention that he worked for the Portland papers to receive the reply, "Oh, you mean May Craig's papers."

To millions of Americans she became famous as a fixture on the radio and television program "Meet the Press." She once made President Jim Carey, of the Electrical Workers Union, gulp visibly by asking: "Don't you think it un-American for a man to have to belong to a union to earn a living?"

—
NO ONE IMMUNE

No President was immune from the sharp May Craig question. President Roosevelt, after fielding a sharp one on three hops, asked May if she stayed awake all night thinking it up. "As a matter of fact," shot back May, "I did."

Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all came to expect the unexpected from May. President Kennedy was wise enough to realize that when a press conference began to take a dull turn that it was probably time to recognize Mrs. Craig.

Yet, if Presidents occasionally rankled at a May Craig question, none was ever able to harbor a grudge.

She was often a visitor at the Hyde Park home of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. President Johnson, perhaps better than most, came to realize the many facets of May Craig. In 1956, when the then Senator Johnson suffered a severe heart attack, each day to his hospital room was delivered a private letter from May, cheering him and informing him of the activities in the Senate.

If the pointed questions, the unusual hats or the familiar features made May Craig a celebrity, they may also to some extent have obscured her real ability as a member of the Washington press corps.

ful of the fact that the percentage of the Negro population in these surrounding political subdivisions is so small as to forestall prompt passage of such legislation.

The legislative remedy must be applied in the areas where the social sickness is most apparent. This means, of course, that Baltimore City must take the leadership in providing metropolitan-wide open occupancy legislation. If each political subdivision were to await the action of the other, the mounting tensions brought about by crowded conditions may possibly explode before a common consensus is arrived at. Accordingly, I call upon this body to enact into law the Fair Housing Ordinance before you. I am mindful of the pressures under which you find yourselves. I know that there exists within your body a desire for statesmanlike leadership.

I pledge you my support and the support of the Archdiocese of Baltimore in assisting and encouraging the passage of similar legislation in the political subdivisions surrounding our beloved city. I am aware of the arguments that are made about the possibilities of a population which may desert our city, and I am equally aware of the inequity that may be visited upon some of those developers who have made their commitment to build within Baltimore City and who may find themselves placed at a great economic disadvantage in the event that some of the dire predictions about urban flight to the suburbs should come to pass.

The heart of the race problem is a moral issue. Even if the percentage of the Negro population in Baltimore City were extremely small, rather than in excess of the one-third figure, the justice of the proposal before you would be unaffected. The argument for justice, however, coupled with the practical consideration of tensions, uneasiness, and potential massive resort to law-breaking, give added impetus to the critical nature of the proposal before you.

I pledge you that this fight for social justice will not be placed upon your shoulders alone, but that the teaching and pastoral capacities of the Catholic Church will support you in what I ask you to do.

I call upon you, then, to make this a matter of civic and social responsibility so as to render to the minorities their rights, and to assist Baltimore in the growth which we mutually desire to see.

ALASKA THANKS MR. SHRIVER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, about 5 years ago, the American foreign relations took on a new image. Beginning in the West African Republic of Ghana, then spreading to East Africa in Tanzania, and outward to Latin America, Asia and the Far East, the finest concept of the New Frontier has taken American educational and technological know-how to 46 countries of the world.

I am speaking, of course, about the Peace Corps, now more than 10,000 strong—the grassroots diplomats perhaps closest to American hearts.

I say they are the diplomats closest to American hearts because there's an inherent remoteness about the fellow who wears a frock-tailed coat and striped pants. But the Peace Corps volunteer in Ecuador, in his jeans and sweatshirt, is a fellow with whom we all can identify. Last year, he may have gassed your car at the corner service station.

Now, all of this may sound like apple pie, and the Peace Corps may have some

of that too, but the U.S. Senate has to be concerned with hard-nosed results. Well, the Peace Corps, in my estimation, has delivered those results. And my State of Alaska also is getting a return from the Peace Corps budget.

Alaska is getting a direct dividend from the Peace Corps because three returned volunteers, two young men who served in Ecuador and one who was a beekeeper in Guatemala, are key people in the Alaska poverty program. Mr. President, I rise today to salute these young people, Mike Valentine of Ogden, Utah, and Gerald Miller of Ceresco, Nebr., who did rural community action work in Ecuador; and Don Johnson, also of Ceresco, who served the Peace Corps in Guatemala.

Alaska Gov. William A. Egan recently paid tribute to the trio when he said:

These Peace Corps returnees have made the most constructive impact upon poverty in Alaska in its 100 years under the American flag.

Gerald, Mike, and Don are working out of Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Bethel. Ninety percent of their time is spent living with Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in remote villages. These men are using Peace Corps skills and the Peace Corps concept of self-help to give Alaska's native people a new sense of personal dignity and value as human beings.

For instance, Gerald Miller, who was a horse trader in Nebraska before he entered the Peace Corps, is working with VISTA volunteers to establish a preschool program in the Eskimo village of Hooper Bay, whose population of 560 includes only 5 persons with salaried jobs. Gerald also has organized adult education classes at Hooper Bay, community action programs at Barrow, Fort Yukon, and Arctic Village.

Don Johnson, working with the Eskimos of Emmonak, has developed a sawmill industry there which will provide paying jobs for people who historically have eked out a subsistence living by hunting and fishing and trapping.

Mike Valentine is working on a program to electrify the Kodiak Island village of Old Harbor. Electrification of the village may help attract a canning plant.

Alaska's 48,200 native people want to pull their share of the load in developing our abundant resources. But in order to fulfill this responsibility, the Eskimos, the Aleuts and the Indians need technical know-how, not how-to lectures from a remote podium. They need demonstrations and examples from people such as our returned Peace Corps volunteers who live in the villages with the people.

That is what Alaska is reaping from the Peace Corps. Now, the real fruits of Sargent Shriver's inspired overseas organization are being harvested in my State, although the seeds were planted in Guatemala and Ecuador.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Sargent Shriver for developing the U.S. Peace Corps into one of America's most effective agencies for international aid, and wish him well in his new full-time assignment as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

To Jack Vaughn, the Peace Corps director-designate, I say, I hope that more of your returned volunteers will journey to Alaska, where there is great opportunity for those who want to serve their fellow man.

DEATH OF ALEXANDER F. "CASEY" JONES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, the death of Alexander F. "Casey" Jones in Florida on February 15 was a great loss not only to American newspapers but also to his many friends and admirers. "Casey" Jones represented the quest for excellence in American journalism. Both the newspapers he managed—the Washington Post and the Syracuse Herald Journal—and their readers benefited from his forthright and fearless direction. He was properly insistent on the people's right to know about the operation of their government whether Federal, State, or local. His sure and distinctive touch will be missed. His imprint, however, will long survive. For many years I was pleased to be counted among his friends and therefore I feel a personal loss.

THE BASE FOR VIETNAM'S GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the declaration of Honolulu has placed the economic resources of this Nation behind what may well be called a great society program for South Vietnam.

Public attention has been almost exclusively focused in the past year or more on the military situation we face in South Vietnam, and continues to pay little attention to developments within the economy of that country and its internal government structure and operations. The truth is that even though there have been no recent coups it is reported the local nonmilitary situation has continually deteriorated.

Two articles appeared in this morning's Washington Post, written by two of that paper's skilled and experienced foreign service reporters, on the spot in Saigon, under a joint headline: "Vietnamese Skeptical of Pledges; Economic Situation Is Worsening." They deserve universal and careful reading. Some may say these analyses are frightening, and they are. But they are also realistic, and we must be realists in the approach we make to our Vietnam involvement.

Our own Great Society is starting to build upon a stable, steady base of growing prosperity over the past 5 years, prosperity which is unprecedented. We are not trying to overlay it on a society shot through and through with inefficiency, corruption, and apathy toward the central government. We are doing it by our own efforts, from the inside, not by a largess stultifying to initiative and involvement imposed from the outside.

But here are some of the conditions reported by the Post reporters.

First, they say that South Vietnam has not as yet established any effective poli-

cics of its own to fight the war on the homefront. Writes Ward Just:

There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of import policy, very little control over hoarding.

Yet we, who are talking of taking on what amounts to the major responsibility for South Vietnam's domestic economy as well as for its war, are beginning to think in terms of the rearranging of our own domestic policies, in order that we may shoulder this tremendous and dubious burden. We are told that we are threatened with inflation, and we are rightly concerned by the possibility that the economy of the United States may creep upward in that direction by as much as 2 or 3 percent. But there, where the Government is not controlling inflation, and where we are feeding it daily with our massive injections of funds, prices rose 10 percent last month alone, and nearly 50 percent in the last year. The prediction is that the rise will be another 35 or 40 percent in the next year. This means that by 1967 it will cost us \$2 for each dollar it was costing us a year ago.

Think of it—10 percent in 1 month. Do we have any assurance at all, any commitment, from the Government of General Ky that measures will be taken to halt such terrible economic erosion? And even if we get such assurances, will there be any possibility that they can be carried out?

Second, it is very dubious whether controls will be accepted in South Vietnam. It is quite possible that attempts to achieve them will merely result in bringing down the Government. Far too many people in South Vietnam are caught up in making a good thing of this war. Here is Mr. Just's account:

But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls. While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.

While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binh Dinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.

"There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

Third, they report that the black market is running away, and a major ingredient in that occurrence is the vast amount of cash, of U.S. dollars, with which we are now flooding the country. Black markets mean corruption, and I raise the question, what assurance have we that we will not spread and compound the corruption now existing as we pour into South Vietnam not only the 27 percent of the fiscal 1967 AID budget earmarked for Vietnam, but further sums—much as they may be needed—for education, health, schools, farm development? Says Mr. Just:

It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antique import licensing law.

The report by Mr. Just's colleague, Stanley Karnow, elaborates and points up more clearly what this means:

Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the Government, is said to require a payoff.

Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

We are not without guilt in this situation. It is obvious that we have not required rigorous preconditions of economic controls and reforms from the Saigon government before committing our own funds, without which that government could not exist.

Further, the impact of the "massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total \$600 million in 1966" has aggravated the black market in money and contributed to the runaway inflation. We have evidently not put restrictions on ourselves, have not used the kind of self-restraint which the situation demands. Mr. Karnow, for example, cites the case of the landlady wife of a prominent Vietnamese general who is turning out a Vietnamese civil servant in order to rent her property to an American who is willing to pay \$600 per month. A barmaid, it is reported, can earn more in a day than a longshore worker in a month, more in a year than a Cabinet official on American money tossed her way. Our employment of 100,000 Vietnamese at high rates has further thrown the local economy into dire straits.

A construction program at \$400 million a year is making an impact of \$100 million on the Vietnamese economy. With a total population of 15 million at a generous outside figure, this is equivalent to an impact about equal to that of our own poverty program—\$1.3 billion. Even 10-year-old boys are getting into the act as construction workers.

Finally, there is the very serious matter which Mr. Karnow raises of skepticism in Vietnam over our Great Society program for them:

By and large, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

This skepticism seems to permeate the local view of the Honolulu meeting of President Johnson and Premier Ky, which is seen "as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese Army officer the other day. "They run for awhile, and then you've got to give them another shot."

In what I have said, I am not decrying

our aims and our good intentions. But if it is essential that we move into a Great Society program in Vietnam, it is essential also that we secure the active cooperation and participation of the Saigon Government. It is futile and self-destructive if we go through the pangs of wrenching our own economy into line for these great efforts, at the expense of serious wounds to our own Great Society program, only to have it fail. Failure is inevitable, however, if we do not take into account the total situation and look realistically at the shaky structure and the limited possibilities of the South Vietnam Government to command the wholehearted cooperative support of those now fattening from the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles to which I have referred may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SAIGON BOOM CAUSES PROBLEMS; VIETNAMESE SKEPTICAL OF PLEDGES; ECONOMIC SITUATION IS WORSENING

(By Stanley Karnow)

SAIGON, February 16.—President Johnson's meeting with South Vietnam's leaders in Honolulu last week, followed by visits to Saigon by Vice President HUMPHREY, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and assorted other American dignitaries dramatized the U.S. commitment to South Vietnam.

Now that the fanfare has faded away, however, Vietnamese are feeling somewhat bewildered and more than a little dubious about the administration's dazzling performance. Their opinions vary, of course, according to their social backgrounds.

Predictably, the educated, articulate civil servants, lawyers, schoolteachers, and other "intellectuals" here in the capital seem to take a skeptical view toward Washington's hopes of helping to build a Great Society in Vietnam.

Some of them were comforted to hear HUMPHREY speak of satisfying popular aspirations and rising expectations—a refreshing antidote to much of the military jargon heard here. Many others were pleased to hear, through the local grapevine, that Freeman had intervened to save one of the country's leading agronomists from being drafted into the army.

By and large, however, the promise of new social and economic programs has not aroused discernible enthusiasm, largely because the history of recent years is crowded with unfulfilled plans.

"We've heard it all before," said a prominent trade union leader yesterday. "We are weary of words."

Doubts about the future are reinforced, moreover, by a fairly pervasive lack of faith in the ability of the South Vietnamese Government headed by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

In his speeches and statements, Ky projects an image of himself as an honest, simple soldier dedicated to promoting "social revolution." That image has reportedly captivated the White House, where Ky's statements are said to be on the required reading list.

But to Vietnamese here in Saigon—and to many American officials, too—Ky is far from the hero he is made out to be by his publicists.

The Ky government is stable largely because it is immobile, explain Vietnamese. In fact, they add, it is not really Ky's government but a junta of generals who, for the

sake of their own survival, have tacitly agreed not to disagree—at least for the present.

In the view of Vietnamese here, moreover, the Saigon government hangs together because it is supported by the United States, which would not tolerate another succession of coup d'etats and uprisings such as followed the downfall of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime in November 1963.

ANOTHER MEETING

Thus President Johnson's personal identification with the Saigon leaders in Honolulu last week has been seen here as primarily an American exercise in bulwarking the local government. And it is believed that another Honolulu meeting this summer, as announced by the President, will repeat that exercise.

"It's like doping horses," commented an irreverent young Vietnamese army officer the other day. "They run for awhile and then you've got to give them another shot."

Much of this criticism reflects uneasiness with the degenerating economic situation here. Tremendous infusions of American money have simply unhinged and disrupted the local society to the point at which a bargirl can earn in a day what a longshoreman makes in a month.

Soaring prices have especially affected fixed-income groups—civil servants, army officers, schoolteachers and other professionals—who are the intelligentsia of any underdeveloped country.

TENANT BEING EVICTED

A middle-level civil servant is being evicted from his house this week, for example, because his landlady can find an American tenant willing to pay \$600 per month rent. The landlady, incidentally, is the wife of a prominent Vietnamese general.

Economic disruption is naturally accompanied by corruption, which is regarded here as almost as great an enemy to the country as the Communists. Nearly everything, from construction contracts to the delivery of motor scooters, which are rationed by the government, is said to require a payoff.

Import licenses are being bought and sold, and it is feared that when the U.S. commercial import program is accelerated—in order to absorb the surplus currency in circulation—the traffic in licenses will boom.

Characteristically, most of the critics of conditions here can offer little in the way of constructive suggestions for handling the situation more effectively. It can be recalled that several of those in positions of authority today were themselves last year's critics, fulminating against the regime then in office and vowing to perform honestly and efficiently if they took power.

FEAR OF ABANDONMENT

Underlying this every-man-for-himself approach, however, is perhaps the one feeling that touches nearly every Vietnamese. It is a fear of being abandoned, forgotten, sold out.

Over the past generation, Vietnamese hopes were buoyed up and then betrayed by the French, the Japanese, the Communists and by successive Saigon leaders.

Despite the gallant words uttered at Honolulu, the Vietnamese are not at all sure how much trust they can place in the United States—which in turn prompts some Americans here to wonder how much trust can be placed in the Vietnamese.

(By Ward Just)

SAIGON, February 16.—Saigon's economic situation, serious for the past year, is becoming critical, and diplomatic sources rate it as second only to the Vietcong as "the most important political problem we have."

According to government figures released yesterday, prices rose 10 percent last month over December and nearly 50 percent over the year 1965. There is an acute shortage of

skilled labor, imports, and consumer goods. A flourishing black market and official corruption add to the difficulties.

Overhanging all is the massive infusion of U.S. funds, estimated to total \$600 million in 1966.

The problem is shot through with paradox. Vietnam, a country at war, has a booming economy—but, informed economists say, it is an almost classic example of a sellers' market run riot.

U.S. officials have made it clear to the government that they regard the situation with the utmost seriousness, and President Johnson himself reportedly told Premier Nguyen Cao Ky at the Honolulu conference last week that even if the military struggle is won, the gain would go up in smoke if the economic situation deteriorates further.

The government, preoccupied with the war and lacking the competence to deal with economic complexities, has not been quick to confront the crisis.

The black market, in money and in goods, has swollen. There is no incomes policy, no price policy, only the bare beginnings of an import policy, very little control over hoarding.

One key suggestion has been to increase taxes on "the winners" here—bar owners, landlords, hotel keepers.

What the boom has done is throw the economy out of proportion, creating an economic problem first, but bringing social and political problems along with it.

This is a country where a bar girl can make more than a Cabinet minister, where a cyclo driver in Saigon can make a killing a day if he caters to the Americans, where the labor shortage is so acute that the gigantic U.S. construction company, RMK, recently pirated a Vietnamese driver employed by the U.S. Embassy.

Not all these effects are bad. The boom has tended to get money into the hands of the urban poor, where it is most needed (as well as into the hands of the Chinese businessmen, where it is not). Farm income rose by an estimated 25 percent last year.

But the pressure has been on prices: Milk, rice, and cloth have all gone up dramatically. Pork has risen, by one estimate, 200 percent in a year.

Many of the goods people want can be produced locally, but because of the war effort it is practically impossible to increase production. The United States employs 100,000 Vietnamese, for example.

MORE CONSUMER GOODS

It is understood that the United States itself will undertake to increase imports of consumer goods like radios, bikes, and television sets. But complicating that problem is an antic import licensing law and the difficulty of moving goods into Vietnamese ports.

Officials here are frantically trying to open up the port of Saigon (where turn-around time for a vessel is frequently 2 to 3 weeks) to imports, to turn the sellers' market into a buyers' market. But the heavy importation of military hardware makes it a difficult task, despite the improvements to the harbors of Danang and Quihon and the Brobdignagian effort at Camranh Bay.

Rippling beneath the surface is the government's refusal—or inability—to do anything about the black money market, to which many prices are tied. The official rate is 73 piastres to the dollar. The black market rate was 135 piastres to the dollar in August and 170 last week.

Sources here say that the gigantic U.S. construction effort must also be cut back. The U.S. investment in construction is now estimated at \$400 million a year, \$100 million of which has a direct effect on the economy.

AIRPORTS BEING BUILT

The United States is building everything from airports to billets, with a resulting

pressure on iron, steel, and cement. As one example of the social and political implications, 10-year-old boys are becoming construction workers.

The best that can be hoped for this year, economists say, is that the inflation rate will be held to 35 or 40 percent.

Experts say that by the adroit use of a fiscal and monetary policy, a savings-bond campaign, for example, and a conscious effort at belt-tightening, the crisis might be averted.

But there is no enthusiasm for the war in this dazed and weary country, and the population is in no mood to accept stiff controls.

While ARVN privates die in the swamps of Haunghia Province, well-off Vietnamese sun themselves at the swimming pool at the Cercle Sportif.

While Americans struggle through the rice fields of Binh Dinh, landlords refuse to sell land to the U.S. Government on which to build tent cities to relieve the acute housing shortage in Saigon.

"There is no patriotism here," said one official. "I am not being negative. I am being realistic."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, yesterday was a day of remembrance for Lithuanians around the world. On February 16, 1918, this small but heroic country located on the rim of the Baltic Sea declared its independence from the great Russian State. But the taste of freedom was short-lived for during the chaotic turmoil of World War II, this Baltic nation was absorbed into the vast Soviet empire. Since that time the Lithuanians have experienced the cold, driving demands of Communist control. Independent Lithuanian organizations around the world, however, have tried to keep alive the fire of freedom and independence which burned so brightly during the 1920's and 1930's.

And the spirit of the Lithuanian people has not been dominated. For several years following World War II, a courageous Lithuanian freedom army actively resisted Soviet authorities. Today, Lithuanians everywhere look to a time when their people will be once more able to follow their daily pursuits in freedom. Thus Lithuanian Independence Day has become an occasion not only for anguished remembrance but also for renewed hope. The people of this country share the ideals of the people of Lithuania. It is only appropriate that now and throughout the year we recall and record our admiration for the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL MILITARY AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2791.

The Senate resumed 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. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

WE MUST START FROM WHERE WE ARE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on yesterday, following the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I made a few remarks on the pending bill, with reference to the money figures in it.

This is an authorization bill, but it is certainly a money bill, and almost the same as an appropriation bill. In a few days after this bill passes, we shall have an appropriation bill before us.

I point out, in addition to the points I made about the money yesterday, that a substantial part—at least 30 percent, perhaps—of the funds provided in this bill has actually already been spent because of the war in Vietnam. At least that much will be used, after we appropriate it, to replace the funds that have been used during the first, second, and third quarters of the current fiscal year, expenditures that have been made as part of the expenses of that war. The money provided by this bill will replace those funds for the fourth quarter.

There is nothing illegal about that. It was authorized by the bill. However, the fact that it was necessary is one of the main reasons why I called attention last year, when we were considering the bill, and I was handling it at that time, to the fact that the Defense Department should have requested more money than was being requested at that time.

At that time only \$1,700 million was expressly earmarked for southeast Asia. It was generally known that it would require much more money than that. It has taken money out of the "hide" of the military budget. As I have said, we are spending fourth quarter money because we are running out of items for the first, second, and third quarter. This money will be used to replace the money that has been used for that purpose.

February 28 is about the critical date when these funds should be available to keep the accounts in the Defense Department from being embarrassed.

Mr. President, I wish to give a special title to the remarks I shall make today on the bill as a whole and the questions involved. That title is that we must start from where we are with reference to the war in Vietnam. This question is not one of how we got there. That question has long since passed. We have been in Vietnam since 1954. The question is not why we went over there. We can argue that question endlessly.

It may be relevant, but it is not in issue now, because we have been there all this time. So the title of my remarks is, "We Must Start From Where We Are."

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that I shall not vote for any amendment to the bill, unless error should be shown in the figures, even though such amendment may sustain my policy views on the question of the war and what should be done about it. I would certainly vote against any that was drawn to endorse an opposing policy. Such a proposal or argument can be made later, in a proper manner. The real point is that our men are fighting, bleeding, and dying. The war goes on. The ships, planes, carriers, and everything else must move. The money must be appropriated for those purposes. Our men must have more than they need; not the minimum of what they may need.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to be associated with the fine patriotic sentiments which have been expressed so well by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has for years handled the military construction authorization bill, and for 1 or 2 years handled the total appropriation bill.

This bill provides an authorization for war material, where needed, by those who are committed to the war. As the Senator has said, this is not the time for an argument about how we got there or why we got there, or to put in this particular bill policy statements. I assure him that I share those sentiments, and I shall so vote.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his remarks and for his solid support, which is always forthcoming. He is a member of our appropriations subcommittee, and is unusually well informed. I repeat, we must start from where we are.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support S. 2791 and the \$4.8 billion of supplemental military authorizations for southeast Asia which it provides. Senators may recall that during consideration of the southeast Asia \$1.7 billion addendum to the fiscal year 1966 military budget last August, I predicted that a much greater amount would be requested of the Congress in January. It was clear to me then that the appropriations requested were entirely inadequate to fund our expanding operations in Vietnam.

No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifice of valuable American lives. I have supported and will continue to support every constructive effort seeking an honorable solution to this tragic problem and an honorable end to our involvement. Bringing this tragic war to an honorable conclusion is the first order of business with me and should be the first order of business with all patriotic and thoughtful Americans.

That means to me that this takes a high and top priority over any domestic program; both the old ones and the new

ones, call them Great Society or whatever they may be called.

The first order of business of Congress is to try to bring this war to an honorable conclusion with the least possible loss of life and expenditure of funds.

The American people, both in and out of the Congress, are rightfully concerned about our involvement in South Vietnam and about its implications for the future. They want to know and are entitled to know just what our policy is and where we are headed.

This is as it should be.

That is why I believe these bills should be considered now on a first priority basis.

However, divisive criticism which gives to the world and our troops in the field the impression the United States is a divided Nation working at cross purposes and lacking in unity is an entirely different question. This serves to reinforce the belief of the Asiatic Communists that we are lacking in national purpose, determination, and moral strength, and lowers the morale of our troops in the field.

There are those who insist that we should undertake meaningful negotiations at the conference table to bring this war to an end. They overlook the very clear fact that we have made every effort to achieve this result and that the recent unprecedented diplomatic effort to open the door to negotiations was unproductive.

There are those who say that the entire matter should be turned over to the United Nations to work out a just settlement. We have now gone to the United Nations with this problem and there appears to be no evidence that the United Nations is capable of achieving any significant or dramatic results.

There are those who insist that we limit the war as much as possible and make every effort to avoid a wider war. This has been our policy and purpose. No right thinking person in America desires an escalation of this war or the loss of American lives. However, we have been compelled to meet aggressive force with the force which is necessary to contain and repel it. To do otherwise would put victory in doubt and raise the possibility that we might be driven into the sea. At best, it would mean a long and bloody stalemate of 10 to 15 years or more, which, in the long run, would be the most costly in blood and money.

Mr. President, that is a very substantial point in my mind. I hope that we are not at the point where we must engage in a long and bloody stalemate year after year. This has been the policy of other nations in Asia in decades past but it certainly must not become our policy.

I do not believe the American people wish to approach it in that way. I do not believe that they would endorse such a policy.

Debate, of course, is useful and should not be curtailed. I do believe, however, that in this difficult time debate should be helpful, constructive, and positive, rather than negative and divisive. We had a very good debate here yesterday afternoon. However, in all of the recent debate and criticism, so far as I can see,

there has not been presented any suggestion or recommendation which offers a feasible, desirable, and effective alternative to the course that we have followed recently and propose to follow in the future.

Although I opposed our original involvement in South Vietnam, one reason being that I believed it to be unwise for us to undertake this commitment alone, I believe it is now too late for disagreement as to whether we should be in South Vietnam. The time has come for Americans everywhere to close ranks and give both the President and our fightingmen in the field the support and backing they need and deserve.

When I say that I opposed our original commitment in South Vietnam, I mean that I opposed it on the floor of the Senate in three Senate debates. I am not bringing that up to say, "I told you so." I do not feel that way about it. I mention that only to show that I am not a fanatic on this subject. I am not war-minded. My position is based on the fact that we are already there. We have to make the best of it and have honorable terms before we leave.

Just as I supported the recent peace offensive and the efforts to open a door to the conference table, so do I support the decision to stand firm in the face of aggression and to meet aggressive military force with the necessary military might of our own.

I think that the pause or lull in the air war against North Vietnam lasted too long, but I am sure that those who made the decisions were doing their best under the circumstances.

The world should know that we are not the aggressors. We are not there for business reasons, territorial reasons, colonialism, or any other reason except our originally announced purpose.

The entire history of the Communist movement should teach us that we are more likely to achieve a just and honorable peace in South Vietnam through strength rather than weakness. The Communists have drawn the line in South Vietnam and have determined to make this war a test of our power and our strength of national purpose and determination.

That is a distinct and major fact. I believe that it has been going on so long—and they have been successful in comparative terms—that they have decided now to make this a test to see how long they can bleed us and how much it can cost us in manpower, money, delay, and everything else.

I doubt very seriously that they will be convinced of the folly of their course and be impelled to the conference table unless and until they come face to face with either the prospect or the actuality of military defeat.

We know what they are going to do if we weaken and if we pull out. We know what they are going to do. They will move in. My real surprise is that they have not already moved into other areas of Asia.

For the same reasons I support what I know was a painful and agonizing decision to resume the air war against North Vietnam. I recognize, of course,

that air strikes alone cannot and will not completely stop the flow of supplies from the north to the south. However, they will unquestionably slow down and hamper the movement of men and material and, therefore, the resumption and continuance of the bombing in North Vietnam is essential to give maximum support and assistance to our fighting men in South Vietnam and thereby to reduce the number of American casualties.

I reiterate my desire for a just and honorable peace through diplomatic channels. However, if this is impossible, as it appears to be at this time, it is imperative that we be prepared with all necessary military equipment, supplies, ammunition, material, and manpower which are necessary to enable our fighting men in the field to perform their missions with maximum efficiency. It is vital and essential that there be no shortages of the tools and sinews of war.

As I said when the battle started, the only way to insure having enough is to have too much.

To insure that there will be no such shortages is the purpose of the bill which we are now considering and the supplemental appropriation bill which is now in committee. The passage of these bills is indispensable to our military posture and preparedness. Their passage by a unanimous or near unanimous vote will give needed assurance to the troops in the field that we are standing solidly and four-square behind them.

Bringing an end to the war and stopping the bloodshed is the first order of business with me, and it should be the first order of business with Congress and all loyal Americans. If this cannot be accomplished through diplomatic channels, then we must be prepared to face up to the situation and take other necessary steps. First and foremost, we must make a national decision that it is our purpose to win.

I have never talked about a so-called no-win policy. I did not suggest that such a policy existed during the Korean war, and I do not suggest it now. I do not accuse anyone of having a no-win policy. But I know that we have already drifted dangerously near to a situation which could be so interpreted. If we cannot do this, we must either turn tail and withdraw or resign ourselves to the prospect of a long and unhappy stalemate which will be costly both in blood, money, and national resources.

This means—assuming that an honorable negotiated peace is impossible—that we must be prepared, if necessary, to increase our combat troops so as to be able to take the war effectively to the Vietcong and their allies and to beat them on the field of battle. We must and should be prepared to fight to win and not just to keep from losing. We cannot achieve our objectives if we are content to fight only what amounts to a holding action in South Vietnam.

As everyone knows, I am not a military man and have no expert military judgment; but I cannot help believing that when we are really ready to strike and carry out a policy of action in the field, tremendous results will be achieved, and fairly rapidly. I could be mistaken, but

I believe that this will make a tremendous difference.

In short, we must be ready, willing, and able to hit the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese as hard, and as often, and wherever necessary from a military standpoint to make them realize that our purpose is to win if we are compelled to continue to fight, and that we will not be content only to defend our positions in the south.

We should face up to the hard realities of the situation. The present indications give no cause for optimism that the way ahead will be easy or that there will be a quick and easy solution to the problem. The war and demands associated with it will directly affect the lives of the American people in many ways and will demand many and increasing sacrifices.

I have slept with this problem, particularly for the past 2 years. While the Subcommittee on Preparedness was looking into the question of the readiness of the Armed Forces and making many kindred and related inquiries, many members of the committee and of our staff visited Vietnam, although I myself have not been there. However, I have heard the sworn testimony of a great number of men who have been there, on the actual field of battle, at the time when we were led to believe, more or less, that our men were not taking any part in the fighting, unless they happened to be shot at.

Many of the young men in the service who returned told us, under oath, the extent to which they had been engaged in battle. We received briefings about the various development there, although most of it was classified.

So these are not conclusions that I jumped to as a result of reading articles in the newspapers. I have lived with this subject to that extent, and even before that I was interested in it. I visited the wounded men as they returned to hospitals in the United States. I visited many of them at Walter Reed Hospital, where many of the more difficult cases were sent. I have visited them in Honolulu and at other places as they arrived from the battlefields.

With the increase in military forces there will come a further and added increase in draft calls.

At least a partial callup of National Guardsmen and Reservists is probable, particularly of units with specialized skills.

We will be required to appropriate increasing amounts of money to support our military operations in Vietnam and to maintain our other forces around the world at a high level of combat readiness.

If the war continues, increased taxes in large proportions are certain.

We may ultimately be forced to a choice between guns and butter. This might entail economic controls and rationing of goods and materials and at least a partial disruption of normal business operations.

I am not predicting that these events are just around the corner, or 30, 90, or 60 days or 6 months away; but if we have to continue our action and go deep-

er and deeper, we shall certainly be confronted with the problem of controls.

Tragically, the toll of American casualties will go even higher, and additional thousands of American fighting men may be called upon to lay down their lives in defense of their country and the cause of freedom.

After soul-searching and conscientious analysis of the entire situation and its implications for our future, I have come to the conclusion that the one course that we should and must follow is that of bringing sufficient military might to bear to force our Communist enemies to the conference table or, failing that, to defeat them on the field of battle. Only this alternative, in my judgment, offers us a chance to peace with honor. I believe that the sooner we undertake this and get about doing the job, the less will be the cost in lives, time, and money.

Where I have used the term "war" in this speech, I have done so advisedly. We all know that we have been carrying a major part of fighting the bloody war in South Vietnam for many months. That does not discredit in the least the South Vietnamese soldier. Under our training and with our equipment—and they themselves have many good officers—they have developed into excellent soldiers. But the push, the aggressiveness, and the offensive part of the battle, and much of the manpower, of course, is provided by the United States. We are having to carry a great part of the load.

We have put our men and our flag on the field of battle and both have been fired upon. We now have more than 200,000 fightingmen actually deployed in South Vietnam and many thousands more directly support them in southeast Asia. When I say "many thousands more," I mean perhaps 40,000 or 50,000 more, at the very least; including our naval forces and carriers and more members of the Air Force, in addition to the 200,000 who are on the mainland of Vietnam itself. More than 2,000 young Americans have already been called upon to make the final and greatest sacrifice for their country.

I am making this enumeration to place before the people what I believe will be the cost of this policy; but I believe it is necessary, and the quicker we face it, the better.

Our commitment in South Vietnam is constantly growing in terms of men, material and money. Barring a completely unexpected and unforeseen development, it will grow even more before we reach the end of the road.

Informed sources tell me—and they are speculating—that we may very well have 350,000 to 400,000 troops in the field before the end of this year. Those are not my figures. I do not know; those who tell me do not know either. But informed sources give this as their speculative judgment.

Let me give one further word of warning before I conclude. Today, we very properly concentrate our attention on southeast Asia. However, in so doing we must not overlook the very real possibility that our Communist enemies may undertake additional adventure and ag-

gressions at other places around the world where our vital interests are involved. Therefore, we must be certain that we do not let the drain which Vietnam imposes upon our manpower, material and resources impair the readiness of our remaining forces to meet aggression at other potential hotspots around the world. We must spend the necessary money to supply the shortages which the requirements of Vietnam have created.

We must face the fact that until recently we have been trying to operate on a peacetime budget in fighting what was a very expensive and growing war exactly halfway around the world.

Some of the funds involved in the pending bill will be used to replenish the materiel, the military hardware, and like supplies which have been burned up and used up from the regular resources of our armed services. We must procure the necessary arms and equipment supplies, and ammunition. We must recruit and train the necessary manpower.

Our manpower has been drained from other units in order to meet the demands of the situation in Vietnam.

We must not be found wanting or be unready to respond to aggression in other areas in which our vital interests are involved, if it should occur.

I do not believe I am an alarmist, but if we should let this war drag on, on just a holding basis, and fight it as a kind of diplomatic war, I believe we would be inviting smaller wars to break out by this or another aggressor, in one form or another, in other places.

The only reason why they have not broken out in other places, such as in Central and South America, is that there is our growing power.

I close this statement by paying a special tribute to our brave men who fight and sometimes die in Vietnam. They are doing a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances. They fight for the cause of freedom with the same high morale, courage, valor, and skill which have distinguished the American soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in all past battles and wars of our history.

I believe it has already been demonstrated that we have sent much of the cream of the manpower crop to Vietnam. That is not to speak disparagingly of any man who has not been sent there. However, the corporals, sergeants, and specialists in certain fields are among the best men in our military forces. We have also sent our best lieutenants, captains, and majors, and right up the line in rank. That is true of our Army, our Naval Forces, of the Marine Corps, and of the Air Force.

These men prove again that a properly motivated American is the finest fighting man the world has ever known. They deserve the gratitude and unstinting support of all Americans and freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Let us pass this bill with dispatch. Debate and discussion are a part of our system of government. But with men fighting, bleeding, and even dying on the battlefields, it is time to act in voting funds to insure the equipment, the sup-

plies, the military hardware, and other tools of war necessary to enable them to carry out their missions, protect themselves, and insure a positive victory.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi upon the very able address he has just delivered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi is familiar with every aspect of this matter, particularly the military one, in view of the fact that he presides over the very important Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I well remember that when the question first arose of sending men to Vietnam, it was proposed that we send some 200 men to assist the French to prepare and maintain and keep in the air the planes that the French had in Vietnam. Most of the planes there were American planes. I believe we gave the French approximately \$3 billion to support them in their abortive effort to hold on in Vietnam.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is entitled to great praise as a prophet. I remember that the Senator from Mississippi made one or more speeches at that time in opposition to sending men into Vietnam, because of the lack of congressional approval and also because of the geographic disadvantages.

I discussed this subject with the Senator from Mississippi on many occasions in 1954. On one occasion when we had a conference at the highest echelons of the executive branch we were informed of a proposal to send 200 men to Vietnam. I made a serious understatement by predicting, "If we send 200 men there now, it will not be long until we will have 20,000 men there." Today we find that we have closer to 300,000 men in Vietnam, and the waters and lands adjacent thereto. We hardly could have let the Communists euvre us into a more difficult position. It is one of the most difficult and unlikely spots in the world in which to fight a war.

I have had many reasons to think about that position.

In Vietnam there are the valleys of the Mekong and the highlands of the north. As a rule, we associate malaria with the lowlands, but it so happens that in Vietnam malaria is found in the highlands. The malaria found there is of a type for which we now have no completely satisfactory medications.

I have almost concluded that perhaps the only other area of the world in which it would be more difficult to engage in a war would be Afghanistan or in the mountains of Tibet. It would be more difficult to get to those areas, and there would also be the matter of logistics.

I am particularly impressed by the cogent reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi that, if this war were not

going on in Vietnam, we might have a military confrontation somewhere else.

The Communist world has never deviated from its purpose, its drive, and its determination to achieve world domination. It will be probing everywhere on earth for weak spots. If the Communists are unable to find weak spots in Asia or in Europe, they will then come to this hemisphere, and we shall have rash of wars of national liberation or wars of some other nomenclature, and we shall have some slogan other than the one now being used in Vietnam.

I am glad that from his knowledge of military affairs the Senator has pointed out that we are spread rather thin all over the world today.

We have highly trained and well-equipped forces in Germany and Korea. A part of the force we had held in reserve in the continental United States has had to be moved to Vietnam and to the Dominican Republic.

Ours is a rather farflung battleline, Mr. President, when we consider the widely separated areas where our troops are stationed. It certainly behooves us to be more insistent than ever before that our allies, for whom we have done so much, make a larger contribution to the defense of freedom throughout the world.

There is no parallel in all human history to what this country did at the end of World War II. We not only bound up the wounds and rebuilt the edifices and the homes of our allies; we went to those with whom we had been only recently engaged in mortal combat, the Germans and the Japanese, and expended billions of dollars to revive their economies and enable them to stand on their own feet again.

Countries like these, which have received benefits that are without parallel in all of history, should be willing to make a larger military contribution to preserving the cause of peace.

We shall not have complete peace in this troubled world any time soon, but we can at least contain this Communist problem. Would that we had cleaned up Cuba of Castro and the Communists there at the time we discovered that missiles had been placed in Cuba. As Senators will recall, we had passed a joint resolution, approved by the President of the United States, which said in essence that any offensive weapon in Cuba would be considered an act of aggression against the United States.

We had the means to destroy the enemy in Cuba, and to eliminate Castro and communism. We had marines at sea, just out of sight of land. We had the necessary air support at bases in Florida. We had moved an armored division from Fort Hood, Tex., to Camp Stewart, Ga., ready to load on ships so that it could follow the marines in.

But we settled for something less than that; and it may well develop in the future that we settled for a great deal less. The Russians did not comply with the original assurances they gave President Kennedy when he wrote them that famous message demanding that they pull out of Cuba and give us the right to inspect, to see that they had removed those

weapons. That was a right that was promised us; but was later denied and refused.

We shall continue to be troubled, as the Senator from Mississippi has so well indicated, by the threat of communism. I think we can handle it better than it has been handled, in many instances. We can achieve more of our objectives by methods other than engagement of armed forces and the loss of blood that is occurring this very moment in Vietnam. But there will be no time, I fear, in my life, or even in the life of my friend from Mississippi—who is much younger and stronger than I—when the threat of Communist aggression will be absolutely allayed and destroyed all over the world. We shall be compelled to bear a heavy burden to maintain a force for freedom—which is an insurance policy. The huge amount that we spend is the premium on the insurance policy which insures the most valuable thing on earth: the American way of life, and the individual rights, liberties, and dignities of the citizen in this land of ours.

I feel better when men who are as dedicated as the Senator from Mississippi are willing to apply themselves to this very onerous task.

Senators who have not served on the Preparedness Subcommittee can hardly imagine the extent of the efforts by that subcommittee on the Senate Armed Services Committee, in our attempts to keep America strong. Despite the very best we can do, and despite the most efficient administration of the Department of Defense, there will be some oversights; there will be something lacking. The Senator from Mississippi, as chairman of that subcommittee, has done a fine job in pointing out such deficiencies and correcting them. He stands here today making his statement in the great tradition of American freedom and American statesmanship, and I commend him for his remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for his most generous remarks. In all the years I have been in the Senate, the wise counsel of the Senator from Georgia and his advice on military matters and other matters has been of great value. He has always been up at the front where the decisions were made. I think he has given as little consideration to himself personally, in his advice and counsel, as any person I have ever known.

I remember the occasion in 1954 when the Senator from Georgia helped turn the balance against a proposal that would have gone a great deal further than the involvement of 200 Air Force mechanics in Vietnam. I remember well how President Eisenhower sent for him time and again. He and the present President of the United States were both opposed to our involvement in the situation as it stood then.

I am delighted to have been associated with the Senator from Georgia in the matters to which he has referred. He taught me all I know on the subject; and I thank him for that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, to the Senator's very generous observations, I wish only to add that when

someone brings forward some alternative to the present program, some proposal of a method for our disengaging ourselves in Vietnam in an honorable fashion, without turning tail and running like a whipped puppy, I shall be happy to support such a proposal, because I deplore what is going on in Vietnam today, with the loss of human lives, as much as anyone possibly can. In the absence of such an honorable solution, I have no alternative to supporting the President.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad that the Senator from Georgia referred to our stretched-out position. He is as qualified to speak as any living person on the subject of our extended efforts all around the world, and how the time of peril and trouble in which we are living will continue for awhile.

I am sure that in his references to our allies, the Senator does not wish to discredit any of them. I know he is not quick to "pop off," if I may use that term, on such matters. But what he says is very timely and very true. Our allies have, in effect, turned their backs upon us in this distressing situation. Many of them, for whom we have done so much, could help with manpower; and even those who could not help us with manpower could stand up for us in the diplomatic circles of the world, take our side, and let it be known that this is a matter of first priority with them. Instead of that, some of them are actively opposed to our position.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for clarifying many of the issues involved in this bill.

I marched with the 1st Army, in the 9th Infantry Division. I served under General Westmoreland, who was then a lieutenant colonel, my regimental commander. I have great confidence in him. I have watched his career since that time as an artilleryman, as an infantryman, as the superintendent of West Point, and as a paratroop officer. In my judgment he is the finest commander in the American Army. He has one of the hardest jobs that any American general ever faced. I feel that, even as I had confidence in him when I marched with the 9th Division, the men who are fighting under him in Vietnam today have confidence in him.

The point that the Senator from Mississippi has made is that we must give to him, his staff, his junior officers, his noncommissioned officers, and every man who is serving in Vietnam, as well as every one of the Vietnamese and every one of our allies, all the materials of war that they need. If they need a missile, if they need a helicopter, if they need additional artillery, if they need more ammunition, we must give it to them; and that is what the pending bill would do.

As was pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], this bill does not determine foreign policy. It does not ratify decisions made in the past. It does not endorse new commitments. It merely provides that whatever we do, we are going to give our boys who have volunteered out of a sense of patriotism, as well as boys who went into the Army as a result of the Selective

Service System and were compelled to go over there, the fullest kind of support, the kind of weapons, the kind of tanks, and the kind of materiel which they need.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill wholeheartedly because I feel that we are committed to a war that is one of the most difficult ever to be fought, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia. We must wholeheartedly support every one of the soldiers whom we have sent over there. That is what this bill would do. If we are to debate policy on Vietnam, if we are to debate what we are to do in Vietnam, let us debate it on the kind of issue which does not mean denying our troops over there, or General Westmoreland and his fine staff, the kind of support which they need.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for his fine remarks.

I yield now to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed with respect to the character of service and leadership provided, and the wisdom exemplified by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I recall that as a junior Senator I, along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and other Senators, awaited the return of the Senator from Georgia and the then Democratic leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson, from a conference which was called at the White House prior to the tragedy of Dienbienphu for the French.

I believe that I correctly recall the report we received from the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and perhaps others, urging President Eisenhower to send American troops to Vietnam to assist the French.

I recall that upon the return of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas, we were advised that they had strongly advised against it. I do not believe that we got the report from them as to what President Eisenhower's decision was, but later the President followed that advice.

I recall one further point, that when the question of the 200 men to whom the Senator from Mississippi had made reference—the first American military men sent there—was under consideration, the Senator from Georgia advised that if we sent 200 men, they would be followed by 200,000. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether that statement is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator gives me too much credit. I believe I said that if we sent 200 troops over there, 20,000 would have to follow in the very near future. I believe that was my prediction at that time.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps that is typical of the creeping escalation we have experienced on this issue, but 20,000 still makes the point. The case of the military forces was the event from which have flowed many other problems. I invite the attention of the Senate to this point, because of the pertinent remarks which the junior Senator from Mississippi has made.

I wish to say to him that I am grateful for the candor which he has displayed on this bill. Not from his lips have come denunciation of Senators who have questions in their minds, who are troubled by the vexatious predicament in which we find ourselves. Instead, the Senator from Mississippi has invited debate.

It seems to me that our aim must be to contribute to the formulation of policy for the enlightenment of the people with respect to that policy in a manner which will bring unity to the people, which is so badly needed.

As the war has been widened, the gap between the President and Congress seems also to have widened. Unrest among the people has increased.

This morning, I thought that General Taylor did an excellent job in presenting to the Committee on Foreign Relations the administration's policy in this regard.

There are many questions left to be asked, of course. But, if, out of all this debate and an examination of policy can come enlightenment of the people and Congress, and perhaps a modification of policy on the part of the administration and some limitations of objectives which the people can understand and support, then perhaps we shall have achieved a degree of unity which I believe is badly needed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his very fine comments.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. First, let me congratulate both the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee for their great wisdom—when the issue of first invading Vietnam militarily by our forces came up—in opposing it, and for saying that it would be unwise policy, that it would lead to a much deeper involvement than appeared to be contemplated at that time, and that they joined in their counsels to the President and others in opposing this involvement.

I believe that their wisdom was prophetic and very great. It is to be regretted that their wisdom at that time did not prevail, because I believe we might have put across the thought which would have prevented many things which have happened since that time and which are leading us down a tragic path, the end of which no one can foresee.

I find myself in thorough agreement with some of the very fine sentiments which the Senator from Mississippi has expressed, and which the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has also expressed, when he said a few moments ago that he would join in supporting any solution which would give us an honorable way out and stop the needless slaughter, not only of our own boys but also of all others. I know of no Member of Congress who would not share that view. Although there may be differences of opinion as to how that way should be found, no one in Congress and no one in the United States would dissent from that statement, and I applaud it most heartily.

The Senator from Mississippi says:

No one has a greater or more sincere desire than I for halting the war in Vietnam and ending the sacrifices of American lives.

I applaud that sentiment, and I share it. I believe that we must all work together to that end, although some of us may differ in details, and some of us will differ on the future.

It is extremely important and fortunate that this debate has at last come to pass. Out of the discussions more wisdom may emerge, and we may be able to arrive at a better solution than that which we are now embarked upon.

We do not know where this debate is going to lead, but certainly we shall find agreement on the desire to find an honorable way out of the situation at the earliest possible moment. I support that view 100 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alaska very much.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

Mr. MCGEE. Let me add my voice to those of my colleagues in commending the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the Senator from Georgia for the hard, bedrock stand which they have taken on this difficult question. What we tend to do, sometimes, is to reduce the question to overly simple terms, as though we had decided we were going to risk a war or live in peace, when that really is not the alternative which faces this country. We are living in a troubled world in which almost every day the risk of war is imminent. When the Senator titles his comments the way he did, he puts his finger on the nub of the question; namely, that we have to begin where we are at present.

It is water over the dam. We cannot do it over. History does not afford us the luxury of waiting 5 years before we make up our minds. We have to decide these issues now. When the Senator reminds us that here is a beginning, here is where we must start, he is rendering a great service to the dialog.

I should like to refer to the suggestions that have repeatedly occurred here on the part of my colleagues about our having to carry a disproportionate share of the burden in South Vietnam. I think occasionally we forget that a great power is not usually loved, and we sometimes tend to think, in affairs around the world, that we can put love on a priority. We have to put necessity, our own needs, the need to rise to our commitments and the demands of those commitments, on a priority. If someone will love us in the process, that is merely a fringe benefit.

Nobody loved the British when they kept the peace of the world for almost 100 years. In fact, the perfidious Albion was the object of much attack. So we must not judge of our actions on whether or not we shall be loved for them. We may hope that those we help will be grateful, but we may also be kicked in the face for our efforts.

We must keep the situation in perspective as to what is happening in various parts of the world.

The French and the British are committed in other areas of the world. Ger-

many is committed in other areas of the world. The presence of the British, for example, around Singapore has had a stabilizing effect in the local disturbances that have taken place there.

The presence of French, German, and British troops in Western Europe means that this country can have a smaller complement of American troops there. The fact that hundreds of thousands of Korean troops are in Korea below the 38th parallel means that we have a much smaller commitment in that part of the world. We must also remember the fact that there are some 25,000 Korean troops in South Vietnam. It was announced the other day that Korea is sending 20,000 additional troops.

People tend to focus their eyes where our country is committed, and block out of view the fact that there are parts of the world where the French and the British are involved in commitments which have not involved a single member of our military forces.

The world being round and being smaller as a result of the modern genius of science, it behooves us to take cognizance of this kind of help. So we should recognize that there are numbers of Koreans and some Australians and New Zealanders in South Vietnam. The hard fact remains that we are there not in a club of friendship or in order to have group companionship. We are there because we have to be there. The times demand that we be there. We must assess our presence and its costs in those terms. When we do that, we should not go off on a tangent or an irrelevant issue as to whether we are getting sufficient help from our allies, and whether our allies are doing as much as they should. I do not believe that should be the criterion in determining what we should do.

The Senator from Mississippi was correct when he said that our commitment is there; we have to take it from there. We should not penalize ourselves, no matter what our feelings may be about other countries or what they are doing in other parts of the world.

I did not want the dialog to close without the reminder that there are commitments of other troops in the world. The bulk of the commitments are ours, as a result of trying to restore stability in the wake of World War II. And so while we risk a great deal in what we hope will eventually be successful, we must try to achieve it.

I conclude by commending the Senator from Mississippi for his wonderful statement this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. He has made a forceful statement. The point he discusses has merit. I certainly did not mean to ignore the help we have, for example, from the very fine Korean troops. They mean exactly what they say in what they are doing. We have our own divisions on their battleline, as the Senator knows. But outside of the Koreans, there are very few other troops in there with rifles, and we want more. I feel that we deserve more, but I do not wish to pursue the argument further at this point. I am glad the Senator

brought up the point and stated his view on it. He has made a very fine contribution by so doing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the concomitants of our military engagement in southeast Asia is the far-reaching effect it is already having and will continue to have on our domestic programs.

We have already seen the far-reaching cuts in education, in resource development, in housing, in aviation, and in virtually every other field. That is one of the consequences of our involvement that those of us who opposed this involvement from the start foresaw and forecast.

It is to be hoped that the President's indication that we could have both things, that we could both develop the domestic programs, the programs at home, many of them overdue, and continue to conduct the war, may be fulfilled.

But the actions taken to date indicate that the actions are not always in accord with the hopeful words.

It seems to me that for economy reasons, if none other, if we are to be strong, if we are to meet our alleged commitments in southeast Asia and other parts of the world—and it was brought out only a few minutes ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in discussing the war, that we are stretched very thin—it is important that we maintain our economy at home and not allow it to be eroded by what is taking place overseas.

An example of one of the many of these cuts came to me this morning in a communication from the capital of my State, Juneau, where the decision of the administration, which Alaskans fervently hope will be reversed, to eliminate substantial funds for public works in the 1967 budget, has demonstrated another example of the bitter fruits resulting from what I, for one, consider the inexcusable folly we have exhibited in choosing to fight an undeclared land war in southeast Asia.

This view has been shared by many eminent military leaders—views now coming into public knowledge—by such leaders as the late and great General MacArthur, General Ridgway, indeed, President Eisenhower, as well as the late President Kennedy.

In my State of Alaska one of the projects that was eliminated from the budget was the so-called Snettisham Dam in southeastern Alaska, to supply power badly needed right now. However, this dam, even if not eliminated by

the action of the Bureau of the Budget, would not have brought that power into use until 1970.

But recently, and before the dam was planned to meet the immediate needs, a vast tract of timber was sold to the St. Regis Paper Co. of New York, to be used in the manufacture of wood pulp. It is the largest timber sale in the history of the Forest Service, a great economic event utilizing a great natural resource which has long been unutilized. It is timber going to waste because it is dying on the stump from old age. It would be exhibiting the most basic principle of conservation by cutting this overripe timber and allowing a regrowth of a much larger quantity of prime forest resources, Sitka spruce and hemlock.

One of the terms of the contract of sale was that the St. Regis Paper Co., of New York, would construct a huge pulp-mill; and one of the prime inducements for the sale of that tract of timber was that power would be provided by the Snettisham Dam, which was programmed for construction at the beginning of this spring. Yet the Snettisham project was not included in this year's budget, although preliminary planning had been completed at a cost of \$1,205,000. In other words, this dam was ready to go; and the Corps of Engineers had informed me that if the excision of this project stands, not only will there be great economic damage to this section and loss of payrolls in an area that needs them, but also that some of the experts, engineers, and planners who have been working there will be lost by being sent to other parts of the world, and their abilities will no longer be available.

What does the Snettisham project mean to southeastern Alaska? In quantitative terms, it means that the construction of the dam and pulpmill would provide upward of 1,100 new jobs. The size of the city of Juneau, the State capital, would approximately double. New State and Federal taxes would amount to \$4,500,000. These estimates do not include increases in employment and revenues by related industries that would be attracted by this new industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Greater Juneau Borough be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

“RESOLUTION 55

“Whereas funds for the Snettisham hydroelectric project were eliminated from the Federal budget for fiscal year 1967; and

“Whereas the decision to eliminate these funds was apparently made before the Juneau timber sale of 8.75 billion board feet of timber by the Forest Service which requires that a pulp mill be established in the sale area to process the timber; and

“Whereas the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is presently at the peak which can be generated by local power sources without the development of additional generation capability; and

“Whereas very substantial normal growth in the demand for power in the Greater Juneau Borough is projected; and

"Whereas the power which Snettisham will provide is particularly needed in order to supply the pulp industry which will develop as a result of the timber sale in addition to being needed to meet the normal growth of power demand; and

"Whereas as a result of representations made to the Bureau of the Budget by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, the Alaska congressional delegation, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has agreed to reconsider the elimination of Snettisham funds from the fiscal 1967 Federal budget; be it

"Resolved, That the assembly of the Greater Juneau Borough urges the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to consider the vital effect that the Snettisham hydroelectric project will have on the economic future of the area both in relation to the Juneau timber sale and to the normal economic growth of the area and to recommend that appropriation be made for this project this year."

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable Charles L. Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Adopted February 2, 1966.

_____, President.
Attest: _____, Clerk.
_____ , Chairman.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the loss in taxes alone should rivet our attention. We should realize that the costly war in southeast Asia is likely to mean, as it already has, a reversal of the widely applauded, sound policy of the administration in reducing excise taxes and income taxes. This already has resulted, in the past few weeks, in proposals for the restoration of taxes which were so cheerfully and hopefully eliminated in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This reduction in taxes was a great achievement, perhaps the greatest achievement in the history of Congress, accomplished with the cooperation of the President and Members of this body and the other body. It was a program that was far reaching, that in many respects was overdue, that covered the entire gamut of our economic and social front, and that did the many things that were sorely needed. It is tragic that now, in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, having marched up the hill, we seem compelled to march down again. This great program of benefit to the American people is being eroded for the benefit of our so-called commitment in southeast Asia, where vast sums, in addition to the military sums which we are being asked to approve now, and which apparently are only a beginning, will be supplemented by vast economic contributions, the end of which we cannot foresee.

The amount required to begin construction of the Sne Hisham Dam this year is not large—somewhere between \$1.5 and \$2.5 million. Surely in a budget calling for the expenditure of more than

\$112 billion, we should be able to find this amount.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alaska care to yield now for a discussion of the point he is raising, or would he prefer to wait until the end of his speech?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Knowing of his interest not merely in a successful conclusion of our engagement in Vietnam, but also of his interest in keeping our economy moving, I am sure that anything that he would say would be pertinent and welcome.

Mr. MCGEE. I share with the Senator from Alaska the strong feeling that we have to keep the well-thought-out domestic programs going. It is my fear that some individuals who opposed those programs are now using Vietnam as an excuse to try to cut those programs back. In the first place, that is hypocrisy; in the second place, it is dangerous to cut the programs back on that score. Even with all the pressures that are upon us throughout the world, we cannot afford to forfeit equally significant efforts at home. I wonder whether the Senator from Alaska agrees with that general observation.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more completely. This is one of the most vital issues now before us. It was foreseeable, but it was still an unpleasant surprise when, at the opening of this session of Congress, we examined the budget and noticed some of the far-reaching and drastic slashes which had been made.

We had been hopeful that the President's declarations that we could both continue the war in southeast Asia and maintain our economy at home would be carried out in the budget; but such is not the case. Some of these matters are just being discussed now.

In addition to the budget cuts, there is the depressing possibility that in some cases in which the amount requested in the budget is appropriated, the appropriation will be withheld from expenditure. This has been done before. I sincerely hope that that will not be the case, and that, although people may differ in their reasons for our becoming involved in southeast Asia and on the future conduct of operations there, whether to escalate or to hold firm, nevertheless we shall continue, certainly for the time being, in this first year of our heavy military commitment, not to let the domestic program erode.

Are we going to penalize the poor? Are we going to diminish the foresightedly conceived and hopefully entered into war on poverty? Are we going to stop vocational training, so that the unemployed may have an opportunity to obtain jobs? Are we going to cut into education, which, with our democracy, is one and inseparable? Are we going to stop research and development? Are we going to make the kind of cuts, which I just mentioned, which actually can be demonstrated to be detrimental in terms of income? We shall need to carry on

our commitments, both at home and abroad.

I welcome the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MCGEE. I believe that much of what is being said about our ability to finance these programs is being said as a ruse to attack programs that were fought by these same people so vigorously at the time they were adopted by this body.

I do not believe that people ought to be fooled by that kind of tactic. The Senator from Alaska knows that he and I disagree on our presence in Vietnam, on why we are there, on the need for being there, and on what our presence there may do to our economy.

We were told these same things 30 years ago and 25 years ago when we were facing the great question of the barter system necessitated by Hitler in Europe and the great inroads being made at that time in the Pacific by Japan. We were told then that we could not afford to involve ourselves in both areas. Fortunately, history did not give us an opportunity to choose. We were forced into both areas at the same time.

One war is being fought now in southeast Asia and another war is being fought here at home. We should not sell ourselves short. We are capable of waging both wars. We must rise to the occasion. It would do us little good if, by our attempt to win peace around the world, we were to forfeit the opportunity for peace and security and a better standard of living at home. I do not believe that we dare to split these challenges as though we are able to choose one in preference to the other. I believe that we must have both.

If I may draw a parallel for a moment, in 1939 and 1940, when Mr. Hitler was reaching his peak, and in late 1941, when Pearl Harbor got us involved, I believe the Senator will recall the many things that were being suggested in those days.

I can recall being involved then in debate in the public schools in which I was teaching on the question of whether we ought to amend our Constitution to limit the national debt of the United States to \$45 billion, because otherwise we would be broke and go down the drain and be lost. This was the argument that was being used to remind us that we could not afford to arm ourselves to slow down Mr. Hitler.

Mr. GRUENING. I recall it very well.

Mr. MCGEE. The upshot was that Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini did listen to the arguments that the American forces could not afford to do anything. The events in Pearl Harbor, the Rhineland, Munich, Hungary, Poland, and Ethiopia, triggered by Hitler and Mussolini, compelled us to go to war.

We then took the wraps off our great economy and discovered to our great shock that we had been operating part time for many years in our economy with at least one hand behind our back.

When the war began, we did things that we had been told we were not capable of doing in terms of economics. We unleashed American capitalism. By the

The President very emphatically urged me not to do it, pleaded with me not to do it; and when I argued that it was important, and that I felt it desirable that the Congress be on record, he said to me, "If we are not out of there by January, you can do anything you please." He indicated that he thought it unlikely that the draftees would be sent to southeast Asia before January.

On the basis of his urgent plea—and it is very difficult to refuse any urgent request of the President of the United States, not merely for a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, but for any member of his party—I agreed that I would not offer the amendment at that time; and I returned to my office and sent him immediately a letter in which I included the text of the amendment that I had proposed to submit that very day and the text of the speech that I had planned to make in support of that amendment, telling him that because of his request and his hope that we would be out of Vietnam by January, I would not submit it.

January has passed, and most of February, and we are not out. We are in, deeper and deeper and deeper. I believe it is desirable, whether or not one may agree with my views on this war, that the Congress be on record on this issue. There are a number of reasons. For one thing, I believe as a matter of good military practice—although I am not a military expert—that some of those 340,000 trained troops which are now stationed in Europe should have priority. They have not been sent to southeast Asia. They, at least, should be sent first, before we take these young draftees from their families and the process of education. We should use those troops, which we have been supporting over in Europe now for many years, who are trained in combat and fully equipped. They should go first.

That is one of the reasons why I have introduced this amendment, and why I think it should be debated when I bring it up, as I hope to in the course of the present dialog.

My position is strongly supported by a member of the Armed Services Committee who recently made a visit to South Vietnam, one of our most enlightened colleagues, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], who incidentally had not taken a very strong position on the situation theretofore, although indicating at various times that he had grave doubts. But upon returning from South Vietnam, he stated that he had reached a very vital and important conclusion, that this was a civil war. Mr. President, that is one of the really important aspects of the situation.

A couple of weeks ago, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, made a speech in Chicago, which was reprinted in full in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 6, in which he stated that if this were a civil war, we had no business taking sides in it.

That is precisely the position that I have maintained for more than 2 years. It is a civil war. President Kennedy, who certainly was in a position to know, who was elected to the House of Repre-

sentatives in 1946 and to the Senate in 1952, and was on the Foreign Relations Committee during all those years of our steadily edging into the present situation, declared it to be a civil war. It is a civil war; and that is one of the many reasons for this debate which is now taking place, and which is so greatly assisted by the wisdom of the Foreign Relations Committee in holding open hearings, so that for the first time the American people may find out what is going on, what are the motivations that brought us in there, and what the prospects are for the future.

I believe, for this reason, that this is an important issue.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. In all fairness to Secretary Ball, the context in which he made his statement, in the speech to which the Senator from Alaska has referred, was that he was discussing many issues present in Vietnam, that if a civil war were the only issue, it would then be open to question whether we would have any right to be there. But, if I recall the article—and I have not had an opportunity to look at it now for over a week or 10 days—because there were other factors operating on the Vietnamese question, such as that of aggression over the 17th parallel, and interference in whatever civil war characteristics were present there, they had overtones which had to condition our presence there, and it was not a matter of isolating the civil war characteristics in order to make the decision easier for us.

The parallel has also been drawn, if I may suggest to the Senator from Alaska, that we had the same kind of harsh decision—even though in another setting—to make in Greece where a genuine civil war was underway in 1945 and 1946. The "good guys," as the Senator from Alaska refers to them, were located in the rural populations in Greece. They were being used, as the record is now clear in showing, by the forces that were coming across the border from a neighboring Balkan State, with leadership and supplies, and with doctrinaire solutions to capitalize on the division going on within Greece. Yet, President Truman rose to the occasion and backed the established government, not because they were the "best guys" but because we had to win a position of stability before the voice of democracy, if we will, in Greece, would ever have an opportunity to practice democracy in their civil war.

It was necessary for us to support the King, to support the black marketeers, and to support all kinds of public personalities whom we would ordinarily cringe from being associated with; but we had to do first things first. Again, in Greece, the first issue was to erect a wall to seal off the border that would prevent this outside meddling with Greece's internal affairs, because if out-

siders had succeeded in meddling, Greece would have had no opportunity to practice democracy, no opportunity for social growth, or economic expansion in the years ahead.

That is the reason we face the requisites in Vietnam at the same time. There are other considerations. But we must keep them in the right order if we are to have an opportunity to rise above the very confused and overlapping, complex, cross currents of the issues which are there, and which were likewise present in Greece.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his helpful contribution. Let me read him presently exactly what Secretary Ball said; but first I should like to say in connection with his remarks that we have supported all kinds of bad eggs. History shows we have frequently supported dictators, crooks, and scoundrels of the worst stripe merely because they surrendered to the idea that they were anti-Communist. That was their passport, that was the "open Sesame" to receive our lavish support. "We are anti-Communist," they would say, no matter what kind of scoundrels they were.

Mr. McGEE. We have been doing that at home, locally.

Mr. GRUENING. The most ruthless dictator in history in Latin America was a man who murdered many people in cold blood, who enriched himself, wrecked his country, and created the existing situation down there. There have been many other such men. I believe it is important that henceforth we consider whom we are supporting, and why.

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator from Alaska suggesting that perhaps we were unwise in supporting—

Mr. GRUENING. I refer to Trujillo. Mr. McGEE. The government in Greece?

Mr. GRUENING. No. I am not. I have no comment on that.

Mr. McGEE. The parallel is a striking one because it had many of the same attributes that make us unhappy today in Vietnam. There was a preponderant military control in Greece. The control centered largely in the capital city, as it does in Saigon in Vietnam. The Greek rural population had no communication with or respect for the Central Government, which is true in Vietnam. Greece was in open rebellion. But, they were also about to be seized by a foreign power. They were being used by groups which the Soviets had trained, educated, and planted across the borders in the Balkan States. Thus, it had all the earmarks of a front takeover, not unlike the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

We might learn from those parallels, even though they were not precisely the same, because one involves the Soviet Union and the other involves the overwhelming presence of China farther to the north. These are considerations with respect to which we must make educated guesses. That is one of the reasons for the differences the Senator from Alaska and I share, but which, nonethe-

end of the war, our national debt had jumped from approximately \$40 to \$263 billion, and we were still going strong at the end of the war.

We were guilty of underselling our great capabilities. Then, because we had to, we expanded our productivity. We began to tool up our great industry and create more jobs. Many people in our country made fun of an American Vice President because he said that some day we would have 60 million jobs. Many thought he was crazy. Today we have close to 75 million jobs, and we shall have more.

One great weakness oftentimes repeated in our history has been the tendency to underestimate ourselves and to sell ourselves short.

With all due respect to the position of my friend the Senator from Alaska, with which position I disagree so strongly, I say that we must afford both. It would not do us well to reward aggression or to let an aggressor get by with tactics that would build up the kind of tension and head of steam that built up when we thought we could buy time in the thirties when dealing with an aggressor. Aggression is aggression. In time, we had to fight a major world conflict which did indeed slow down the great social programs of the thirties, though we recovered quickly as a result of the expansion of our production capabilities.

I believe that it would be far more damaging to the great programs at home if we were to pull back and reward an aggressor with the excuse that we had to protect our programs at home. I do not believe that history gives us that much choice.

We have to do both and we dare not forfeit one in favor of the other. Both programs are called for and both must be carried forward. We have the capability to rise to the demand. However, we do not like to do that. We have not set our personal priorities in the right order. We still like our Cadillacs. I guess that is the wrong term, because they are so common. However, whatever the term might be, we have not really laid our top objectives on the line—education, the battle against poverty, the battle for health and adequate medical care, the battle for individual economic security in the Great Society. These things must be laid alongside of the demand for power politics. Our country is one of the greatest powers available today to do something about the present situation. I believe that the time is at hand when we must make our decision. Let us quit kidding ourselves. We must do it. We can do it, and I hope, in the course of the deliberations of this great body, that we will do it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I know that the reaction among my constituents—and I have no doubt that the same is true with the constituents of the Senator from Wyoming and others—when we learned that, under the school lunch program, the supply of milk for children was to be drastically reduced, was one of profound shock.

Mr. McGEE. It is ridiculous.

Mr. GRUENING. We can afford to give milk to our children and also engage

in a billion-dollar program in the Mekong Delta. The American people will not stand for any other course.

Mr. McGEE. I agree. We can and must do both.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very helpful contribution.

Mr. President, I am planning, sometime in the course of this discussion, to propose an amendment to the pending legislation, Senate bill 2791, which would provide, that in order for draftees to be sent involuntarily to the war in southeast Asia, Congress must first give its consent.

I have discussed this subject before. The history of my purpose for this amendment should be further explained. It seemed to me that there was a great lack of approval on the part of Congress for our performance in southeast Asia. While I am fully aware that the administration considers that the resolution which was drafted a year ago last August, after the Tonkin Gulf incident, gave the President a blank check to use the Armed Forces of the United States anywhere in southeast Asia that he saw fit. The language of the resolution covered, "Vietnam and the protocol states," which would include Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. The administration considered that to be ample authorization to escalate the war to the point that we now have 200,000 men engaged in combat in South and North Vietnam.

A number of Senators now feel, and have so expressed themselves, that they had no idea how far this commitment would carry our intervention and escalation.

I say for myself and for my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] that we did not have this feeling. We felt that this was a blank check and that, under the Constitution, this was not the proper way for Congress to delegate its authority to the President.

In any event, the language was plain, it was not in fine print; it was spelled out in the plainest of print. It gave the authority to the President, as he saw fit, to use the Armed Forces of the United States.

Nevertheless, there is a growing feeling, which has been expressed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, that a further expression of congressional intent should be sought and obtained.

My amendment would furnish that opportunity. If agreed to, it would give the Congress the opportunity to determine whether the taking of young draftees from their homes and sending them to southeast Asia to be slaughtered shall be approved or disapproved.

I feel, as I have stated before, that there is a certain difference between these young men and those who have made military service, whether in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, a part of their career, either permanently or temporarily, and who therefore are bound to follow the orders of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I feel that they are in a different category from young men who are pursuing their education at home, many of whom now are married but no

longer exempt from the draft. I feel that they should not be snatched by the draft and sent into jungle warfare in southeast Asia. Congress should face that problem, and should be on record by voting whether we shall send these boys to Vietnam, or not send them.

This is an important issue. Such a vote would bring the Congress closer to the war. It would enable us to share responsibility with the Executive, who so far, except for the Tonkin Gulf resolution, has been conducting the war merely as an Executive activity.

I discussed this matter with the President last August. It happened that I had an appointment with him, which came about in this manner: I had inserted an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD highly praising the President's achievement in securing, through the Congress, his great, unprecedented domestic program. The eulogy which I placed in the RECORD—fully deserved, I felt then and do now—caused him to telephone me at home and thank me for it.

However, to make sure that there was no misunderstanding—although I am sure he was aware of what my attitude had been—I told him that while I sincerely and enthusiastically applauded his domestic program, I was in complete disagreement with his military program in southeast Asia, a disagreement which was not of recent origin, but which began nearly 2 years ago, shortly after President Johnson was inaugurated after campaigning on a platform somewhat more pacifistic than that of his Republican opponent. I felt then that it would have been very easy, at that time, when no men had been sent into combat, when no bombing of North Vietnam had taken place, when the American people were basking in the happy contentment of a pacific way of settling this problem, for that to take place; and in anticipation that the situation might be changed. When the President congratulated me on my statements in praise of the domestic program, I told him that I disagreed with him on the foreign program in southeast Asia, and that I hoped that I would have the opportunity to discuss it with him.

He agreed; and a few days later I received an appointment at the White House. I was given an opportunity to present my views on the conduct of the war—the feeling that we should never have been committed to a ground war on the continent of Asia; that our security was in no wise jeopardized by whatever happened in southeast Asia; that we had not been attacked; that we were engaging in an enterprise without the approval of Congress; and that it could lead only to disaster.

I elaborated on those views, and after I had finished, I told the President that I was preparing, on that very afternoon, to offer an amendment to the military pay bill which was about to come before the Congress to provide precisely that the Congress should approve or disapprove the question of whether draftees should be sent into combat in southeast Asia involuntarily.

less, contribute to this dialog to resolve this very tough question.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the regimes which has come to power by a series of coups, without any democratic practice, has been particularly "perfumed" in that way. We have to keep on insisting on the overly long due reforms which President Eisenhower made conditional in his dealings with Diem—and which he never carried out. Diem was finally "removed"—I will not say with the assistance but certainly with the awareness of our Ambassador down there—after his tyranny, lack of cooperativeness, and lack of public spiritedness became manifest, and when the war was going from bad to worse. Diem's successor's have apparently been no different, including the present incumbent, Ky, who, when interviewed on who were his heroes said, "I have only one: Adolf Hitler."

If that is the kind of man we are going to entrust with a reform program and with the inculcation of freedom which we allegedly are fighting for, the outlook is rather bleak.

Mr. McGEE. Let me say to the Senator from Alaska that I deplore such a statement as that attributed to Ky as much as my colleague from Alaska does; but I say that some time, farther down the list of our priorities, Mr. Ky may not be there tomorrow; he may be gone week after next. The point is that Vietnam will still be there, the problem of power will still be there, and the problem of priorities will still stare us in the face. There has been an act of aggression, openly and flagrantly practiced across the line. The suggestion is correct that that kind of aggression should not be rewarded, that once the line can be firmed up, there is then the opportunity to do things the right way—whatever they may be or seem to be—for the people of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree that if Mr. Ky is the best we can produce down there, he being the ninth incumbent after Diem was bumped off, we had better stop trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, which, unfortunately, has been the situation down there in trying to get a public spirited and honest executive?

After all, we control the situation. We hold the purse strings. We should be able to achieve that.

Mr. McGEE. I should think so; and I would hope that we would. I would hope that the people of Vietnam and not the United States would be responsible for that, but I have not seen a word to the effect that there would be any opportunity for anyone to try to make something better out of the situation presented by the issues. If we allow the aggressors from the north to take over, it will be gone, and we shall not have an opportunity to reconsider.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me go back to the statement which Secretary Ball made. I hold in my hand a page from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 6, 1966, section E-3. This is what he declared:

Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the north, or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that

Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

Mr. President, that is a clear statement.

Mr. McGEE. Is that not precisely what I suggested that Secretary Ball said to us? He then goes on to say that it was not what the Communists said it was, but it was an indigenous civil war, does he not?

Mr. GRUENING. But, on the other hand, let me say that a recent observer, one of our colleagues, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who spent considerable time in South Vietnam, reports his views as follows—and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1966—

Mr. McGEE. Is the Senator referring to our friend from Ohio?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. He is a most knowledgeable person. He served in the other body. He was elected to this body in the last election. He states as follows:

This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited southeast Asia, it had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of time, I was in every area of Vietnam—when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stillwell and other generals that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved. The fighting has been going on there since 1945. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

The point is that he got this same information from our military authorities, General Westmoreland and General Stillwell. Would the Senator challenge that? Is that not correct?

Mr. McGEE. I would challenge the Senator's interpretation of what he has quoted, because they were responding to the percentage of the Vietcong born in South Vietnam. I was there in 1959, with the Senator from Tennessee. I was there 2 or 3 years later, and then still later. That still does not make me an expert. But we can give an educated guess about what Secretary Ball means.

There are indeed dissident forces loose in South Vietnam, but I do not believe that is the preponderant factor that should concern us in our action. We have only to remember that the forces to the north seek to split the country. To permit that would have the same effect that would have taken place in Greece, and that took place in Austria

and Czechoslovakia. There should have been action then. There was not. We are not going to get by it by doing nothing. If it is not stopped now, there will be another nation, and then another, that will fall. Then the aggression will have to be stopped at a much greater cost. So now is the time and this is the place.

Is it not significant that of all the dissidents in South Vietnam, not a single sect—neither the Buddhists, the liberals, the students, the militarists, or the Catholics—has embraced the Vietcong? Not a one of them has pointed to the Vietcong and said, "There is our cause. Lead us to a better tomorrow."

With all the divergencies in Vietnam, they have not gone over to the Vietcong. So I say we should look at the Vietcong in proper perspective, the leadership of which is in the National Liberation Front, or Hanoi. This has been established not only by ourselves, but by the International Control Commission, which has been there since 1956. It has established that the real front, the head of this animal, the National Liberation Front, was conceived and born in Hanoi, to serve the cause of Hanoi.

We should have learned enough from the lessons of history to know enough about the operations of a front and a deceptive propaganda wing, not to fall for it.

As to the views of the people, I suppose that one would find a divergence of views anywhere. The boys in the hills are down on capitalists. This is true in my own State of Wyoming. I would assume it to be true in Alaska. What is different in this situation and the reason for our commitment is that it has been clearly demonstrated that the intercession has been from the north.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator and I differ on the view that Hanoi is the villain, that Hanoi started the infiltration. My reading leads me to a different conclusion. It shows that this movement took place because of the violation and our persuasion of Diem to violate the 1954 Geneva agreements to hold elections; it was the tyrannical suppression and jailing of hundreds of people, the suppression of freedoms, which caused the civil war to break out. As we added to our arsenal, infiltration began from the north.

The hearings now being conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee may bring it out. It is important and crucial that it be brought out. I go back to the categorical statement on the part of Secretary Ball which seems to contain the entire issue, namely, that if it were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict. I have maintained from the beginning that we had no business taking sides.

I am glad to see that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] is now present and presiding. I say to him that I have just quoted from his address to the Senate on February 8, when he said categorically that:

This is a civil war going on in Vietnam.

He then stated further that before his visit to southeast Asia:

It had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north.

That is the propaganda which the administration has put out.

The Senator from Ohio further said:

But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days * * * when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam.

General Stilwell said the same thing. That shows that, if we take Secretary Ball's word, we have no business being there. That is the same thing I have maintained from the start.

Mr. McGEE. May I reply to that point? When the Senator refers to the Vietcong and what has been sought to be done through the peasants in South Vietnam, I think the Senator evades the issue and still misconstrues what was said. There again, in terms of powers of leadership, the head of the animal itself is Hanoi. The International Control Commission has documented this fact down to the last comma. Our own intelligence agencies have documented that fact. I do not believe it can be denied. It is a matter of record. It is evident to any rational person that the purpose is to take over South Vietnam. We have a commitment, and we must see it through.

At the end of World War II there was an unhappy division of territories with the Russians. It was done in order to expedite agreements with Russia. There was a division of Germany. There was a division of Berlin. Nobody wanted to see two Berlins, but it seemed to be the easiest way to come to an agreement. Korea was separated at the 38th parallel. Nobody wanted Korea to be separated, but that was the way to come to an agreement. Now we move to Vietnam, to the area which the French once controlled and then left. When the agreement was made to divide, there was a division which was not based on any ethnic division. It was a geographic division. North Vietnam would be north of the 17th parallel, and South Vietnam would be south of it.

Mr. GRUENING. Temporarily only.

Mr. McGEE. Temporarily, just as Korea was temporary, just as Berlin was temporary, and just as Germany was temporary. But the hard fact remains that this was the starting place and the original election to which we have committed ourselves. It has been the one fundamental conviction that we are not going to permit forces on the other side to nibble away in these commitments if there is any status quo on which we could build a better world. If they can get by with nibbling at it, we are rewarding the aggressor, and we shall pay a much heavier penalty at a later date.

That is what we did in Germany, and that is what we did in Berlin. That is what we took on in honoring the agreement in 1956 on the 17th parallel in Vietnam. We did not retreat from those temporary arrangements, temporary ar-

rangements that some day will fade away. They are not designed to be permanent. They are the starting point. We do not dare forfeit them. At this date, it would be more suicidal than if we suggested that in the beginning.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator aware that the United States made a unilateral declaration with respect to the agreement at Geneva that there would be elections; that we stated that as national policy; that we then went back on that declaration and violated that agreement; and that we encouraged Diem not to hold those elections? That is the basis on which we have not pulled out.

Mr. McGEE. I do not agree with the Senator. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will discover that by 1956 one of the two Vietnams had been divided. Ho Chi Minh had already outlawed the political opposition. In North Vietnam there was already but one political group, and that was the Vietminh. That was his group, and it was on that basis that he was going to hold free elections.

What would the Senator have done, even as a dictator in Vietnam?

It has already been stated how free elections were defeated, how they were a mockery, and could not have been and should not have been held. They still may be a long way off in a country as badly torn as Vietnam.

We have a great temptation to project the American image. It is assumed that they know what it is about when they have to face up to responsibilities of any kind in self-expression. I believe we have to understand that we cannot expect the impossible from them. It would destroy them.

There was a case in point when a vote in 1956 would have been like a free election in East Berlin. What kind of election is that? We have to be realistic on this matter and quit hiding behind nice-sounding words.

We must live with the facts of our time. This is difficult for us because we are idealistic. I hope that we apply what we learned in Vietnam, as well as we did in Korea, Berlin, Greece, and elsewhere.

Mr. GRUENING. What kind of democratic, fine American principle is it when it is agreed to go to an election, but when it is found that one is going to lose the election it is called off? It could not happen in the United States, and yet we are projecting that image in other countries. Is it an example of freedom, democracy, and adherence to law?

That election should have been held, but it was not.

Eighty percent of the people in North Vietnam favored Ho Chi Minh. He was their hero and would have been elected.

Mr. McGEE. That was 1954, but in 1956 it was a different kettle of fish when he had abolished the political opposition. We could not lend ourselves to condoning that kind of principle.

Mr. GRUENING. Just as Diem had abolished his opposition in South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. It is all the more ridicu-

lous to say that free elections are to be held. There were none of the makings for a free election. We would have to live with the agreement until there was economic growth and expansion that would permit rising to a more sophisticated state.

Mr. GRUENING. The provision was that the elections would be supervised.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is so wrong.

Mr. GRUENING. They were to be supervised.

Mr. McGEE. I have a group waiting for me for lunch. I thank my friend for this dialog.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. General Taylor just finished explaining that the Communists would not agree to any kind of international supervision. They were going to give us a Communist election there.

What would they do? They would go ahead and stuff more ballots in the ballot box than there was population, and at the same time they would hold the other side to an honest count in South Vietnam.

When the Communists had North Vietnam and the anti-Communists had South Vietnam, 1 million people moved from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to live under a form of government that is other than communism.

It is said that it is not good government. I challenge the Senator to tell me of any government on earth that is worse than government by communism. I would like to know.

The Communists were in the position to stuff the ballot box until it outnumbered the population, while holding the people of South Vietnam to an honest count. The ideas of free election are not ended. We are asking now and are ready now to have a free election.

That is one thing that the Communists would never agree to. They will never agree. Do not think they will make that mistake.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to know if the question of the Senator is whether there is any government worse than communism.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to ask which government, if any, is worse than communism?

Mr. GRUENING. The United States invested \$2 million in supporting a Communist dictator in Yugoslavia, Mr. Tito. The State Department and the administration think that that is a good investment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As among Communists, he is the better of a bad lot.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not believe that it follows that the point is logical, when the administration supported a Communist dictator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been voting against Tito receiving aid from this country.

Mr. GRUENING. So have I.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is a Communist government.

The Senator has yet to name a government worse than the Communist government. He finds fault with our friends. Perhaps some are corrupt. We have even had some dishonest people in

our own Government. The Communists do not have to worry about somebody stealing money out of the till because the Communist government owns everything, the houses, and even the eyeballs, and nobody can steal anything because no one is permitted to own anything. Corruption in government is one thing that they do not have to worry about.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. A few minutes ago Gen. Maxwell Taylor was adverted to for the reason that he testified this morning before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The junior Senator from Ohio will not, today or tomorrow morning, pass up other important things to read what Gen. Maxwell Taylor had to say because of an incident that occurred the last time General Taylor testified before a joint meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. At that time I asked General Taylor that assuming that the civilian Prime Minister of South Vietnam at the time would be overthrown and that the next Prime Minister would step in and announce, "We want the United States to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam," what would be our position keeping in mind that we are there at the invitation of the Government of South Vietnam?

Instead of answering the question, General Taylor said:

There is no possibility that the present Prime Minister will be overthrown.

That statement is in the record. Within 48 hours after General Taylor had said that there was no possibility that the civilian administration could be overthrown, and before General Taylor could leave the United States, he was proven wrong. Whether the Central Intelligence Agency was to blame for having given him bad intelligence is something that the junior Senator from Ohio does not know. But the stark fact is that within 48 hours of General Taylor's making his positive statement, of General Taylor's posing as an authority because he had been in Vietnam, he was proven wrong. The Senator from Alaska may recall that 10 generals overthrew the civilian government of Prime Minister Quat and shortly afterward installed Air Marshal Ky as Prime Minister; and Ky has been Prime Minister ever since.

I say that although General Taylor was adverted to as an authority, to me he is a poor authority indeed. I do not pay any attention to his statements, and his testimony would not impress me.

But let us return to the facts. Much has been said about the Geneva accords of 1954. Historically, as the Senator from Alaska knows, there are no such countries and there have been no such countries over the years, as North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as the Senator from Alaska knows that the Geneva accords of 1954, which the United States agreed to in effect, but

which our representatives failed to sign, stated:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

Then, an International Control Commission was created with representatives from India, Canada, and Poland.

Under the Geneva agreements, an election in Vietnam was scheduled for 1956. That election was never held, and the United States was a party to this failure. President Eisenhower believed that Ho Chi Minh, who was regarded as the George Washington of Vietnam—not the George Washington of North Vietnam and of South Vietnam, but as the hero, the George Washington of Vietnam—would have been elected President had that election been held. Of course, the election was not held because the Central Intelligence Agency and Secretary of State Dulles intervened.

It is true that neither the Senator from Alaska nor the junior Senator from Ohio pretends or presumes to be an expert on southeast Asia. However, I made some trips to southeast Asia. From last September 28 to October 18, I was in Vietnam, Thailand, Korea, the Philippine Republic, Guam, and Hong Kong. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the junior Senator from Ohio were in those countries on an official mission.

We had gone to Korea as guests of the Korean Government, and at the expense of the Korean Government. Although the Senator from Alaska is likely to say that since American taxpayers' money is spent so lavishly all over the world, even though the Government of Korea paid our expenses, the money, in effect, came from the pockets of American taxpayers.

While I was in Vietnam, I did not spend much time in Saigon. I visited every Air Force base in what is called South Vietnam. I visited the camps and the hospitals; I spoke with many Ohio boys. I spoke with one boy from Cuyahoga County, the area where I live, within 3 hours after his leg had been amputated. I obtained the names and addresses of 180 Ohio GI's. Wherever I went in Vietnam, I spoke with soldiers, whenever I could, in the absence of officers. I would say to the young men from Ohio, "I served for 37 months in World War II. I want you to know that I have been an officer and I have been a private. In time of war, it is much harder to be a private than it is to be an officer. Now I am speaking with you in the absence of any officers. What are your problems? Are there any shortages?" With very few exceptions the answer invariably was, "no problems, sir."

The Senator from Alaska will agree with me, I feel certain, that the cream of our crop of American young men is in Vietnam right now. The 200,000 or more GI's who are fighting in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam are the finest of the youth of America. In addition, 50,000 men are attached to the 7th Fleet, offshore. I was in Thailand for 4 or 5 days, a coun-

try where we have 30,000 fine soldiers. I also traveled throughout Korea, as far up as Panmunjom, at the line of demarcation. Fifty-three thousand of our soldiers are committed in Korea.

It is said that we are likely to have 500,000 boys in Vietnam by next October. If we do, I will state publicly, anywhere, that the next 300,000 will not be any better than the 200,000-plus who are over there now. They are fine Americans. It is a great misfortune that we have involved these fine young men in a civil war in southeast Asia.

When I was over there, in late September and early October, it had been my belief that the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were all Communists, that they were all infiltrators from the north. I also had been told that Vietnam was of strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. May I ask the Senator whether he found that that was not true; that they were not all infiltrators?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Of course it was not true. That is not only my observation. General Westmoreland, the commanding officer in Vietnam, on one of the evenings when I was in Saigon, said that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting us in South Vietnam was born and reared in South Vietnam. Directly after that, when I was in Thailand, Gen. Richard Stilwell, the second in command said—and I remember his exact words:

Senator, 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in South Vietnam.

As the Senator knows, the Mekong Delta is west and south of Saigon.

Mr. GRUENING. Demonstrating, as the Senator has pointed out, that this is a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is very definitely a civil war in which we are involved. Furthermore, Vietnam is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. While the Senator from Ohio was occupying the chair as Presiding Officer I quoted, in my colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming, the statement of Under Secretary of State Ball, to the effect that if the Vietnam war were merely an indigenous rebellion, the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms. We are engaged in a civil war. We are taking sides in a civil war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. To emphasize this fact further, the leader of the National Liberation Front, Nguyen Huu Tho, the leader of the VC's, was born and reared in South Vietnam. It is said that he is not a Communist. He was a lawyer in Saigon.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Ky, who was installed as Prime Minister by the 10 generals who overthrew the civilian government, was born in North Vietnam. He talks about democracy. He does not know what democracy is. The fact is that he was born in the suburbs of Hanoi. He was reared in North Vietnam. Some cabinet members of the Saigon or South Vietnamese Government were born and reared in what is called

North Vietnam. In addition, the commanding officers of two of the army corps of the South Vietnamese Army were born in North Vietnam. This is ample evidence that a civil war is being waged there.

We hear many patriotic speeches about our commitments in Vietnam. It was stated on the floor of the Senate that, "We are over there because of the commitments made by three Presidents."

However, the late great President John F. Kennedy said on September 3, shortly before his assassination:

I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government 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 has gotten out of touch with the people.

The President was then referring to the Government of Saigon.

On another occasion, President Kennedy said:

Transforming Vietnam into a western redoubt is ridiculous.

The President was saying, in other words, that Saigon is not a bastion to protect Seattle or Alaska.

The junior Senator from Ohio is not a great admirer of the 8-year administration of President Eisenhower. However, President Eisenhower did not commit us to South Vietnam. President Eisenhower said in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam:

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 it really be claimed that Marshal Ky heads a strong, viable state? Throughout the entire time that General Eisenhower was President the United States military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from 327 in 1953 to a total of 685 on January 20, 1961. What President Eisenhower said and what he did throughout his 8 years as President proves he did not make a commitment of American soldiers to combat in Vietnam.

It is not a truthful statement to say that three Presidents have committed our American forces to fight over there.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska on the statements he has made here.

It will be recalled that our President said on several occasions that he would go anywhere in the quest of peace and sit down and talk with anyone. However, when Secretary of State Dean Rusk

while recently testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations was asked:

Would you be agreeable to having the U.S. delegates sit down at a peace conference with representatives of the National Liberation Front or the Vietcong?

He replied:

I would have to consider that.

There can be no peace anywhere; there can be no cease-fire; and there can be no armistice unless the representatives of those who are doing the fighting, the National Liberation Front, so called, are permitted to participate in the conference.

The Secretary of State is not being honest with the American people when he makes that reservation at the same time that our President is telling the world that we will participate in a peace conference at Geneva or any other place without any conditions whatever.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator not think, in view of the various conflicting statements made by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, that the opposition cannot have very much confidence that we can be on the level when and if we reach the peace table? Must we not have a policy firmly enunciated by the President of the United States that this is what we will do, and not have such a policy nullified by a statement from the Secretary of State?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It would be more encouraging to the American people, and more particularly to the mothers and fathers of youngsters who are likely to be drafted, if an agreement were reached so that our President would not make one statement and then have our warhawk Secretary of State make a contrary statement at almost the same time.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a fact that repeatedly through recent months when statements have been issued from our supposedly responsible officials, they have said on the one hand: "We must insist on an independent South Vietnam," and have said on the other hand: "We must adhere to the Geneva accords." The Geneva accords provide for a reunited Vietnam and for an election.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Geneva accords provide for a free election throughout the entire country of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Alaska and I would not like it if a Communist were to be elected President of Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. However, it is for the Vietnamese people to determine that by free elections supervised by the International Control Commission. I believe the Senator from Alaska will agree with my statement that the United States does not have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world.

The United States is supposed to be the most revolutionary Nation on earth. Our Founding Fathers made it that way. Let us hope that we have not become complacent, wealthy, and easygoing to the point that we are now the most unrevolutionary nation in the entire world.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

I hope that this colloquy may continue as debate proceeds, but we are under obligation now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to take up other business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CALL OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of certain measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 929, that the items be considered in sequence, and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be granted such additional time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

The resolution (S. Res. 187) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate in its due consideration of these resolutions. I know how useless it is to make any effort to eliminate or even reduce the moneys to be appropriated for the various subcommittees. I except to make a general statement, and most of the resolutions will probably go unchallenged as far as I am concerned, except where there appears to be an increase in the number of employees.

As I shall demonstrate in a moment, the number of employees on the special committees has increased from 359 to 401. I have a list of the increases, and I shall ask the chairmen of the committees to justify those increases in personnel.

Mr. President, I regret to contest again some of these special resolutions, as I have been doing from year to year. This is a task which I neither look forward to nor enjoy performing. I have stuck with it year after year in the hope that one voice raised in protest would sooner or later have the effect of returning the Senate to a position of giving to the taxpayers respect rather than mere lip-service.

In 1900 waste from our cities and towns was the equivalent of raw sewage from 24 million people, and organic waste from industry equaled the raw sewage of 15 million people. City-borne wastes flowing into streams in 1960 equaled the raw sewage from 75 million people, and industrial waste the raw sewage of 160 million persons. In 1970, just a few short years hence, municipal wastes will equal the raw sewage of 85 million people, and industrial waste will equal the raw sewage of 210 million people.

The population growth in Michigan, projected by the Census Bureau through 1985, gives an idea of the increase in water demands which can be anticipated by our people. In 1960 the population was 7.8 million. In 1970 our population will be 8.6 million. By 1985 Michigan's population will be 10.5 million people, using prodigious amounts of water for industrial and municipal purposes.

The problem is spread across the continent. It will get worse, in Michigan and elsewhere, unless most vigorous action is taken. While Michigan has performed better than most States, and while much has been done, vastly more remains for us to do.

On a statewide basis there are only two municipalities with populations in excess of 5,000 without treatment works. But many of these treatment works are not now adequate for the demands upon them, and are still less adequate for future requirements.

Only a few of Michigan's communities have secondary treatment systems. Many small towns and communities in our State lack any treatment facilities at all.

It would be fair to say that many Michigan industries have established treatment plants. It would, however, be equally fair to say that there are others which need treatment plants or which have inadequate or even hopelessly obsolete treatment plants. Many which do have treatment plants, fail to properly operate those plants, or have been found not to operate them at all for substantial periods from time to time.

Michigan's legislature is to be praised for its enactment of good water quality legislation. The statute enacted by this legislature during its last session offers more promise than anything Michigan has yet seen, and more promise than the legislature of almost any other State. It shows that our great State is beginning to move forward.

From the foregoing we can arrive at some conclusions. Michigan has become increasingly aware of its responsibilities. Although the citizenry of Michigan have not been sufficiently aware of the needs of abatement of pollution, they have been ahead of their officials. In like manner, our people have not been aware of the need to make their will known to their public servants. Our officials on all levels need new awareness of the need, and the enormous pool of latent support, which exists for cleanup.

A striking comparison is New York, whose fiscally responsible Governor rammed through a water quality program, probably better than that possessed by any other State in the Union, involving substantial State funding by loans and grants of municipal projects, and involving remarkable expansion of State enforcement powers. These programs passed the legislature unanimously and were adopted by the people of the State when presented to them by referendum with better than a 4 to 1 margin.

Certainly this shows the willingness of people to support proper action by States and municipalities for cleanup of our waters.

More immediately, a program of cooperation based upon mutual trust and common purpose, between State, local and Federal Government is required.

Substantial expenditures of funds by State and local agencies will be required.

Increased funding on the Federal level is required. The \$280 million for matching grants to States and communities for water

pollution abatement works is less than half the amount needed. For this reason, last session I introduced legislation to increase Federal expenditures under Public Law 860 to \$500 million and to increase fourfold the size of grants to communities.

The State of Michigan should be prepared to participate in the funding of local endeavors, and active consideration should be given to tax benefits for industrial waste treatment works by the State.

Secondary treatment plants should be regarded as mandatory for all municipal systems, except for the very small and isolated communities. High standards of treatment on a local and State level for septic tanks and similar private treatment works are a must.

Disinfection of municipal waste effluent must be practiced to reduce coliform densities to below 5,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. Combined storm and sanitary sewers must be prohibited in newly developed urban areas and eliminated in existing areas wherever possible. Urban renewal must be used as a vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. Alternative methods, less complicated and more economical than actual physical separation, are now being developed and should be applied as soon as they are successfully demonstrated.

State, county, and city officials should determinedly embark on a course of action to encourage combined treatment of municipal and industrial wastes in the same treatment plant. This spells economy of operation and savings for both the public and industry. Where industry locates on the city's environs, it will still pay the community to install an interceptor sewer to bring that industry's wastes to the city plant for treatment.

All new sewage facilities must be designed to prevent the necessity of bypassing untreated waters, something which is a major contributor to the pollution of the Detroit River.

The operation of waste treatment plants should be entrusted only to trained and skilled operators, who should be required to obtain state certification of their competency.

Great emphasis must be given to prevention of accidental spills of waste materials into Michigan's waters. Inplant surveys to prevent accidents should be utilized by State and local officials.

An appropriate system of reporting of unusual increases in waste output and accidental spills to the appropriate State and local agencies must be instituted. Use of waters of the State for disposal of trash, garbage, and other noxious refuse must be prohibited.

Existing dumps along the waters of our State must be eliminated. Industrial plants must be required to improve practices for segregation and treatment of waste to effect maximum reductions of acids, alkalies, tarry substances, oils, phenols, ammonia and nitrogen compounds, phosphorous compounds, and all other wastes with a special emphasis on oxygen-demanding substances.

Federal agencies must be forced to conform to high standards in the discharge of their wastes. The President has issued an Executive order which squarely places this requirement on all Federal installations. Federal water quality standards under the Federal statute just passed under sponsorship of Congressman BLATNIK, Senator MUSKIE and myself must be fixed at the highest feasible levels.

More adequate funding of State programs, and indeed of local programs, must take place to provide for an adequate ability to analyze, trace and prevent sources of pollution. More enforcement personnel on the State and local level must be available to combat pollution.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has increased its expenditures in all areas of water pollution almost sixfold and has assisted generously State programs for prevention of pollution and abatement of this terrible hazard.

Communities have bettered this record, yet an enormous construction backlog remains. There is, as New York has shown, reason for State participation in funding projects.

Michigan and other States must have a more realistic system for appraising and reporting needed waste treatment facilities. For example, Michigan's three largest cities report needs for \$98 million for construction; Detroit indicating needs of \$45,300,000. On the other hand, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers came up with a figure for the whole State of \$4.7 million. The Public Health Service Conference on cleanup of the Detroit River estimates Detroit's needs for secondary treatment to be on the order of \$500 million; whereas, the Detroit Water Board says that secondary treatment alone, which is badly needed on the Detroit River, will cost \$750 million. It appears that some better way of reporting present and future needs must be devised.

A Senate committee study will shortly show National and State needs and expenditures are vastly larger than any present source indicates.

Local officials must insist on this adequate reporting to enable enactment of adequate State and Federal aid programs.

All State and municipal agencies must require sewerage or water use charges sufficient to finance construction and operation of adequate collection and treatment works.

The Federal Government has been drawn into water pollution abatement by failure of the States to preserve our waters and to abate pollution. If the several States, Michigan included, intend to preserve their ancient right and responsibility in water quality control they must display new vigor and effectiveness.

There must be a full understanding that there is place for Federal, State, and local activity in pollution abatement. The Federal Government neither desires nor has the ability to handle every single source of pollution and every improperly managed and operated cesspool and industrial or municipal treatment works. If the States and communities will accept the invaluable skills and tremendous resources of the Federal Government; if they will support Federal activities to abate pollution by understanding it is a cooperative endeavor; and if they will carry out their own great responsibilities in this area; prospects are good that when we see "water wonderland" it will mean just that, not only for Michigan, but for all America.

Declaration of Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's decision to dispatch Vice President HUMPHREY to several Asian countries is seen by the Milwaukee Journal as a sign that "while the war continues, the quest for peace goes on."

The Journal noted that the Honolulu declaration is "another vigorous reaffirmation of broad U.S. policy in Vietnam: resisting Communist aggression while continuing to pursue every path toward honorable peace."

The newspaper also found it encouraging that the declaration reemphasized that "the purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace."

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A795

State agencies to the upgrading of Federal water pollution control endeavors on grounds that it is not needed, it costs too much, and it impinges upon State responsibilities.

Happily, this legislation also became law. The Water Quality Act of 1965 is applauded even by its former critics, one of the most active of whom now seeks to run the new agency he so vigorously opposed. Through this law, a Federal Water Pollution Control Agency has been established, and provision has been made for workable Federal standards to abate pollution of our interstate waters. More importantly, these several legislative fights have brought about an increase in the level of Federal expenditures to States and communities for abatement of water pollution from \$50 million to a figure today in excess of \$280 million, with the possibility of an expenditure of \$300 million in the next fiscal year, commencing July 1.

Since these Federal expenditures have generated local expenditures at the rate of about 4 to 1, we can reasonably anticipate that total expenditures in the field of water pollution in the coming year may be increased from \$1.2 to \$1.6 billion.

The best indication of national need is shown by the vast number of new plants which must be constructed and obsolete plants which must be upgraded.

The cost of cleanup can be conservatively estimated at anywhere from \$20 to \$40 billion.

We recently had opportunity to observe the attitude of the Michigan Water Resources Commission in connection with two Federal proceedings, the first on the Menominee, an interstate proceeding, and the second on the Detroit River, an intrastate abatement action.

Essentially the reaction was the same—opposition to Federal cleanup; although in the second case the opposition was muted by the fact that the Federal proceeding was begun at the request of the then Governor of our State, the Honorable John Swainson.

What opposition was lacking on the part of the State government to clean up the Detroit River, its tributaries, and the Michigan waters of Lake Erie, was certainly abundantly supplied by the general manager of the Detroit Board of Water Commissioners, who characterized Federal cleanup of the Detroit River as unnecessary and an act of gross intrusion into the affairs of the State and the Detroit Water Board.

I would be fair to point out to you that the Detroit River is recognized by all who dwell near it or who use it, as a greatly defiled body of water. Succinctly put, some 540 million gallons of municipal waste containing an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to the raw sewage from a population of over 3 million, innumerable coliform bacteria, over 25,000 pounds of iron, 600,000 pounds of suspended solids, almost 300,000 pounds of settleable solids, some 16,000 gallons of oil, 1,200 pounds of phenolic substances and many thousands of pounds of ammonia, phosphates, and chlorides are deposited there daily. In addition to this, a total industrial waste volume of 1.1 billion gallons is discharged daily into the Detroit River containing among other things, wastes that have an oxygen-consuming capacity equal to raw sewage from a population of over 1 million, 3,000 gallons of oil, 800,000 pounds of suspended solids, 1,400 pounds of phenol, 80,000 pounds of iron, 3,000 pounds of ammonia, 200,000 pounds of acid and over two million pounds of chlorides. My friends, I repeat, these are daily discharges.

An ancient combined sewer system permits raw sewage discharges about 45 times a year, and Detroit's main sewage treatment plant contributes 95 percent of the municipal wastes going into the Detroit River.

Without reading them to you by name, other streams in Michigan have reports of

fish kills, phenol and cyanide escapes, and similar spectacular examples of pollution. We constantly read complaints in the newspapers of rivers like the Rouge, the Huron, the Grand, the Red Cedar, and of course the Kalamazoo, which like the fabled western river are too thick with pollutants to drink but too thin to plow.

It is passing strange that we who live in a State whose auto license plates, by State statute, bear the motto "Water-Winter Wonderland" are faced with a Public Health Service report which indicates Detroit and Michigan hold unchallenged last place in regard to water pollution control in the Lake Erie abatement proceedings.

Primary treatment systems remove from 30 to 35 percent of the solids involved in the waster, and secondary treatment systems remove from 80 to 85 percent of the oxygen-consuming organisms present in the solid components of the waste.

One hundred percent of Indiana's and Pennsylvania's drainage into Lake Erie is served by secondary treatment plants. Cleveland has switched all its waste treatment to secondary plants, and 60 percent of Ohio's drainage into Lake Erie will have secondary treatment. The figure for secondary treatment in the whole State of Michigan is only 15 percent. Still the general manager of the Detroit Water Board protests that Detroit does not need to go to secondary treatment, and that the Detroit River is not polluted.

If all the communities in these other States have been able to finance and build the plants, why can't Detroit? If the other States have been willing to insure that their cities and communities abate pollution, why has not Michigan done so?

Our society, our economy, and the unique productivity of our area, are based upon the Great Lakes, their tributaries, and in a very large measure, upon our inland lakes.

The beneficent presence of the Great Lakes moderates the temperature extremes. This magnificent supply of fresh water, the largest in the world, and our splendid climate and scenery make our tourist industry. Our industries are dependent upon our waters for cooling, washing, and other purposes. From Lake Erie alone industries take 4.7 billion gallons of water a day, including 3.85 billion used for power production. Municipalities along Lake Erie shore draw another 619 million gallons of water per day.

By using these figures to project water usage on the other lakes, the enormity of the dependence of our people on the Great Lakes takes on its proper and unbelievable proportions. The abundance of our water resources has created an economy of incredible productivity.

Prospects for continued expansion of industry and prosperity of the Great Lakes region are bright. Production in our Detroit area alone, measured in value added by manufacture, could increase from about \$5.8 billion in 1960 to something over \$13 billion in 1980. Population in the Detroit area will probably approach 5.5 million by 1980.

Yet with population and industry growth come ugly results. Every species of game fish that thrived in Lake Erie had declined greatly, and Detroit and other Michigan communities and industries are major contributors to the contamination of Lake Erie.

The clear blue water of that lake is steadily being transferred into something thick and ugly. The shores are lined with debris of all types; decaying organic matter, and waste from ships, cities, and industries. The same situation is found at the south end of Lake Michigan.

Hardly a mail delivery comes to my office that I do not find a complaint about the condition of our Great Lakes or our inland lakes. Our people complain of declining water levels and filth and contamination

that result in noxious odors, and ruin swimming, fishing, and water skiing opportunities.

The manager of the Wyandotte waterworks complained to me that he was being forced to run a waste treatment plant, not a municipal water distribution system. The Detroit Water Board suggested Wyandotte place its intakes on the Canadian side of the river, outside the "Water-Winter Wonderland."

A warning of new wastes appeared in the Michigan Municipal Review. In an excellent article in that publication, Donald M. Pierce, chief, Waste Water Section, Division of Engineering, Michigan Department of Health, points out "new wastes create new hazards," and continuing the quote, "technological developments of industry in recent years have produced many new substances whose characteristics have introduced new and complex problems in water treatment and in waste water treatment and disposal. At the same time, medical science has raised new questions yet unanswered on the public health significance of many of these products."

"The toxicologist has gone just far enough in practical research to begin to recognize the long-range toxic potential on man, animal, fish, and birdlife of the thousands of known toxic substances manufactured today and in common use by the public. A wide array of these substances reach our streams, flowing through waters used for recreation and entering water supply intakes. These include synthetic detergents, organo-insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, certain classes of both inorganic and organic substances, and even radioactive substances. Many of these may also reach the ground water resource, through percolation from industrial waste lagoons, sewage lagoons and oxidation ponds, and even solid absorption systems from septic tanks and cesspools."

Twenty-five years ago water pollution was a problem of the heavily populated areas of the northeastern United States.

Today it is a crisis in all parts of our country.

An editorial in one of the major Maryland newspapers described one of the principal recreation areas of that great State as being a peninsula surrounded by silt and sewage.

A Federal official brought two jugs of water along with him into a congressional hearing recently, one of which was a sample of the drinking water supply of a community and the other treated waste water. He pointed out to the committee that there was no earthly way to tell the difference by taste, odor, or color.

At low water, the bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River flowing into Lake Erie from Akron and Cleveland is four times as high as in a stream of raw sewage. The central portion of the Delaware Bay estuary has been ruined by refuse of cities and plants on the Delaware. Its oxygen content has fallen almost to zero and present are scum, black sludge, dead fish, noxious odors, gas bubbles, and floating debris.

Recently, the Willamette River near Portland, Oreg., was turned into a giant septic tank and to flush it the Secretary of the Interior had to order release of water from Federal dams. When water is low, rivers such as those in New Jersey consist largely of undiluted sewage, and the Connecticut, Merrimack, and areas of the Potomac have been unsafe for as long as 50 years.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, recently retired head of the Public Health Service, declared not long ago, "We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfection processes and entering our water mains. Hepatitis may be an example." Dr. Terry cited in connection with this the rather noticeable increase in hepatitis cases in many parts of the United States.

February 17, 1966

A797

Mr. Speaker, I request that the entire editorial, as follows, be included in the RECORD:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Feb. 9, 1966]

DECLARATION OF HONOLULU

Shorn of the pomp and circumstance that attended its birth, the declaration of Honolulu appears as another vigorous reaffirmation of broad U.S. policy in Vietnam: Resisting Communist aggression while continuing to pursue every path toward honorable peace.

Although unstated in the official communique, the Honolulu gathering clearly served another function. It committed the United States more firmly than ever to the support of the present Saigon government. The pledges of more intensive efforts to revive the battered Vietnamese economy and to provide a better life for the people are evidence of this. Of course, such goals can never be fully realized when a war is raging.

Significantly, the declaration ignored the publicized demands of the Saigon leaders to step up the war, particularly with wider air operations against the North. Also, another basic difference is signaled by the silence on the issue of recognition of the National Liberation Front, the parent political organization of the Vietcong, as one precondition for any possible negotiation. Prime Minister Ky insists on total nonrecognition. The United States has said that the Vietcong would have no difficulty in having their views represented at any conference.

It is encouraging that the declaration reemphasized that "the purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace." President Johnson's decision to dispatch Vice President HUMPHREY again to several Asian countries seems to be a sign that, while the war continues, the quest for peace goes on.

Policy Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we know from experience that frequently it is not easy for either a parent—or a nation—to take a stand, to be firm. But it is sometimes necessary.

We all recall Hitler's aggressive steps, and the great world conflict it took to stop him.

The New York Journal American, recalling this and other aspects of aggression, has commended the administration for its stand in Vietnam.

In an editorial which I thought particularly apropos, the paper stated that in Hawaii President Johnson "has emphatically restated the unassailable case for the American presence in Vietnam," and it adds:

Perhaps the most striking point made by the President was his comparison of the Vietnam war to American foreign policy decisions of the 1940's, and 1950's when "we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression."

The editorial asserts that President Johnson's Hawaii speech is a "reempha-

sis of the 'so far and no farther' outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years." And the paper concludes:

The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

While I have quoted from the editorial, I am certain that many will want to read it in its entirety and, therefore, with permission granted I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Feb. 8, 1965]

L.B.J.'s REMINDER

Speaking in Hawaii, President Johnson has emphatically restated the unassailable case for the American presence in Vietnam. The speech provides a fitting rebuff to opponents of his Vietnam policy who, regardless of their motivation invariably fail to offer a logical and honorable alternative.

Perhaps the most striking point made by the President was his comparison of the Vietnam war to American foreign policy decisions of the 1940's and 1950's when "we took our stand in Europe to protect the freedom of those threatened by aggression."

The firmness of such stands—for example, in Greece and during the Berlin airlift—has apparently convinced Soviet Russia that America means business when it says it will not stand idly by and watch communism prey on small and relatively defenseless regions. This determination was, of course, also strikingly and grimly illustrated during the Korean war, at great cost in American life and treasure.

The taking of such a stand, moreover, evokes sad memories of the pre-World War II era when democracy allowed Adolf Hitler to prey in precisely the same fashion on his neighbors. It took a great world conflict to stop him, or don't the administration's Vietnam opponents recall this?

The Hawaii speech is a reemphasis of the "so far and no farther" outlook which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy in the post-World War II years. The policy has worked, and to depart from it would court disaster, shame, and inevitably world war III.

Marcellus M. Murdock: 68 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 15, 1966, Marcellus M. Murdock, a distinguished Kansan and great American, was honored in Wichita, Kans., on the occasion of 68 years of service in journalism, his community and State. It was my privilege to be present with other citizens from Kansas and other parts of the Nation to pay tribute to Mr. Murdock.

Mr. Murdock remains active as president and chairman of the board of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co. The Murdock name has been synonymous with newspapers and with progress in Kansas for many, many years.

Marcellus Murdock is one of the pioneers of aviation in our State and he has assumed a leading role in making Wichita, Kans., the air capital of the world. At 83 he is a man who is young at heart, and an inspiration to all who have sat with him to discuss personal problems, business, politics, or the future in general.

Britt Brown, vice president and secretary of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co., Inc., presided at the luncheon honoring Mr. Murdock. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts of Mr. Brown's informal presentation concerning Mr. Murdock:

As I told you in my letter of invitation, this is in no way to be construed as a retirement party. To the contrary, he will continue his very active participation in both the management and the setting of editorial policy for the newspapers.

In addition to thanking each and every one of you for taking time from your busy schedules and in some cases to come from as far away as Los Angeles and North Carolina to help commemorate this auspicious occasion, I do want to say a few words about my great- (and I do mean "great") uncle that may be of interest to you.

"One fine old stud horse of the Murdock line who still proudly stands, pawing the gravel and sniffing the breeze," as William L. White stated it so well in his editorial honoring "The War Horse" published today in the Emporia Gazette. I commend it to your reading. Though of course Bill is very, very prejudiced in this instance.

Marcellus' professional life in the field of journalism began in 1898, when as a high school boy of 15, he began working for the Wichita Daily Eagle, established by his father, Col. Marshall M. Murdock, April 12, 1872. In 1907 when he was barely 24 and when growing Wichita had a population of 47,000, Marcellus M. Murdock succeeded his father as publisher of the Wichita Eagle. In 1927, he established the Evening Eagle to supplement the morning paper. In 1960 the Wichita Eagle purchased the Wichita Beacon. Three years ago Mr. Murdock became president and chairman of the board of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon Publishing Co., a position he holds with active interest and distinction. For many years he was also vice president and general manager of radio station KFH. You know, that other media. In 1961, Marcellus M. Murdock received outstanding recognition in the field of journalism when he was awarded the Kansas citation for journalistic merit by the William Allen White Foundation.

Many of you present today were also present at that award on February 10, 1961, when our good friend Clyde M. Reed, Jr., wrote a presentation entitled, "The Man Who Did Not Run".

You will remember the presentation talk was prepared by Clyde M. Reed, Jr., publisher of the Parsons Sun, and delivered, because of the illness of Mr. Reed, by Fred W. Brinkerhoff, publisher of the Pittsburg Sun and Headlight. The response by Mr. Murdock, who also was ill, was read by Rolla A. Clymer, past president of the foundation and editor of the El Dorado Times.

Mr. Murdock, who recently purchased a new Beechcraft Bonanza, is still active as a pilot at the age of 83, even though his close friend, the late Walter Beech, said to him in 1928, when Murdock was 45 years old, "Murdock, you're too old to fly."

"I will show you who is too old," retorted Murdock. "Get me an airplane and an instructor, and I'll show you." And so it was that Beech secured for Murdock an instructor and in 1929 sold him an OX-5 powered open-cockpit Travel Air. Many of you OX-

5'ers here today probably remember this well. Receiving his private license (No. 5964—mine is 1062536 and I have been at it some 20 years) and a certificate signed by none other than Orville Wright in April 1929, Murdock became aviation's most enthusiastic booster in a town that was then beginning to consider itself the air capital of the world.

Using his airplanes extensively for news gathering and picture taking for his newspaper, he was one of the real pioneers in the development of aviation.

Flying in those early days without the benefit of such now-taken-for-granted items as navigational aids, dependable engines and prepared airfields, Murdock had his share of catastrophes. But since there are FAA people present, it will suffice to say that during his first few years in aviation, he permanently retired two Travel Airs and a Cessna. Yet, in six unorganized landings, the only injury he ever sustained was a broken tooth. This occurred when, having flipped a Travel Air on its back landing on a rough field, he unbuckled the seat belt and fell out on his head.

Always a spokesman for aviation interests in Kansas, Murdock was instrumental in establishing airfields all across the State. In Wichita alone he took an active part in developing three municipal airports, including the present \$10 million-plus facility.

During World War II, he served as a captain in the Civil Air Patrol and flew his Cessna C-3 on practice missions. In 1947 he purchased the fastest 4-seat airplane on the market, a Beechcraft Bonanza. Fascinated by the new lightweight (for those days) navigational and radio equipment being made available to general aviation, Murdock determined that he would become an instrument pilot and began taking instrument instruction early in 1954. In July of 1955, at the age of 72, he passed the CAA instrument written test with a perfect score of 100. Up until that date no one had ever done this and to date only two others have. This is the only thing in our close and personal association for which I have never forgiven him. It took me three attempts to pass the written and I finally did with a score 1 point above passing. I will say that I have logged more actual instrument time than he, but this is merely a monument to monumental lack of judgment. You know the saying quoted among us birdmen, "There are old pilots and there are bold pilots, but there are no old, bold pilots." Marcellus Mayberry Murdock was 83 yesterday. At the age of 82, he received his multi-engine rating in the corporation's Beechcraft Baron and today at the age of 83, flies not only his 1963 model Beechcraft Bonanza almost daily, but the twin Baron, and wears proudly his mach buster pin on his lapel, having exceeded the speed of sound in a F-100 Super Sabrejet. Further, he is still passing his FAA physicals with what must seem to many younger men, a disgusting regularity.

When asked if he has any regrets about his long career in aviation, this intrepid open-cockpit veteran of engine failures, bird collisions, forced landings, ground loops, and a multitude of other close shaves and near misses too numerous to catalog, replies, "Only one, that I didn't start flying 20 years sooner."

He was a member of the first board of directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, and for 10 years headed the aviation committee of the chamber. His many activities in State and municipal organizations which have promoted the educational, social, and cultural life of the State, and of this community, are numerous. He has found time to serve on the Community Chest from its beginning in 1923 and still serves on the United Fund board of directors. He received the first honorary degree conferred by the University of Wichita since 1944 when Milton Eisenhower was similarly honored (the first

since 1932) on August 18, 1963, when they conferred upon him the degree of doctor of humane letters during Wichita University's summer commencement ceremonies. During 83 years of vigorous living in a period of phenomenal growth and expansion for Wichita and Kansas, he has, through organizational connections and professional journalistic activities, been an integral part of the development of the culture of our community and our time. His life span, which began in Wichita on February 14, 1883, covers all but 22 years of the life of the State of Kansas.

He has served the city of Wichita and the State of Kansas with integrity and distinction. His career reveals a long and enviable tradition of progress and foresightedness. He possesses, moreover, the personal qualities of humility, courage, and intelligence.

It is indeed most fitting and proper that we here assembled today should seize the privilege of doing ourselves the honor of commemorating this 88 years of service to our area and the Wichita Eagle and Beacon, the newspapers that serve it.

Daylight Saving Time Uniformity Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent statement in support of national uniformity in starting and ending dates for daylight saving time has been made by Lloyd Brandt, manager, legislative department of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Brandt testified before committees in both the House and the Senate. S. 1404 passed the Senate and soon we will be considering the question in this body.

I am sure the problems raised in Minnesota by the lack of time uniformity are typical of many States. Many of my colleagues will recognize the type of confusion described in Mr. Brandt's testimony before the Senate committee as follows:

STATEMENT OF LOYD BRANDT, MANAGER, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE ON S. 1404, APRIL 26, 1965

Mr. Chairman, we are happy to have the opportunity to read a short statement from our organization.

The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce by resolution of its board of directors, supports S. 1404.

After years of experience in our State legislature, it is our conclusion that a national bill is the only way to bring order out of chaos. This bill has definite limitations, but it is a step in the right direction.

This is the situation in Minnesota. The time statute in Minnesota orders daylight saving time from the fourth Sunday in May to Labor Day. However, communities along the Wisconsin border such as Duluth, Winoona, and a host of smaller towns moved their clocks forward the last Sunday in April to conform to daylight saving time being observed in Wisconsin. On the fourth Sunday in May, the rest of the State will go on fast time except certain communities along the Dakota border. The same procedure will be followed in the fall—some cities remaining on daylight saving time while the State goes back to central standard time.

As a result of this confusion, for 6 months all Minnesota clocks are the same. During the remaining 6 months various combinations of time can be found in the State depending on what month or day it happens to be.

I don't need to tell you what kind of problems are presented to the transportation companies, radio and television, and others by this confusion. These are isolated industries, however, and if only they were affected, it might be a tolerable situation.

Such is not the case; the efficiency of every major company if affected. We are a grain, finance, and electronics center and for the most part, our community of interest is with the East. The great majority, 80 percent of long-distance telephone calls originated in the Minneapolis area are with the eastern connections. During the period that we are on central standard time and the East is on daylight saving time, our time for telephone contact with the eastern offices is reduced to less than 2 hours per day.

Gentlemen, we are traditionally a conservative organization. We don't usually look too favorably upon Federal solutions to local problems. In this case, however, we feel justified in requesting your intervention in what has heretofore been a local matter. This does involve commerce across State lines and it is a problem that cannot or will not be satisfactorily resolved by the States.

In Minnesota, I am sure that after reapportionment, our problem will be solved as we get heavier dominations from the urban areas and we will go into conformity with the East. But I would call your attention to the fact that there are many other States that are then going to be faced with the same problem that we have had for the last 8 years—in the Dakotas, in Nebraska where there has been rural domination, and as the urban areas are more heavily represented in their legislatures, they are going to start struggling with this problem of if they have daylight saving time, how long, and arriving at some kind of compromise.

So we urge the passage of S. 1404. We think it is a step in the right direction since we are one of the few communities of our size in the country that isn't on the standard 6 months daylight saving time.

Blessings After Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, although I cannot say that I relish the postponement of some of the tax cuts we made last year, nor do I ever really enjoy paying taxes, I think that a column from the files of the Pomona Progress-Bulletin of December 15, 1965, written by Joseph H. Firman, has a succinct message in this regard. The article follows:

BLESSINGS AFTER TAXES

(By Joseph H. Firman)

Having coffee—and in my favorite greasy spoon the other morning, I was afflicted by sense of dependency such as comes over every thinking man from time to time, and I heaved a deep sigh as I sloshed a chunk of doughnut about in the coffee.

An elderly over-easy-and-bacon next to me glanced my way.

"Whoosh." I said, in answer to his unspoken invitation to unburden my soul "Taxas. I mean, taxes."

February 17, 1966

**Statement of George F. Kennan Before the
Senate Foreign Relations Committee**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador George Kennan is one of the men most qualified to give advice on our foreign policy and our outstanding export on communism.

His statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should be read by every American.

I am therefore entering it into the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. KENNAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

So we move into the second half of this decade with a most fortunate combination of circumstances: A nationwide concern with the environment and the economic wherewithal to translate this concern into action programs.

Last year, the Congress provided great impetus to this situation, with both the Housing and Urban Development Act and the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The President also delivered a special message on developing goals for natural beauty. The latter pricked the conscience of almost every American community and has stimulated a growing preoccupation with the shape and condition of our total environment.

In closing, there are a couple of important aspects of our whole approach which I want to emphasize. First, I cannot stress strongly enough that every effort will be made to see that what are perhaps the two most enduring characteristics of the city—diversity and opportunity—are greatly enhanced through all our programs.

Diversity is what makes the city exciting and vital. We recognize that it must be fortified and made to thrive. There must be room for all peoples, of many incomes and with many different notions about what constitutes the good community. Hopefully, these will continue to be aired, in democratic fashion, and out of the continuing consensus will come the sort of urban environment which can continue to make the democratic city the chief symbol of civilized men.

Diversity is a hollow virtue without opportunity, and the President has emphasized that the demonstration cities program will aim squarely at creating new opportunities not only for employment and training, but also in the choice of housing available and the use of community facilities. While we demonstrate new ways to achieve maximum opportunity, I trust we no longer need demonstrate that this is the essential element of the democratic city. That is what the rest is all about.

Another key aspect of this new program is an emphasis upon quality which will pervade every element of every project. This means not only the highest regard for architecture and design, but also for the critical interplay of building and spaces, for the strategic positioning of open green spaces and plantings, for the opening up of those areas long congested by rubble-filled alleys and junkyards, and for the development of community vistas which can make a lasting contribution to a spirit of pride and spiritual enrichment.

The words I have been using today fall into easy sequence:

The opportunity for a better life, and to demonstrate workable solutions toward that goal through the carefully geared workings of our flexible constitutional system—creative federalism.

In the months to come, you will see the things I have been talking about coming to life. A major instrument to achieve this will be the demonstration cities program with its equally important companion proposal for demonstrations in comprehensive metropolitan planning.

In any case, our urban programs will be carried forward with a greater sense of purpose as our system evolves more effective solutions to problems plaguing our cities and metropolitan areas. In that process, our constant concern will be to lift the horizons of hope and expectation of urban America. For we are convinced that there can and must be a better America. We are dedicated to make a significant contribution to that objective. And we know that it can be achieved only through a partnership between government at all its levels and society, with all its elements involved.

regime would find it either necessary or desirable, in present circumstances, to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power. In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect of a limited Communist success in that area seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that led to our present involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate—as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today; and by the same token I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious, on the other hand, that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions, ulterior to the basic long-term problem, which have to be taken into account. A precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place. This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, will have to be recognized not only by the more critical of our friends but by our adversaries as well.

I have, at the same time, great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if, by the use of that term, we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims. I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes. There seems to be an impression that, if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear, there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have, between them, a great deal of space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that, if really pressed to extremity on the military level, they should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence, rather than accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayal of the political prospects of the causes to which they are dedicated. Any total rooting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life, and civilian suffering generally, for which I should not like to see this country responsible. And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China in one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another

The first point I should like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to. Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory. Were it not for the considerations of prestige that arise out of our existing involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not present, in my opinion, dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention. Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent political course. There is no reason to expect that such a

February 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A805

Today, concern over issues has given way to concern for broad problems. As contemporary problems such as poverty, social disorganization, civil rights and rampant urbanization become readily identified, creative federalism responds with solutions instead of ideologies.

This approach involves the initiation and shaping of new responses to urban and other domestic problems through a complicated interplay of many forces, public and private. In terms of urban problems, the major responsibility for such responses rests with government, as the public welfare is the focus.

Yet private enterprise and private institutions are increasingly being called upon, in this new form called creative federalism, to play key roles not only in program execution, whether as homebuilders or campus developers, but in policy formulation as well.

This development, still in its early evolution, parallels what is happening in the defense and space industries. These are today's vast complexes of private and public enterprise, contiguous in their operations at many different points but ordered systematically within the context of specific problems to be solved.

But let me first indicate the broader framework. Creative federalism stresses local initiative, local solutions to local problems. The Federal role as a partner in creative federalism will continue to be one of support for locally initiated and locally administered activities. But this is not a passive role. Where the obvious needs for action to meet an urban problem are not being fulfilled, the Federal Government has a responsibility at least to generate a thorough awareness of the problem.

The goals we have set for urban America are the most ambitious in our history. The times call for inventiveness and ingenuity to match the welter of change boiling in and around our great metropolitan areas. Indeed, none of our institutions is likely to be the same by the time this century draws to a close—by the time we have built another urban America.

Thomas Jefferson suspected and even feared the city. He was a gentleman farmer at heart, although certainly the most urbane farmer in this or perhaps any nation's history. But Jefferson understood change, and the necessity for adapting to it. And he once described change in a democratic society in terms which come strikingly close to defining what we now call creative federalism:

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

And so creative federalism and the approaches which evolve from its conceptual framework will, indeed, change our institutions. It must, if these institutions are to survive.

Our approach today stresses innovation and the breaking of customary ineffective patterns. We intend to do this through experiment and demonstration.

Last year, a striking innovation in providing housing for low- and moderate-income families was proposed. The President called the program, for rent supplementation, "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city." It would bring the strength of the private building market to bear directly upon our greatest unsolved urban problem—the construction of decent housing for low-income families. This program involves mortgage insurance offered by FHA at market rates of interest of nonprofit, limited dividend and coopera-

tive sponsors. The housing is privately owned, managed, and privately financed.

Although the Congress has not yet funded this critically needed program, interest has built up terrifically in the past several months. We have already received preliminary proposals from sponsors for the construction of nearly 70,000 low-income units. These proposals have come from 265 different localities in 43 States, and sites are already available for 40,000 of the units. There is no disputing the need for or the interest in this program.

Now we have pushed into the most dramatic form of experimentation this urban nation has ever seen—striving to demonstrate that whole chunks of cities, large and small, can be reborn in the image of this Nation's promised urban greatness.

Yesterday, I spoke to a group of 400 municipal leaders from Connecticut. I outlined how this new demonstration cities program will work. I stressed that its failure or success rides principally upon their own inventiveness and ability for effecting the changes so badly needed to make their cities viable systems for human development. Their response gives me as much confidence as anything I have yet heard in the capacity of the American city to adapt to change. Most important, even while understanding that not all Connecticut cities can be in at the beginning of this experimental program, these officials realize that the solutions and approaches which will be developed, throughout the Nation, will help them in their own problem solving. For while we have come to see that the city holds a myriad of facets to every major problem, there are solutions which can be developed and tailored to fit every individual situation. That is what we are looking for in this program.

This is, in a very real sense, where it all comes together. The President's message shows the way. It indicates that this new program has three major thrusts:

To concentrate all available resources in planning tools, in housing construction, in job training, in health facilities, in recreation, in welfare programs, in education—to improve the conditions of life in urban areas.

To coordinate all our available talent and skills.

To mobilize local leadership and private initiative, so that local citizens will determine the shape of their new city freed from the constraints that have handicapped their past efforts and inflated their costs.

Solutions will be tailored by local officials, with a minimum of Federal direction but a maximum of Federal assistance and technical aid. Those cities developing the most imaginative solutions and energetic leadership will be the first aboard. This is, perhaps more than anything else, a time for the testing of the ingenuity and resiliency of the American urban intellect.

These demonstrations, and indeed all our programs, will be operated from a new context which in itself reflects the creative federalism of which I have been speaking.

As most of you know, we have been in the midst of drastic reorganization, aimed at making all of our programs—including demonstration cities—most effective. At the same time, we are developing new management techniques, under the so-called planning-programming budgeting system, for getting the maximum impact from Federal expenditures, as well as the fullest measure of administrative efficiency.

The new organizational structure we are developing is facilitated by the legislation which created the new Department. That legislation places in the Secretary the authority to administer and effectively supervise all the programs now in, and to be assigned to, the Department. With such new powers, we are rearranging functions. In the organizational structure that will soon be announced responsibilities for super-

vision and direction of the major activities of the Department will be delegated to Assistant Secretaries. The grouping of activities, however, will be oriented to broad problem solving rather than on the basis of bureaucratic identification. For we are resolved that traditional agencies must be integrated to meet total objectives.

Consistent with principles of sound public administration and responsive to the needs of urban America, we shall place greater decisionmaking authority closer to the problems and the people. For those programs which are established, the decisionmaking authority will be in the regional offices. And in the new demonstration cities program, much of the decision authority will be at the local level centered in Federal coordinators.

These novel officials will be located at the local level. They will not, as has been affirmed, look over the shoulders of the mayors. Rather they will serve the local communities by coordinating HUD programs, assisting in the coordination of other Federal programs, aiding local officials in securing cooperation on the part of State agencies, and generally expediting Federal activities in the locality. Their usefulness has been recognized by many mayors in the Nation. Speaking for a group of them, Mayor McKeldin of Baltimore recently said that they had been disabused of the fear that the Federal coordinator would be a czar dictating local policies.

Thus, in this new Department we are beginning to give form and substance to the new federalism. Our efforts will be supported by a continuing program of research, demonstration, and experimentation. Not the least of our concerns will be to assert leadership for, and encourage, the development of techniques to solve the administrative problems which emanate from the long-existing proliferation and overlapping of local governments. We shall, with continuing careful evaluation of results, attempt to utilize and apply the newer tools of systems analysis to urban problems.

Two weeks ago, President Johnson called for vigorous support so that 1966 could indeed be, in his words, "the year of rebirth for American cities."

This rebirth, this rebuilding of our great cities will start against the backdrop of the strongest economy in U.S. history. This year, the gross national product is expected to total over \$722 billion, representing a rise of 5 percent in real growth, after accounting for possible price changes. Perhaps most important, this great and growing economic strength provides us with the opportunity to utilize as fully as possible our manpower and to direct a maximum effort at relieving those dislocations in our labor market which have particularly afflicted cities with pools of unemployed.

The economy is strong and the temper of the Nation is, as I have already indicated, for change and continued striving toward a better life. This might seem surprising because it has often been assumed that in times of prosperity, democratic peoples are content to sit and live off the fat of the land. This is hardly true today. Not only is there widespread support for a major campaign against poverty, both in cities and rural areas, but the Nation is even exercised about beauty. And if you don't believe that,

I refer you not only to the tremendous enthusiasm generated by last year's White House Conference on Natural Beauty, but also to what happened recently in the Kentucky Legislature, which just passed a pioneering law restricting strip mining in the State. This action opens the way for seven other nearby and adjacent States to enter into a compact which would halt the ravages of this wasteful practice, which has so brutalized the landscape.

February 17, 1966

A807

one which is no less weighty. This is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity. Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously as was to be expected—and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is involved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them. More unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feeling entertained toward us by the Japanese people. The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had—and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where today the snarls of modern war could be produced on a formidable scale, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia. There is no success we could have in Vietnam that could conceivably warrant the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people. Yet we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort. It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among other peoples normally friendly to us. Our motives are widely misinterpreted; and the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary of our operations may seem to us to be, produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country. I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that it is so, and that it is bound, in the circumstances, to be so. A victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

These are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict; and why I hope that we will continue to pursue vigorously the question for such a resolution of it, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives and if the resulting settlement appears to us as less than ideal. I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation; but everything I know about its political aspects suggests to me that General Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there. I have listened with interest to the arguments that have

been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the much wider areas which expanded hostilities, if successful, would presumably bring under our normal control. Nor do I understand the argument that our allies will lose confidence in us if we fail to press forward aggressively in Vietnam. In the first place, I am not aware that any serious commentator has been pressing for anything like a total and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. But even if that were the case, it seems implausible to me that we should suffer much loss of confidence on that account at the hands of a Britain which has wisely and tolerantly liquidated great portions of its former colonial empire since the recent war; of a France which has only recently, in an impressive exhibition of statesmanship, withdrawn from its former north African possessions; or of a Netherlands which, under our urging and encouragement, has had the generosity to give up the great territories in Indonesia. In matters such as this, it is not, in my experience, what you do that is decisive; it is how you do it. I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the Government of that territory, I would like to note what that commitment really consists of and when and how it was incurred. What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain foreign political entity but to assure the internal security of its Government in circumstances where that Government is unable to assure that security by its own means. Now any such obligation is one that goes, obviously, considerably further than the normal obligations of a military alliance. If we did not really incur it in any formal way, then we should not be inventing it for ourselves, and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it, today. But if we did, then I fail to understand how it was possible for us, in entering into any such commitment, to bypass the processes of senatorial advice and consent which were meant to come into play when undertakings of even lesser import than this were entered into.

Now just two concluding observations:

First, I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them, men and commanders alike. I have no doubt that they can and will, if duty requires, produce military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities but the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, let me say that I am not looking at this whole problem from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their methods, dictatorial and oppressive in their aims. Their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded, arrogant, and outrageous. A country which fell under their exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy. And I would hope that this eventuality, at least, can be prevented by our present effort.

But our own country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores,

from our culture, and from the experience of our people. In saying this, I am only paraphrasing, and very poorly, words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee existed in his day, would certainly have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind. They were spoken in this city 145 years ago, on the Fourth of July 1821. Some of you may be familiar with them, but they will stand repeating at this moment.

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers." "But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatrix of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Gentlemen, I do not know exactly what Adams had in mind when he spoke those lines; but I think that, without knowing it, he spoke very pertinently to us, and very wisely.

TV and America's Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Oklahoma editor, publisher, author, and syndicated columnist, never misses a chance to prick America's conscience. He points out:

History is endless repetition of the truth that the most glittering civilizations collapse if the central core rots out with corruption, crime, and license.

When he lectured publishers on the subject several years ago, he stated the case so colorfully that reprints of his speech were immediately exhausted, and new ones ordered. The speech made a hit in Congress, too. I believe a dozen Members, besides myself, asked permission to put it in the RECORD.

Now he has turned to the television industry with both praise and needle. He applauds proposals within the industry for turning the cathode tube on the problem of "patching the slow leak in America's moral values" and for "pumping up some pride and spirit in the business of citizenship and prosocial behavior."

Inspiration for his column in the Washington Star last Saturday is a proposal filed recently with the National Association of Broadcasters by its new Ad Hoc Committee on American Values.

Like Mr. Jones, I am hopeful that the committee's call for programing which counterbalances the present path of least resistance, the featuring of violence, mayhem, and passion will meet with prompt action.

The ad hoc committee accents something most of us have known a long time, first, that there is a positive side of American life—for every criminal there are 1,000 law-abiding people—and second, that the positive does not have to be made dull on television.

Columnist Jones refers to some television attempts to be positive as perfunctory wastage of prime time by amateur sermons produced by the office boy, and urges the industry to use its best genius to remind America that good living is good living and that national survival depends upon national behavior.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record at this point the column, "TV and America's Conscience," by Jenkin Lloyd Jones from the Washington Star of February 12.

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

TV AND AMERICA'S CONSCIENCE

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

There is a lot more to selling the good life in America than depicting the good guy telling the bad guy with a kick in the stomach and a karate chop.

And to start selling the good life in America over the powerful medium of television is the self-appointed task of a new Ad Hoc Committee on American Values headed by Charles H. Crutchfield, president of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte, N.C.

In a report to the board of directors of the National Association of Broadcasters on January 28, Crutchfield and five leading TV executives came up with specific proposals toward turning the cathode tube on the problem of patching the slow leak in America's moral values and pumping up some pride and spirit in the business of citizenship and prosocial behavior.

Crutchfield and his committee indict the broadcasting business on two counts. First, its preoccupation with the lawless, the abnormal, and the sleazy in American life.

"For every criminal," says the committee, "there are 1,000 law-abiding people; for every juvenile delinquent there are 20 constructive kids; for every member of an extremist group there are 180 members of moderate philosophies. While the featuring of violence, mayhem and passion is the path of least resistance, it is the legitimate task of an American values committee to call for the addition of programing which counterbalances them."

Second, the Crutchfield committee tackles the plea by broadcasters that seminars or documentaries on social problems cause most viewers to twist the station knob. The positive can be made dull, but it doesn't have to be. As Crutchfield puts it:

"If we can sell soap, we can sell sanity. If we can sell cigarettes, we can sell citizenship. If we can sell hardware, we can sell honesty. If we can sell razor blades, we can sell responsibility. We can sell American values to the American people. And it is a product they need."

Crutchfield's group points to a recent survey of 45,000 people published in This Week magazine on a choice of 15 national goals. The majority placed the control of inflation as No. 1, the raising of human standards—moral, religious, intellectual, and physical—as No. 2, and the control of crime and labor racketeering as No. 3.

The committee admits that a lot of uplift programs are horribly dull. On crime, for example, an inarticulate police chief appears on the screen to bumble through a ream of statistics. But, says Crutchfield, consider the impact on a youngster if a hard-hitting professional TV personality looked straight into the camera and unloaded something like this:

"Ever thought about robbing a bank? Do you want to be an idiot? The average bank robber makes \$75 for every year he spends in prison. Seventy-five dollars a year. You could make a better salary every week, and in freedom. Nine out of ten bank robbers are promptly caught. Would you walk across an expressway if you had 9 chances out of 10 of being hit before you got to the other side?"

The pitfalls of teenage marriages, the ultimate agony of dope addiction, the life-time millstone hung around the neck of the youth who gets a criminal record, the long dark tunnel of alcoholism, the bitter taste of promiscuity—all these have lent themselves to high and absorbing drama in literature, and in the hands of experts they can make high and absorbing drama on TV.

A hedonistic nation, ever more dedicated to the quick satisfaction of appetites, has no uncertain future. History is endless repetition of the truth that the most glittering civilizations collapse if the central core rots out with corruption, crime, and license. The road down which the movie moguls are currently taking as bears the wheel ruts of ancient Rome, Egypt of the Ptolemies, Constantinople, and Imperial France.

The power of popular TV should have a higher mission in modern America than the chasing of rustlers, the leering dropout, and the exposure of cleavages down to here.

It is time for the television industry to shoulder this responsibility, not by the perfunctory wastage of prime time by amateur sermons produced by the office boy, but by using its best genius to remind America that good living is good living, and that national survival depends upon national behavior.

What We're Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of a local radio station in San Diego, KSON, set a realistic example of community and national service for the country's broadcasters to take note of. KSON president, Dan McKinnon, son of our former colleague Clinton D. McKinnon, has sponsored a "Why We're Fighting in Vietnam" contest and the results attracted exceptionally thoughtful reaction from KSON listeners.

Dan McKinnon's creative and catching contest produced three winning statements from San Diego listeners and under unanimous consent I include them as a portion of my remarks:

WHAT WE'RE FIGHTING FOR

(By Herb Travis, San Diego, Calif.)

The reasons for the war in Vietnam are many and varied.

The most important reason is communism has got to be stopped, somewhere, somehow. The United States has decided that Vietnam is where it must end. If com-

munism is not stopped there, it will spread to here. That must not happen.

Our boys are giving their all, so that we at home can enjoy this Christmas and many more to come.

The war is being fought to show the world and those who wish to control it, that we will not and that we are tired of other countries being overrun, stepped on, beaten, starved, raped, murdered, and Vietnam is the place where the United States of America has decided that communism has to end.

And remember all the freedoms we enjoy and the life we are accustomed to, and all the things which we take for granted, are at stake.

Maybe my reasons aren't the best, but these are the things that run through my mind.

There are five more reasons, personal ones, for the war in Vietnam: So my wife, Donna, my sons, Jimmy and Billie, and my little daughter, Debbie may live, grow, and work as they please. Freedom to do as they please.

WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING FOR

(By Bernard Wewer, El Cajon, Calif.)

In Asia, in the whole of this planet for that matter, we are fighting for many things, including our own freedom. Communism is a greater threat to us than the Nazi Party was some 25 years ago.

Adolf Hitler tried taking over the world in the same manner as Alexander the Great and the Romans did thousands of years ago—by brute force. This way of doing it—Hitler's way—arouses anger, hatred, and a will to fight back in the people the aggressors try to conquer. In Vietnam and all over the world we are fighting for countries, freedom, and human beings. With lies, empty promises, and sometimes by force if need be, Red China and Russia make America look like a horrible monster in the eyes of the people in other countries.

Their aim is to get a strong grip on the minds of the people in Africa, Asia, South America, Central America, and Mexico, so they could choke the United States to death. With America out of their way, they could go on to England and the rest of Europe. If they succeed in their takeover in Vietnam, that will make so many more men for their army, more land upon which they can build army and navy bases. That strengthens them and weakens us—so we can't afford another Laos, Korea, or Hungarian revolt. Russia and Red China seem to respect power and a country that steps forward, not back, when its toes are stepped upon.

The late President Kennedy proved this when he began to push back when Russia tried to bluff its way through the Cuban crisis. President Eisenhower didn't back up the Hungarian people in their revolt as he had promised. What made Russia think that America wouldn't back down again? If America did, it would make us appear afraid in the eyes of the world. South America and Asia, along with other parts of the world made up of smaller and weaker countries, will give up to communism sooner if they think America isn't going to back them up. After all, how can such small countries hope to stand up under the huge, powerful Soviet Union without outside help? Russia made a bluff, J.F.K. called it, and Russia backed down. This made a few people think that the great Soviet Union isn't such hot stuff after all.

Russia failed with their mixture of psychology and bluffs, so now Red China is trying to back Johnson in a corner. Now that the United States came out fighting, Red China can't give up just like that. If they do, they lose face. If they keep fighting and lose, they'll have to try something else or feel humiliated. If they fight and win, we, as Americans, lose. We lose what respect we have in Asia, and it'll make it harder to put in more and bigger bases in the yet free countries there.

February 17, 1966

What I've said hasn't made much sense, but one thing should be as plain as a smog-free day. Every inch of land lost to communism is that much closer to conquering the whole world. It is only a buildup to their all-out attack on the United States and their attempts to strip us of everything from our 10 cent cigars to our minds themselves. We would just be another country with no free enterprise, no churches, no personal freedom of any kind, and no right to even the shirts on our backs. If we let other countries fall one at a time, no matter how small that country is, as far as we know, America may be the next to fall. That's what I think we are fighting for in Vietnam, no matter how mixed up it sounds.

WHAT WE'RE FIGHTING FOR

(By Donald Biddy, San Diego, Calif.)

Since the Red Chinese came into power they have left a crimson trail of blood in the wake of their conquests and aggression. To establish their government in China required a blood purge of millions of their own people. Everyone, who in the opinion of the Red leaders, represented a threat (whether real or imaginative) to their government were either imprisoned or brutally murdered. Should they take over our Nation today, tomorrow could very easily be your last day on earth—especially if you are over 30 years old, of religious inclination, or just plain patriotic to the American way of life.

The Red Chinese extended their aggression into Vietnam, and North Vietnam fell to them becoming their satellite. The South Vietnamese, like the South Koreans, did not want to come under Communist rule. They wanted to remain free and independent, but were not strong enough to withstand the Communist aggression—armed terrorists, political and civil agitators, guerrilla activity, and all types of scientific aggression inspired, governed, and implemented by the Communist political machine now solidly established in North Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese had a decision to make. Either submit to a Communist takeover with its subsequent blood bath or engage them in a war for which they were totally unprepared. Either way meant the loss of numerous lives and eventual Communist takeover. They decided to fight for their freedom. If they were to lose their freedom, they would at least go down fighting.

They made an appeal to the United States for help. Not being a military nation they needed not only arms and ammunition, but technical assistance and expert advice as to how they might successfully resist the Communist aggression. To have looked the other way and made excuses or to have refused to help them, would have been a wanton act of inhumanity on the part of the United States.

Our initial role in the conflict was that of military advisers, but when the Vietcong, the internal South Vietnamese faction, began to receive help from North Vietnam, Red China and Russia in not only the form of arms and ammunition but armed troops from the north, we were forced to either get out and let them have South Vietnam or beef up our troops there and render physical as well as technical assistance.

To withdraw would be to let the Communists take over. This would be a great moral victory for them and only fan the fires of their dedicated determination to conquer the whole world—including us.

If we can beat them, over there we can not only preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese but seriously curtail the steady stream of Communist aggression and bloodshed flowing out of Red China.

We are in South Vietnam for the following reasons: First and foremost we are there on an errand of mercy helping a free people to retain their freedom. Next, we are there in our own interests (and of the entire free world) to stem the flow of Communist ag-

gression which they have made no qualms about their intentions to extend unto the uttermost parts of the earth—a sort of crime preventive measure.

Sure we could turn our backs and peacefully watch the rest of the free world gobbled up around us by the blood-letting Communist machine. But what will we do when we are the only free nation left? You can't fight the whole world, and we don't intend to.

A stitch in time can still save nine—may be more.

Small Business Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. Irving H. Dale delivered a presidential address to the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies at their seventh annual meeting held at the Plaza in New York City, on November 30, 1965.

I know Mr. Dale as an outstanding citizen of my city and State; I have also worked with him in matters affecting small business. I know the fine record made by him during his year as president of the trade association which represents SBIC's. During his tenure he set high standards of conduct and lofty goals for the industry.

I believe his remarks worthy of review and ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Dale's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS BY IRVING H. DALE,
 NOVEMBER 30, 1965

Four years of service as a member of the board and as an officer of NASBIC are drawing to a close tonight. Even if I were to harbor some romantic illusion that this entitles me to come before you to make speeches, to reminisce, and to act pontifical, I have come to know you well, and you to know me, and we both know that you won't abide any such nonsense. Furthermore, you owe me nothing, not even an obligation to listen. Although the work has been time consuming and often taxing, you know that I have enjoyed every minute of it and am really in debt to you for giving me the opportunity to make whatever contribution I have made.

Let's talk first and briefly about the past year, not as historians, but only for whatever light it throws on the future.

Our SBIC's have done better. They continue to make more and more investments. They have started to reap some of the rewards from their good investments. Some marginal SBIC's have left the industry, and others are planning to leave. Those that remain are becoming stronger. The prices of the stocks of the public companies have moved up and their stockholders are faring better. In some cases they are getting dividends and profit distributions.

Our reputation has improved. Other sectors of the financial community have come to know us better, and unless my senses and observations are deceiving me, their opinion of us is growing more favorable with every passing day. Our public relations programs, thanks to the near-unanimous support you

gave it, is well launched, and will enhance our stature.

Our relationship with the Government continues to be excellent. Perfect? No. Our legislative program, though absolutely sound and well conceived and strongly supported, was not enacted during this past year. Our tax bill has still not been introduced, and is still awaiting final approval in the Bureau of the Budget. Our capital bank bill is likewise being studied, and will, I hope but do not promise, be introduced in the next session of this Congress.

Businessmen continued to seek our financing and counsel. Our investment opportunities improved in quality. It was proved beyond any doubt that American small business needs the SBIC industry.

That's a brief but fair summary of last year. Now let's look ahead, and let us start with our relationship with the Small Business Administration. Never in the history of our industry has this relationship been as mutually respectful, as constructive, and as productive. I have no thought of recounting tonight the numerous changes that have taken place in the regulations. We will be hearing about them at our various business sessions and you have been reading them as they crossed your desks. I had a fond hope that I might be able to tell you tonight that every proposal we made was approved and has been put into effect. I cannot. The administrative process grinds slowly. If speed alone were the problem, the answer would be easy to find. There are other problems, however, and they reveal what I believe to be an issue of principle. This issue of principle is so basic that I propose to make it the central theme of this address.

My dear Milton Stewart uses an expression about the SBIC program; he harkens us to look at "the grand design." Consider those words. They can mean something quite pedestrian. "Grand" can mean, for instance, "overall"; and "design" can mean "pattern," and "grand design" can, therefore, mean "overall pattern" or "structure" or any other words which would allude to the laws, the rules, the regulations, and other formal matters. But "grand" can also mean "high," and "design" can also mean "purpose," or "social objective," and that leads us to think of "high purpose" and the social goals of the SBIC program. If we lose sight of our high purpose, we cease to be of importance in our society. Yet, as craftsmen, we must never forget that high purpose is not achieved only with fine words and noble demeanor; it takes a well conceived set of rules and regulations to make the high purpose achievable.

What is our purpose? Why were we created? Our Government correctly determined that small businessmen were not able to get the kind of long term capital that they needed to grow strong. It determined also that small businessmen need not only capital, but seasoned help and advice to achieve success in this complex society of ours. High purpose No. 1, therefore, is to see to it that small businessmen get this financing and this help. Whatever fosters their getting it is consistent with this high purpose; whatever blocks it is contrary to public policy.

But this high purpose cannot be achieved in a vacuum. We can't do our job unless we too are successful and confident enough to remain venturesome and to take the risks involved in backing independent business. If we are weak, if we don't prosper, if we grow timid or uncertain, if our activities are unduly obstructed, we won't perform our function. Whatever removes these hindrances is, therefore, consistent with the high purpose; and whatever perpetuates them is contrary to public policy.

In that simple basic context, what is the responsibility of our industry, and what is the responsibility of SBA, our regulator?

It is never to lose awareness of the high purpose, and to foster a practical pattern of regulation within which it can be achieved. We respect SBA too much, and I think they respect us too much, to permit ourselves to get bogged down in trivial details; but some of the most important things in life are an agglomeration of details, and the art of the skilled leader is to know what is trivial, and what is really part of the grand design.

There are many examples I could recount here of a running dialog on various issues that has been going on with people at the SBA. There is no need tonight to document my point. I just want to be sure that our eyes are always on the same goal, that we place a high value on that goal, and that we don't permit ourselves to be diverted from it. The crossing of t's and the dotting of i's is a function of pattern, not of high purpose.

The question should always be, will this or that regulation make it more likely that small businessmen will get more financing and more help. If the answer is yes, then everyone must move forward to fashion the words and details to bring it into being, and argumentation about clauses should be tolerated with only as much patience as a detail deserves in the light of the grand design.

No one should forget that small business is 90 percent in number of all American enterprise. Small businessmen are a major foundation in our society for the preservation of true democracy. They keep the large businessmen lively and alert and competitive; they keep open the door of opportunity to all young people starting out on their own careers, they police a real anti-trust program simply by creating a constant pressure of competitive talent and energy. They employ hundreds of thousands of people, render innumerable services, pay billions in taxes, and keep the basic dream of our society true. So long as small business survives, grows, and succeeds, men will know that in this country there is no elite society of managers, there is no elite group of economic power. There will be no position to which competent people cannot aspire and no measure of success for which they cannot hope. And this, in large part, is what democracy is all about.

I give you another issue to examine in the same perspective. Once again we are faced with the problems that arise with a change of administration of our program.

Gene Foley, that brilliant dynamo who contributed so mightily to our progress the past 2 years, has left us. This is but one in a repetitive series of changes over the years in either the Administrator's or Deputy Administrator's position. This necessarily creates doubt, confusion, and concern within the Agency, and, in turn, in our industry. This must affect adversely the rendering of the services we are expected to give to small business.

I suggested last year that it was a matter of important public policy to see to it that the SBA and the Investment Division in the SBA were headed at all times by outstanding men who would welcome it as a suitable career for a long period of time, and who would participate in the highest councils of Government. If the grand design is to help small business, then what is happening now and what has happened in the past and will continue to happen, hurts small business. It's against public policy. Why does it keep on happening? Is our governmental partner facing up to its responsibilities?

Let us, you and I, fellow SBIC'ers, now look at our responsibilities. Our task is supplying American independent business with the funds which history teaches it could not otherwise get and to give all the other aids we can to help it prosper.

I know that it may seem childish and unsophisticated to be talking of social responsibilities. After all, are we not money men, hard boiled, knowledgeable, intent only on profit? Should we not let the philosophers write the theses about responsibilities to society? Let's just make money. Don't label me an Idealist; such a reputation could destroy me. But surely hard headedness, overdone and unbalanced, removed from all feeling of what men owe men, is not sophistication; it is intellectual and emotional jaundice.

Let me say quickly that I do not mean that we must serve without profit to ourselves. Businesses that do not profit do not survive. What this adds up to, therefore, is that we are an industry charged with a vast public responsibility; that we intend to meet that responsibility with honor, with wisdom, and with profit both to those we help and to ourselves. In this goal, we should be joined by the executive and legislative arms of government.

The relationship between us is and should be a partnership. We should support them, and they us, to achieve the high purpose. If there are errors and malfunctions, let us press for their elimination.

When we need help, let us not be chary about asking for it. Remember that we go not as supplicants, not to win some tawdry private advantage, but as worthy and indispensable members of our economic society, who made a compact with our Government and they with us, and who simply call on our partners to do their share of the job so that we can do ours. We can afford to be, and have the duty to be, frank, outspoken, and untiring in our efforts to make our program increasingly effective.

This grand design, this high purpose, obliges us to exert our every joint effort to procure the enactment of the tax bill which we so urgently need in order to make us more effective instruments of public policy, and of the capital bank bill and of other legislative matters to which we have not yet given sufficient attention. From the very bottom of our hearts, we thank Gene Foley and Dick Kelley for taking on this major task and bringing it to the point of development where it now rests, but it would be both unfair and unwise to expect them to do it by themselves. It is up to us to go directly to our partner, to remind him of the high purpose of the program and to ask that support which partners ought to give to each other. That we shall achieve success in these goals is undoubted. I don't doubt it, because I know how staunch you are and you can be sure beyond a shadow of a doubt that your officers and governors are as firm in their dedication to this task as you could wish.

And now, at the risk of appearing insatiable in my appetites for this industry, let me make clear my personal conviction that when we have finally gotten the regulations into harmony with the grand design, when we have finally gotten the tax bill, when the capital bank has been organized and is functioning, we can then, and perhaps without even waiting for that moment, address ourselves to some truly basic problems that will challenge our strength and our talents.

Consider, for instance, the need for liquidity on the part of our own investors. The public companies are only part of the picture. What of the investors in private SBIC's who either because of discouragement, personal reasons, impatience, or personal need, desire to liquidate all or part of their investment? Of what meaning is the overly touted tax loss provision to a man who can't sell? Can you expect increased capital to flow into an industry when that capital will become rigidly locked in? And with all the irrelevant and unintended complications thrown upon our public companies by provisions of

the 1940 Investment Company Act which were never intended to apply to them, how can smaller companies afford to think seriously of becoming public? Does this mean that there is no way to give some measure of liquidity to their stockholders? I refuse to accept this hopeless conclusion. No one can persuade me that in this audience of intelligent and knowledgeable human beings, we can't find, if not a final answer, at least a vast improvement.

And what about liquidity in our investments in portfolio companies? Is the only recourse sale, merger, or going public in some limited regional market?

What does it mean for a small company to go public when the over-the-counter market is 100 or 200 shares a day and sometimes those shares are traded back and forth by the same brokers just to create the illusion of a market. Are we incapable of developing some instrumentality which will provide some measure of liquidity to our investment?

One day soon we must face up to the problem of valuing our portfolios. A balance must be struck. True, we can't permit overoptimistic Boards, or those influenced by questionable motives, to exercise an unfettered judgment in valuing things that have a limited market. But if truth is the objective, is it any less misleading to understate value than to overstate it?

In finding the answers to these problems we shall need the support and sympathetic understanding of SBA, SEC, the Congress, and the White House, and I am undismayed about getting this support if we do our homework and develop sound programs; I have this confidence because this liquidity will free funds and time and talent for small business, will increase the success of SBIC's, will multiply their usefulness, and will contribute to the forward march of American independent business. It fits in precisely with the high purpose for which we were created, and so long as our objectives are attuned to this purpose we can expect and will get all the aid and support we need.

Let us give thanks for the unwavering support of Senators SPARKMAN and PROXMIRE, to Congressman PATMAN, and many other legislators in both Halls of Congress on whose help we can count with complete confidence.

And am I not fortunate to be given this opportunity to express publicly the gratitude I feel and which I know I express on your behalf to Walter Stults, Charlie Noone, Al Hattal, and Eileen Biermann. There are no more capable association executives, and to this I can bring testimony not only from myself but from the people in Washington who have gone out of their way to tell it to me.

As I pass my nonexistent gavel on to my successor, I may be pardoned the human frailty of wondering whether what's happened this year at NASBIC has made an impact, and whether our labors and efforts will be remembered. I'm just vain enough to hope they will be. But there is one thing I don't have to wonder about. When our contributions to America have become sufficiently important that sensible historians will feel some urge to make a record of them, they will not fail to remember me for one thing, and that is, the part I played, however small, in helping to select the wonderful group of men who will follow me in the leadership of NASBIC, and in persuading them to serve. I'm in goodly company when I am succeeded by Grogan Lord, and after him, given good fortune, by Milton Stewart and Elliott Davis.

Those of you who know them well know how true is the assurance I give to the rest of you, that your interests could not be in better hands, and that our greatest accomplishments lie ahead.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

William Lockhart Clayton, who died Tuesday at the age of 86, was one of the truly great men of his time, and even though he scrupulously and consistently avoided the limelight to the extent that he could, he contributed notably to the shaping of the contemporary world and left behind him an imprint upon the affairs of men that never will be effaced.

He was one of a breed of men that is all too rare, in that he blended the hard realism that is essential to success in the world of business and commerce with an idealism, compassion for his fellow men and a high regard for human values that provided the foundation for a career of outstanding public service.

As a founder of the world's largest cotton company, an enterprise which contributed mightily to making Houston one of the major port cities of the world, he demonstrated his acumen and ability as a businessman. Through extensive philanthropies, he and Mrs. Clayton helped to enrich the lives of large numbers of their fellow citizens and the community as a whole.

In the area of public service, he will be remembered best as an originator of the Marshall plan which brought about the phenomenal postwar recovery of Western Europe. He believed passionately in the brotherhood of man. He was honored and respected in intellectual circles. He recognized and accepted the social responsibilities that go with wealth and business success.

If any one thing contributed most to the stature that he gained and deserved, it was perhaps the fact that he understood the realities of the world in which he lived. And in his thinking and conduct he proved that realism need not be incompatible with vision and the pursuit of goals that are part of mankind's deepest aspirations.

His counsel, as well as his services, were sought on frequent occasions by those in the highest echelons of Government. He responded without ostentation or fanfare. And, although he never sought elective office, he was an active participant in the political life of his Nation.

In the conflict between conservative and liberal political philosophies, which often seems to revolve around the question of value priorities, he once said that he considered himself a conservative liberal. In any case, he was a Democrat and remained staunchly loyal to that party throughout his life. Opposition partisans respected his views, as they respected him as a man.

Internationally, his special area of knowledge and expertise was that of trade and commercial relations between nations. This was based on personal experience with and understanding of the economic forces involved. But he recognized that economics, politics, and social considerations are inseparable, that they underlie and influence relations between countries as they do among individuals, and that they, therefore, are crucial in the continuing struggle for freedom and democracy.

By any measure, William Lockhart Clayton was a man of unusual talents and an outstanding citizen, not only of his community, State, and Nation, but the free world. Indeed, mankind as a whole is indebted to him. It is further along the road toward achievement of its goals as a result of his endeavors, only part of which were in Government. This and the welfare of his fellow men were the only rewards that he sought in a long and fruitful career of public service.

Members of his generation were fortunate to have had among them a man of his gifts, principles, and dedication, and the influence that he exerted will continue to be felt far into the future.

The Post joins with all his fellow citizens in saluting his memory and in extending con-

dolences to members of his family. He was a good and valued friend.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

WILL CLAYTON

"Economic nationalism," Will Clayton used to say, "just won't mix with political and military internationalism." In his quiet, courtly way, Clayton fought with a ruthless missionary determination for his creed, and it was Clayton as much as anyone who made economic internationalism come alive during the crucial transition period spanning the war and postwar years. He picked up where Cordell Hull left off in the newly created role of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Economic expertise found a place within Foreign Service sanctums for the first time in the heady early days of the Clayton regime at the State Department when the Marshall plan was born. Later, as an elder statesman peering down on Washington from retirement in Houston, he became one of the first to see the interrelationship between trade and aid in the Western approach to the developing countries.

The personal charm which gave Will Clayton his special finesse as a negotiator and bureaucrat was a blend of warmth and commanding dignity. His manner and style instantly conveyed the story of the self-made man who could go from a sharecropper's cabin in Mississippi to the cotton brokerage houses of Manhattan and then, at 63, to fulfillment in a new career as one of our exemplary public servants.

The Office of Emergency Planning Rendered Magnificent Service to Louisiana in Aiding and Assisting the State To Recover From the Effects of the Disastrous Hurricane Betsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Betsy was one of the most disastrous storms ever to hit this hemisphere in all history, and at the time that the Louisiana people so desperately needed help, and needed it quickly, the Office of Emergency Planning arrived—hardly before the wind stopped blowing. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson literally put them off the Presidential plane when it arrived in New Orleans with instructions to "get going and get the job done" and they did just that. They set up headquarters immediately and did an amazing job in the weeks that followed.

In view of this tremendous accomplishment, I have written the following letter of commendation to the Honorable Franklin B. Dryden, Acting Director of the Office of Emergency Planning:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.

HON. FRANKLIN B. DRYDEN,
 Acting Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. DRYDEN: There is an old adage which goes "a friend in need, is a friend indeed," and I would like to take this oppor-

tunity to thank your agency for being such a magnificent friend to the people of Louisiana in their hours of deepest need following the devastating Hurricane Betsy.

The fine assistance of your agency in organizing, coordinating, and directing Federal emergency relief held the tragic effects of this storm to a minimum by helping to prevent further loss of life and human suffering, and by aiding and assisting our State in overcoming this tragedy.

Louisiana will be forever grateful to your agency, and to your capable, hardworking representatives, who went far beyond the call of duty to come to the aid of our stricken State.

With kindest regards, I am,
 Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
 Member of Congress.

**Our Senator Becomes a Statesman—
 United States Vietnam Policy**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the finest weekly newspapers in Indiana is the Bloomington Star-Courier. It is also one of the largest and oldest newspapers in my State.

This respected newspaper recently editorialized on my position concerning our Vietnam policy. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Bloomington, Ind. Star-Courier of February 3, be printed in the Record.

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

OUR SENIOR SENATOR BECOMES A STATESMAN

Ebullient, young man in a hurry, R. VANCE HARTKE is now at age 46, Indiana's senior U.S. Senator.

Resoundingly elected and then reelected as a Democrat from normally Republican Indiana, HARTKE spent his first 6-year term learning the ropes, doing his homework well, and following the politician's maxim, "The best way to get along is to go along."

Now, to the surprise of many who had become resigned to VANCE HARTKE's bustling earnestness and his somewhat countrified political outlook, Senator HARTKE is showing all the signs of becoming a statesman, in the real sense of the word.

Long happy to be tagged as one of Lyndon Johnson's most dependable yes-men, Senator HARTKE has in the past year repeatedly demonstrated the independence, courage, and intelligence which set him apart from other young men and which propelled him steadily upward in this world.

Item: A few months ago, HARTKE alone had the courage to inveigh against L.B.J.'s appointment of a retired Air Force general to head the supposedly civilian-dominated Federal Aviation Agency (FAA). HARTKE warned against the ever-growing trend toward military men and retired brass hats controlling our Government. (Too many people have paid too little attention to President Eisenhower's farewell message which warned against the danger of the growing military-industrial complex.)

Item: Following L.B.J.'s state of the Union message asking for higher taxes and reimposition of recently lowered excise taxes, HARTKE

was among the few to doubt publicly whether the excise taxes should be reinstated.

Item: VANCE HARTKE led the 16 Democratic U.S. Senators who last week wrote President Johnson asking that he seriously consider not resuming the bombing of North Vietnam.

We're not sure whether we agree with all of HARTKE's positions on these issues. However, his information is far superior to ours, and we must assume from past performance that the Senator did not reach his dissenting opinions without patient study and deliberate judgment.

It is heartening to see a poor boy, who fought his way up from the little German village of Stendahl in rural Pike County, at last feel secure enough on the national political scene to reveal himself as a true Jacksonian Democrat who cares about the welfare of people.

So hats off to the emerging "New VANCE HARTKE," humanitarian and statesman.

Food and Grain Institute, a Center of Excellence, To Be Established at Kansas State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Kansas State University, of Manhattan, Kans., continues to set the pace in enlarging the world's knowledge in the areas of production and distribution of food through the establishment of the Food and Feed Grains Institute on that campus.

The scope and importance of this undertaking are outlined in a story in the February 8 issue of the *Southwestern Miller*. The editors of this fine publication also saw fit to editorialize on the center of excellence which this institute will become.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the news story and the editorial in the Appendix of the *Record*.

These items follow:

ESTABLISH FOOD AND FEED GRAINS INSTITUTE

MANHATTAN, KANS., February 7.—Establishment of the Food and Feed Grains Institute at Kansas State University to include the present internationally noted department of flour and feed milling industries and to expand the services to the grain processing industries and American agriculture was announced last week by Dr. James A. McCain, president of the university. The institute will also involve the university more fully in growing international food programs, it was announced.

Dr. Glenn H. Beck, university vice president for agriculture, who joined in the announcement, said the Food and Feed Grains Institute will be a "center of excellence" in training personnel for service in the industries with which it is concerned, in conducting research, and in providing needed information. It will be supported by the resources of the entire university.

The new institute, recently approved by the Kansas State board of regents, will incorporate the flour, feed, and baking activities of the university and also draw on the school's resources in human and animal nutrition, marketing, and grain production. Each of the programs, including milling, feed, baking, and others will be under a chairman with an overall director.

DR. WILLIAM J. HOOVER, DIRECTOR

For director of the institute, Dr. William J. Hoover, now administrative vice president of Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., in Washington, D.C., has been chosen. He will assume his new duties April 1.

Dr. Hoover will be the director and will also take over as head of the activities of the Department of flour and feed milling industries which Dr. John A. Shellenberger has headed with great distinction for 21 years.

Dr. Hoover, now 37, received three degrees at the University of Illinois, where he specialized in food technology. He has been in industrial research nearly 15 years. He also has been active in several professional and honorary organizations, including the American Chemical Society and the American Association of Cereal Chemists. He is a former chairman of the Washington section of the Institute of Food Technologists, and was chairman of that organization's session on cereals, starches and confections at its 1965 meeting in Kansas City. He is scheduled to preside as chairman of a session on cereal grains, industrial uses at the 1966 annual meeting of the AACCC in New York City in April. At last year's AACCC meeting in Kansas City, he presented a paper on "Challenges to Increased Cereal Product Utilization."

He began his career as a food technologist with the Quartermaster Food & Container Institute in Chicago in 1951, and a year later became an instructor at the University of Illinois. A number of his papers have appeared in technical journals. He was born in Champaign, Ill., in 1928.

SHELLENBERGER IN A MAJOR ROLE

Dr. Shellenberger has reached the regents' mandatory retirement age for university administrators, but will continue on the staff in an important position. The leadership of Dr. Shellenberger brought international attention upon the services of Kansas State University to milling, baking, and feed manufacturing and paved the way for the Food & Feed Grains Institute.

OUTLINE OF MAJOR OBJECTIVES

The major objectives planned for the institute were thus listed by Dr. McCain and Dr. Beck:

Educate and train personnel for the grain and feed processing and marketing industries.

Develop methods of milling and processing grains as foods for humans and feeds for livestock.

Study nutritional properties of grain and grain products for humans and for livestock. Investigate new food and industrial uses of grains with particular emphasis on wheat and sorghum.

Develop basic methods of evaluating quality in grains and grain products.

Study both economic and physical problems associated with handling, transporting, and storing grains and grain products.

Study domestic and international grain marketing structures.

Provide information to decisionmakers at State and National levels.

ALONE WITH UNIVERSITY DEGREES

The flour milling, feed milling, and baking courses of Kansas State University, now a part of the department of flour and feed milling industries, stand out in the world. It is the only school in the world granting a university degree in milling technology. It also offers the only 4-year baking program in the country which leads to a bachelor of science degree. The curriculum provides university training not only in milling and baking, but in engineering, the humanities, and in all the basic sciences. Students have enrolled in the department from all parts of the world.

The staff now includes specialists, milling engineers, biochemists, bacteriologists, microscopists, biologists, baking engineers,

business administrators, and experienced educators.

The facilities include a pilot flour mill, a pilot feed mill, and a baking laboratory, all equipped with the most modern machinery and devices. The equipment consists largely of gifts from various interests that aggregate hundreds of thousands of dollars.

FIRST MILLING LESSONS IN 1909

Instruction in operative milling at Kansas State University was inaugurated in 1909. The first instruction was by Prof. L. A. Fitz. Milling and baking tests have been conducted at the university since 1905. The early investigators included Dr. C. O. Swanson, who headed the department from 1923 to 1939 and brought to it worldwide attention. The milling department was headed by Dr. E. G. Bayfield from 1939 to 1945, and Dr. Shellenberger has been its head since 1945.

COORDINATE WITH U.S. FACILITY

The new Institute will be closely coordinated with the U.S. Grain Marketing Research Center to be established on the campus of Kansas State University and also with grain industries throughout the Nation, Dr. McCain said.

A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE

With an admirable record of invaluable contributions to the advancement of the grain growing and processing industries that has won it national and world acclaim, Kansas State University moved last week to add to its usefulness in this field. Dr. James A. McCain, president of the university, announced the establishment of a Food and Feed Grains Institute along lines that should cheer millers, bakers, feed manufacturers, and wheatgrowers in their quest for still greater achievements in production and distribution in their businesses. The institute, Dr. McCain disclosed, will aim not only to expand services to American agriculture and processing industries but, at the same time, involve the university more fully in the growing international food programs. It will weld together the present Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries, including flour milling, baking and feed milling facilities, with the university's resources in human and animal nutrition, marketing and grain production. It will be closely coordinated with the \$3,500,000 U.S. Grain Marketing Research Center being established on the university's campus. The aim is to make it a "center of excellence" in training personnel for industry and research and as a source of information. Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president of the university for agriculture, added in the announcement.

In the establishment of the institute, the highest level of the university, the work in milling, baking, feed milling, and other undertakings will acquire added prestige and importance within the organization. It will share in greater cooperation from all the other facilities of the university. To realize the ambitious objectives outlined for it, the institute will function through chairmen of its programs on flour milling, baking, and feed milling, and on other activities. The present Department of Flour and Feed Milling Industries will thus give way to the Food and Feed Grains Institute.

The objectives listed for the institute by Dr. McCain and Dr. Beck leave no doubt that it will be indeed busy and possess possibilities of inestimable results. Besides continuing in the training of personnel, for which the flour and feed milling and baking industries have already endowed the university with many thousands of dollars in money and equipment, the institute will study nutritional properties of grain and grain products for food and feeds, investigate new uses, seek to improve quality evaluation, and study economic and physical problems in handling and storage. It will also study

prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple: whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial on this subject in today's Washington Post at this point in my remarks:

THE TRIAL ENDS

The opprobrium which has descended on the Soviet Government for its conviction on two writers is richly deserved. Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel were guilty of nothing more than presenting the artistic version of the truth as they saw it. This is the single essential function of art.

That the two men were convicted for writing as prophets rather than parrots is not vitiated by the fact that they got a semipublic trial and not a star chamber hearing or a bullet. They were punished for their views; that is the central point. How self-degrading that the Soviet public should now be summoned to blindly condemn the two men for views it has never been allowed to read.

The irony is that the Soviet Union, like the United States and Upper Volta and every other inhabited point on this earth, vitally needs the kind of independent critical analysis supplied by Sinyavsky and Daniel. In the short run, perhaps, probing honest criticism of any established order may be embarrassing but in the long run it is essential. This is particularly so for the Soviet Union, whose every major advance has been in response to conscientious criticism. At each stage, the critics have first been suppressed.

The Soviet Government has acted as though the Sinyavsky-Daniel brief would undermine it. This is ridiculous. The Soviet system has admitted much criticism since Stalin, all belated and all beneficial. The Government still stands and the people rarely riot in the streets. Soviet power is strong and one wonders why the Kremlin should show so much more doubt than its native critics.

The Communist Party has an interest in maintaining a theoretical monopoly on "truth." Hence its compulsion to squat atop independent-minded men. But the party is in trouble, probably permanent trouble. Stalin used the terror to enforce the party's will, but nothing less will do. If some men will court death in order to speak out, many more men will speak out if they need not court death. Unless the Kremlin is willing to kill its critics, it must learn to live with them. Far better that it should recognize how valuable critics are.

Fighting Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Public Health Service has described alcoholism as among the worst of our public health menaces, ranking behind only heart disease, mental illness, and cancer. It has been estimated that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents due to alcoholism runs to some \$2 billion annually.

There are an estimated 5 to 6 million alcoholics in the Nation, 1 out of every 15 Americans who drink. Roughly 250-

000 persons each year join the ranks of alcoholics. Some 15 percent of all new admissions to public non-Federal mental hospitals in 1960 were alcoholics.

Yet, despite the heavy incidence of alcoholism and its human and economic costs, the Federal establishment today has relatively few programs dealing with this problem. To remedy this situation, on January 26 for myself and Senators COOPER, FANNIN, MURPHY, PROUTY, and SCOTT, I introduced the Alcoholism Control Act of 1966—S. 2834. This measure establishes an Office of Alcoholism Control under the Surgeon General to administer a program of matching grants to the States for treatment, rehabilitation, education, prevention, and research in alcoholism; the Office would also administer a program of research, training, and demonstration projects and coordinate alcoholism programs conducted by different agencies.

The Washington Post, in a February 14 editorial, has indicated support of this proposal as an approach which would "insure a nationwide effort to control a disease which is responsible for a staggering amount of human anguish and crime as well as the destruction of the careers and lives of too many of this Nation's citizens."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

TO FIGHT ALCOHOLISM

In light of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in the Driver case that chronic alcoholics cannot be prosecuted as criminals, a new emphasis must be placed on treating those afflicted with this most pernicious disease. If State and local courts come to accept the precedent of this decision, there will be heavy responsibility at the State and community level to provide adequate, well-run facilities for the treatment of alcoholism.

Fortunately JACOB JAVITS and several other Republicans in the Senate have proposed a measure that would institute a Federal grant-in-aid program to fight alcoholism. Senator JAVITS asks that an Office of Alcoholism be established under the Surgeon General "to administer a program of matching grants to the States for treatment, rehabilitation, education, prevention and research in alcoholism." The program would begin with \$3 million in the next fiscal year and rise to an annual level of \$9 million.

This approach would insure a nationwide effort to control a disease which is responsible for a staggering amount of human anguish and crime as well as the destruction of the careers and lives of too many of this Nation's citizens. With a push from the courts and the assistance of the Federal Government perhaps the battle against alcoholism can be pursued with more vigor.

Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter

from a man who has been very vocal in the past about the waste in the Job Corps program. After making a visit to the Job Corps center in Omaha, Nebr., he had this to say:

Went for a tour of the Women's Job Corps the other day. Am convinced it is a good deal. These girls were well groomed, bright-eyed, and looked like a group right out of some college home economics department. It is smart business for the Government to take dead-enders, spend \$3,000 to \$6,000 on them and put them in the income tax paying category—which it appears is what this center is doing. Costs are what they are, due to the very low teacher-student ratio. It is about 1 for 10 plus counselors and advisers.

Well, it is apparently working. These girls are working hard and taking a real interest in themselves and other people too. They are being exposed to experiences and values which the average kid grows up with. It is people helping people—not using or abusing or ignoring—but helping.

Let's spend the money. It will change lives for the better. How can such a thing ever be valued in dollars?

UN
It's Uncle Who Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Richard Starnes is a lucid columnist whose writings appear in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and others. He is a keen observer of national affairs. One of his keen and lucid observations was published on Monday, February 14, in the Washington News. I ask unanimous consent that this column entitled, "It's Uncle Who Pays" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

IT'S UNCLE WHO PAYS

(By Richard Starnes)

If the war in Vietnam follows the melancholy course of every other such mad enterprise, it will double in cost in 1967 (which would put the tab at \$30 billion and change), and then will level off and only increase by about 10 percent every year thereafter until it ends.

The official rationale for the high price of wars, first developed to explain why the Battle of Hastings was so infernally expensive, is that the machinery for making war is always becoming more complicated and hence more costly. Broadwords cost more than pikes, for example, and matchlocks cost more than longbows.

But it seems to me that our own crop of war budget apologists are missing an excellent opportunity for advancing the art of explaining the high cost of war. The old system is still effective, to be sure, for it is a fact that an F-105 costs a lot more than a Spad. But where is the planning for 100 years, which is what the current generation of intellectual generals is supposed to be noted for? The sensible man can now foresee the day when we will be back to fighting with clubs and large boulders, and then where is the glib explanation to Congress on why that war will cost more than the previous one?

Instead of explaining away the cost with the old story of more sophisticated hardware,

force of arms. Her actual independence lasted only a little over 20 years, but her spirit of independence is as high and brave as ever. Her people, both home and abroad, continue to resist the tyranny and oppression of Communist domination. I salute the courageous people of Lithuania, and look forward to the day when they will all be able to celebrate in truth her independence.

Embargo Problems in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to note in the Washington Evening Star, February 16, 1966 the comments of the syndicated columnist, Richard Wilson, on the subject of the rising concern over the continuation of free-world trade with North Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make this article available to the wider audience it deserves.

EMBARGO PROBLEMS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Wilson)

A contradiction in the Vietnam war that excites many people is the continuous supply of the Vietcong by U.S. allies, particularly the British. This is one of those problems that gets through to main street.

County newspapers are publishing letters from irritated readers who can't understand why our closest allies should engage in a profitable trade in war materials with our adversaries. Even Secretary of State Dean Rusk shows a little irritation when he notes that the British ask us to embargo Rhodesia but won't themselves embargo Hanoi.

Some high U.S. Navy officials are bothered by the contradiction, also. Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Pacific Fleet commander, says the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific "has the capability" to blockade or quarantine the North Vietnam ports, but he stops short of advocating it as do some Navy officials farther down the line at the Pentagon.

All through 1965 free-world ships piled in and out of North Vietnam harbors with vital supplies. About 150 vessels were at one time engaged in this trade under the flags of Britain, Norway, Greece, The Netherlands, Lebanon and even West Germany—all good allies.

Britain supplied the most shipping, probably about half of it. In 1965 a combination of pressure and high insurance rates began to cut into a trade that helped to supply the Vietcong.

At one time more than a dozen ships carried cargoes into Communist North Vietnam and then came into American ports to pick up or deliver shipments in the United States. These were mainly Greek ships. Such ships are now being blacklisted by U.S. maritime authorities from hauling Government-financed grain and other goods.

Now there is an interesting shift in cargoes for North Vietnam. Allied trade to help supply the Vietcong has fallen off and the Red flag now flies above more ships going into the Vietnam harbors. Polish and Russian ships are the main suppliers. An airlift carries goods from the Soviet Union across Communist China into North Vietnam. Russian rail shipments are trans-

shipped twice to cross China for unloading in North Vietnam.

But goods are still reaching the Vietcong by sea, and it is suspected that free-world ships may be unloading at Hong Kong for re-shipment to continue the flow of supplies through North Vietnam. According to one estimate, allied ship trade with the Vietcong has accounted for approximately 17 percent of all nonstrategic goods going into North Vietnam.

What stands out in all this is that the continuous sea supply for North Vietnam and the Vietcong, whether allied or Communist, could be stopped if we had the will to do it, and without bombing Hanoi or the harbor at Haiphong.

The Kennedy precedent in the Cuban missile crisis is invoked to show what a determined government can do in using its superior sea power. When the Kennedy quarantine was imposed, the Russian ships turned back. Republican policymakers have called for the imposition of a Kennedy quarantine on Hanoi.

There are, however, some very sharp differences between the Cuban quarantine and the Vietnam shipping problem. The Cuban quarantine was confined to offensive weapons. It did not cover the range of supplies that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong need to maintain their economy and carry on guerrilla warfare.

Heavy military equipment is believed to be going into the Vietnam ports in Russian and Polish ships. A recent Polish broadcast spoke of the 50th shipment from the port of Gdynia to Hanoi as shipments from the free world have dropped off.

The new condition, therefore, is that a quarantine would not stop at sea and turn back the ships of our allies so much as it would ships flying the Red flag. This would amount to a serious confrontation on the sea between the United States and the Soviet Government, and not merely an exchange of frigid notes with the Wilson government in Britain.

Sentiment in Congress against this shipping, originally aroused by Representative PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, appears to be rising as more protests are heard from main street, but there is yet no sign that the Johnson administration is moving toward either a blockade or a quarantine.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, again we pause to join with Lithuanian people everywhere in commemorating the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day, February 16. Today, while we do not recognize the incorporation of this valiant country into the Soviet Union, the brave people of this nation are enslaved by their Communist oppressors. Lithuanian Americans deserve much credit for the vigorous work they have done and are continuing to do in behalf of freedom for their native country. We must stand firm in our support for the rise of this nation to be free and independent again. I join my colleagues in rededication to the fight for self-determination for Lithuania and all forcibly enslaved nations.

Vast Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean declares that President Johnson's food-for-freedom plan "could well be one of the most significant steps the United States has taken in its relations with the rest of the world."

The paper thinks that "the key to the program, insofar as other countries are concerned, is self-help. The President correctly pointed out that it would be self-defeating for this country to increase food aid without regard to incentives in recipient lands."

This program is being hailed in all sectors of the country by informed observers and because the editorial to which I have referred is so typical of many I have read I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD, where it may be read in its entirety.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Feb. 12, 1966]

FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PLAN CAN BE VAST OPPORTUNITY

Hunger represents the oldest, most persistent and most explosive political issue in the world. The cry for bread has helped spark two of history's most profound revolutions in France and Russia. It is a vast and growing problem today.

It has been estimated by a United Nations agency that up to one-half the world's population suffers from chronic hunger or malnutrition. At least a billion people are undernourished as a result of poor diet. And, with the world population burgeoning, hunger could prompt a savage struggle for survival among millions in many lands.

Within this framework of reference, President Johnson's new food-for-freedom program is an encouraging step in the right direction. As outlined to the Congress, the expanded program would not only extend food subsistence to hungry nations, but will seek to supply American know-how and materials to enable farmers in less-developed countries to increase their own production.

The key to the program, insofar as other countries are concerned, is self-help. The President correctly pointed out that it would be self-defeating for this country to increase food aid without regard to incentives in recipient lands. "Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon U.S. food increased. Such a course would lead to disaster."

Too, there is a problem at home. This Nation's own food stockpiles are shrinking, and obviously there must be adequate food reserves for the future. The switch in long-range domestic emphasis from curbing surpluses to assuring adequate commodity reserves probably won't mean any immediate changes in acreage or marketing controls for crops other than wheat, rice, and soybeans.

But in the future great increases in planting, involving relaxation in crop controls, might well come—as determined by domestic needs, commercial export market demands, and requirements of the food-for-freedom program.

Congress should look closely at the legislative mechanisms for implementing this program, with an eye on future potentials of

change and the effect on the farmer. But as to the overall program, it could well be one of the most significant steps the United States has taken in its relations with the rest of the world.

Humanity and prudence call equally for a major effort on the part of this Nation to help others help themselves to stave off mankind's oldest enemy—hunger.

The Surge for Clean Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation will be forever indebted to the man who has made the need for clean water a topic of conversation on every one's lips. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the dean of the Minnesota delegation, Mr. JOHN BLATNIK.

It would be an endless task to list the accolades that have poured in across the country in honor of the chief sponsor of such laws as the Water Quality Act of 1965. In appreciation of his great contribution to his Nation, our colleague has well earned the name, "Mr. Water Pollution Control."

Today JOHN BLATNIK is delivering an important talk before the Midwest Governors' Conference in Lexington, Ky., as part of his relentless campaign to clean up our rivers and streams.

I urge every Member of this House to read and digest this talk:

THE SURGE FOR CLEAN WATER

(Remarks of the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK at Midwest Governors' Conference, Lexington, Ky., February 17, 1966)

I am privileged and certainly honored to be invited to address this distinguished group of Midwest Governors. I convey the best wishes of your respective congressional delegations for a successful conference. It is indeed an inspiration to see successful leaders like yourselves turn so much attention to the enormous task of cleaning up our water. This is the kind of team effort we have fought for since the first water pollution control bill back in 1956. If we are to overturn pollution as the boss of our waterways, our joint effort must be a total all-out commitment.

During the decade since 1956 the Federal Government has spent approximately \$200 million for treatment plant construction right here in the Midwestern States that are represented here today. This is not even a down payment on what should be done. This kind of pace in 1966 is like using the same tools today to cross the ocean that Columbus used. As you know, it took him 70 days to cross the Atlantic. Lindbergh crossed it in 33 hours. A B-58 can do it in a little over 3 hours, and 2 months ago our Gemini spacecraft covered that distance in just about 10 minutes.

Why is it then, with this fantastic advance of science, that we are still in the era of Columbus when it comes to rolling back the tide of pollution? This, gentlemen, is the immediate and enormous task that we must set about. We need your leadership, your help. There is a big gap between 70 days and 10 minutes. But we are going to close it.

The surge for clean water soared to an all-time high in the 89th Congress. To help

make up for lost time Congress directed five separate cabinet level agencies to zero in on what has been called the No. 1 domestic problem—that of cleaning up our waters. These bold, realistic steps are more in keeping with 20th century living. This all-out legislative effort will push us forward at least to the Lindbergh era. But the fact still remains that we have allowed pollution's poisoning power to become the absolute master of our waterways before we launched this fivefold 89th congressional attack for clean water.

Let's look briefly at the highlights of these major efforts:

Water Quality Act of 1965: This powerful instrument is the result of just plain hard work. We met with conservationists, with industrialists, with State and Federal officials, civic groups and many others to come up with a cross section representation of the needs of this vast program. I must admit some of these meetings were not too pleasant, but we called a spade a spade and so did our opposition. Finally, after 5 months in conference and about eight drafts of statutory language, we emerged with a strong workable bill that was a major, significant surge forward in our pollution abatement program.

Frankly, the States' role in the stepped-up program for clean water put us to the wall. Many said the States "have obviously failed—we cannot depend on them." But fortunately the majority of the conferees agreed—and I led that point of view—that the States should be given a chance to establish their own water quality criteria. If they comply, then this can be the basis for Federal standards. This is consistent with the team effort of having governments at every level work hand in hand to accomplish this task.

In addition to upgrading the whole program, this act also doubles the amount of the grants available for single and joint projects. It also makes \$20 million a year available the next 4 years for waste-water research and development. I have summarized the contents of the act in the handout that you should have at your tables. Now let's move on briefly to other 89th Congress legislation that fortifies our all-out effort for clean water.

HHFA (Public Law 89-117): Now under new Cabinet head, Robert C. Weaver. This act includes authorization for 50 percent of project cost to local governing bodies to build public water and sewer facilities. The purpose of this act is to promote orderly urban development, especially in needed community facilities for low income families. As of this date \$100 million was appropriated under this act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

Farmers Home Administration Amendments of 1965: Administered by the Department of Agriculture, grants for the construction of rural water and waste disposal systems will be available on a 50-percent matching grant basis. The grants are authorized to total \$50 million annually for water and sewer facilities. It is expected that over 30,000 rural communities (less than 5,500 population) will qualify for this 50-percent matching grants. These grants are designed to serve a rural area and as such take up where other programs leave off, so as not to leave a gap between urban and rural programs. No grant will be made unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies that the waste water carried by the proposed facility meets the appropriate water quality standards.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: I was privileged to manage this act on the House side, and I am proud to say that we got the Federal share up to 80 percent in the neediest areas for water and sewer facilities. Basic criteria for eligibility for substantial unemployment and/or low family income. As you know, this program combines the best features of accelerated

public works and ARA and authorizes \$500 million annually for 4 years for public works and development facility grants.

Water Resources Planning Act: This act establishes a water resources council made up of the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Army, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The purpose of it is for maximum development of water resources by the coordinated planning of water supply needs by region. The act authorizes \$5 million per year for 10 years to States for water resource planning, with emphasis on comprehensive development.

Encouraging as this legislation seems, it is but an idle paper entry unless we are able to harness the State leaders right here in this room in an all-out unprecedented "pull together" effort to meet the challenge at hand. One only need glance at the overpowering reality of the 20th century to appreciate the urgency of maintaining clean water. Look at the population explosion alone.

Keep in mind that our supply of water is more or less constant, but think that at the beginning of the Christian era—at the time of the first Christmas—there were only about 250 million people in the whole world.

In another 10 years there'll be that many might here in the United States. And we live on only 7 percent of the earth's surface. So it's time we take bold action commensurate with the era in which we live.

We have no choice but to manage and conserve this precious item called water. The same amount of water must be made to serve more and more people. This mandate is made clear by the fact that it took the human race over 2,000 years to develop a population of 3 billion people, and we are going to double that figure in less than 30 years. Right here in America we are growing so rapidly that we have almost the numerical equivalent of a new State of Kentucky every year. This is just people increase, not to mention the vast new technological, chemical, and scientific changes that correspond to such a growth.

Imagine the impact these changes have on our supply of water. One of the best yardsticks to demonstrate this impact of our changing times is the fact that our old processes are becoming obsolete so fast today that the average American industrial worker changes jobs 15 times and has to be retrained 3 times in the course of his career. So just as our highly retrained industrial worker gives his product the 1966 treatment, let's do the same for our Nation's water. Let us stop pretending that the ancient aqueducts that carry our combined sewer and storm runoff are sufficient. Like the up-to-date industrial worker, let's attack the backlog of unbuilt treatment plants. Let us prod our State pollution officers into firm action. Some of our States have been real laggards in this effort. Once we get a full, all-out commitment, then you prod us into increasing the Federal share of the cost of this national problem. The success of this joint effort stems largely from your initiative. Your cooperation made the highway program work. It will also make this program work.

A good example of strong, bold, realistic State action is the billion-dollar bond issue passed by New York State. The worst drought in two centuries has forced public action in that State. It's not hard to talk about clean usable water to New Yorkers. The lack of usable water has made it the number one topic of conversation. Restaurants were forbidden to serve water unless the customer specifically asked for it. This is a real paradox when the Hudson flows right by their doorstep, but severe pollution has put the Hudson water off limits. Even if it took the drought to bring the message home to New York, they responded, and in 6 years

branch. Such a proposal is contained in bills introduced by a number of Members of the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle.

All the proposed legislation seeks to establish a committee to draw up a report and propose a code of ethics. Then the committee is discharged.

Many bills provide for a public disclosure of financial interests, using a dollar figure, most favoring the figure of \$10,000. Thus only financial interests over and above that amount would be required to be reported.

Only few of the bills include a means of enforcement, or the consequences of violation of the code of ethics.

When a new Member of the House approaches his colleagues for advice and guidance in matters involving a possible conflict of interest the responses are vague, indefinite, conflicting, and confusing.

Let me cite some of the problems which I was faced with when I was elected. Other House Members are likewise faced with complex problems, varying only in matters of degree.

I was and still am senior member of a law firm which, at that time had 6 partners and 12 associates. A quick survey showed that we had very little to do with Federal agencies insofar as our real estate activities were concerned, and no clients who sold products directly to the Federal Government, but in our activities on behalf of corporations, we did considerable work with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Also in our corporate work we had dealings with the Food and Drug Administration and the usual contact with the Internal Revenue Service.

I could get no definitive opinion as to whether the filing of a registration statement on behalf of a client with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or even the filing of a routine periodic report form would represent a "conflict of interest."

It was recommended by House Members that a new law firm be established in which I would not be a partner and not participate in fees—which would engage in handling all matters in which the Federal Government was involved—a procedure approved by the bar association. This does not seem to me to be the best solution of the problem since there need not necessarily be a conflict of interest involving the routine dealings by a law firm with an agency of the Federal Government.

I carefully studied all of the pending legislation and I have thus far refrained from expressing myself in favor of or in support of any of the bills and have refrained from introducing a bill of my own, up to the present time. I have not found the answer to provide the elements missing from the pending legislation.

I have been privileged to serve as a member of the board of directors of the New York County Lawyers Association during the past 7 years. I have also served as chairman of a special committee to examine into problems dealing with professional ethics—professional economics—and unlawful practice of the law. One of the specific problems dealt with by my special committee was that (provision of penal law section 276) dealing with division of fees with attorneys and the problem of so-called forwarding fees. The State of New York considers an attorney in any one of the other 49 States, not admitted to practice in the State of New York, as a layman and prohibits the sharing of fees with him.

I have been impressed throughout the years with the effectiveness of the self-policing procedures relating to professional ethics and conduct by bar associations. The investigations of alleged misconduct on the part of an attorney is conducted under rules of maximum security to protect the number of the bar who is involved. I know of no violations of the confidential nature of these investigations.

That is why I am now considering and am engaged in drafting legislation, the main purpose of which will be to establish a joint Senate-House Committee of Congressional ethics, or two separate committees, one dealing with the problems of House Members and the other dealing with problems of Members of the Senate. Such committee will not be confined only to lawyers but should be available to assist all Members with possible conflict-of-interest problems.

As I conceive it, the committee should be available for advisory opinions and thus set up guidelines and standards which could be used by all Members. The committee would also hear complaints against Members insofar as it relates to problems of ethics and conflict of interest and enforce the code of ethics which Congress itself adopts.

I invite the cooperation—the advice of the American Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers Association, the Nassau County Bar Association, and other Bar Associations in helping to formulate this legislation.

In bringing it to you today I have done so to stimulate your interest in the problem of ethics and conflict of interest and welcome your recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, after I receive replies to the inquiries which I have sent to some of our distinguished members of the bar, I plan to introduce legislation along the lines outlined above. I urge my colleagues to consider these suggestions so that we may eliminate those situations which create even the appearance of conflict of interest or improper conduct for members of the legislative branch.

Backs Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Post sees that "social, economic, and political reforms are, in a very real sense, weapons for achieving the desired victory" in Vietnam.

It said on February 11 that "without the support of the Vietnamese people in the villages and rice paddies, however it is obtained, the Vietcong would soon wither away."

As the Post clearly puts it, "rehabilitation and conquest must go on simultaneously."

In reading this editorial on "Security and Reform Linked," I felt it would add some light to a subject which vitally concerns the entire world, and with this in mind I make the editorial available for the Record:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 11, 1966]

SECURITY AND REFORM LINKED

Some observers of the Honolulu conference professed to see evidence of conflict, despite the public declaration of agreement, in the fact that the South Vietnam officials, in their public statements, emphasized the military aspects of the war in their country while the Americans stressed the dual nature of the struggle, the importance of a simultaneous effort to improve conditions of life for the people of South Vietnam.

It would be remarkable if there were not

some differences of viewpoint or opinion between the governments in Saigon and Washington. Communist propaganda to the contrary, the leaders of South Vietnam are not puppets. Their people have been experiencing war for a decade, and they can hardly be blamed for wanting to achieve a military victory as quickly as possible.

The fact is that security and the need for social and economic reforms that would benefit the South Vietnamese people, particularly those in the countryside, are inseparable. Obviously, very little can be done for them except on a very temporary basis until the government in Saigon is able to give them physical protection from Communist terror and tyranny.

However, the launching of these non-military efforts is not something that can wait until the entire country, or even most of it, has been cleared of enemy elements. Social, economic, and political reforms are, in a very real sense, weapons for achieving the desired victory.

The military effort required would be much less if the people would refuse to submit passively any longer to Communist control in areas that the Communists hold. But they must be given both an incentive to resist, and an alternative to submission.

At the very least, reforms can be initiated in those areas that are held firmly by the Saigon government and its allies, and extended as the other areas are brought under control.

Without the support of the Vietnamese people in the villages and rice paddies, however, it is obtained, the Vietcong would soon wither away. And without their support for the Saigon government, the struggle could go on interminably.

The dual nature of the war that is being fought confuses a great many people. It is different from the wars of the past to which they are accustomed. In these conventional wars, all energies and resources could be concentrated on winning a military victory in a relatively short time, with little regard for social, economic and political reforms in the areas being fought over. The messy and costly job of cleaning up and rehabilitating conquered areas could come later.

In the type of guerrilla war to which the Communists are resorting in South Vietnam, the two operations cannot be wrapped into neat, separate packages. Rehabilitation and conquest must go on simultaneously.

If in any given situation it comes to a choice of which should have priority, the military or the nonmilitary effort, then, of course, the military one must take precedence because the work of rehabilitation cannot be carried out, on any basis of permanency, until firm physical control has been established and there is physical security for the people in the area. There are many areas in South Vietnam where this choice does not have to be made.

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, although February 16 marked the 48th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuania has not been truly independent since 1940 when that gallant nation was again taken over by Russian

February 17, 1966

A829

James M. Gavin, retired, conducted the study.

Under the existing Federal program, the Army distributes limited quantities of military arms, on loan, and free ammunition to be used in target practice to organized shooting clubs.

BACKED BY FEDERAL FUNDS

The clubs are supported by the federally financed National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, headed by an Assistant Secretary of the Army, in close coordination with the privately managed National Rifle Association, which has more than 600,000 members.

These include youth groups, hunters for sport and competitors in target shooting. The study recommended that club officers be fingerprinted and the prints be submitted for checking with police authorities.

The executive officer of the board is an Army colonel who also has the title of Director of Civilian Marksmanship. The present director, Col. Merle R. Preble, has a civilian deputy and a staff of 22 persons to keep records.

The study group recommended that the staff of the director be broadened to include representatives throughout the country. It also recommended that the Army official assume direct responsibility for checking individual participants in the national program.

Most of this is now done by the National Rifle Association, although the national board is technically responsible for lending arms and distributing ammunition to qualified clubs. The board thus supports about half of the association's 12,000 member clubs.

NO ABUSES UNCOVERED

The Kennedy assassination and the stories about the Minutemen, especially one about the discovery of a huge Minuteman arsenal in Clinton, Ill., in May 1964, focused attention on the precautions taken to assure that only authorized and responsible persons were getting arms and ammunition under the Federal program.

The Arthur D. Little investigators reported that although improvements in control would be desirable, they had been unable to uncover a single incident where a club affiliated with the Director of Civilian Marksmanship, "or its members have been convicted of using firearms, ammunition, and/or Government property improperly or where the Director of Civilian Marksmanship arms have been used in crimes of violence."

The investigators endorsed the program on the same ground on which it was initiated 50 years ago, as a means of contributing to national defense by training young men in the use of arms. The Army's training program, it observed, "still leaves something to be desired."

Studies indicated that the men who had had previous rifle training were not only more proficient than other recruits, but more apt to enlist and more apt to prefer a combat outfit.

The study group also emphasized the benefits of the program in developing teams to represent the United States in international marksmanship competition, including the Olympics.

The report included recommendations for improved budget practices, so that while savings could be achieved in certain areas the net effect would be to underscore the value of the entire program for relatively modest outlays.

The report said that 100 clubs "in areas where problems of control were apt to be most critical" were selected for the study. These were areas, it was said, "known to have problems with racial tensions and violence, extremists and subversive groups, and high crime rates."

The group said that it found no instances of direct orientation toward any political

programs or extremist activities and, in almost all instances, club officers stressed that it was club policy to reject applicants known to have extremist views.

Job Corpsmen Visit Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the goals of the war on poverty is to help our less fortunate Americans equip themselves for a full, active and productive life.

The Washington Sunday Star of February 13 contained an article about 38 Job Corpsmen from the Camp Kilmer, N.J., Job Corps camp visiting the Nation's Capital and spending the weekend with families in the greater Washington metropolitan area. Through such weekend "happy family hospitality sessions," the rather limited world of these young people can be immeasurably broadened and brightened. I hope the Members of this body will read this article:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 13, 1966]

FAMILY WEEKEND: 38 JOB CORPSMEN VISIT HERE

(By Larry A. Still)

Thirty-eight members of the Job Corps from Camp Kilmer, N.J., today are ending a "happy family weekend" with complete strangers in Washington.

The 38 corpsmen were selected from 1,500 trainees at Kilmer to participate in the second "hospitality weekend" with families in the greater metropolitan Washington area.

Some 22 families volunteered to pick up the youths, ranging from 16 to 21 years of age, to give them an opportunity to share in the normal life of an average family for a weekend, said Mr. and Mrs. Roy Larini, who accompanied the group as chaperones.

The families met their corpsmen at the Foundry Methodist Church, 16th and O Streets NW. They immediately began a round of activities that included a visit to the Lincoln Memorial, tours of the Capitol and Arlington Cemetery, supper at the Washington Hebrew Congregation, and an evening of social relaxation with "their family and friends."

The volunteers included residents of Alexandria and Arlington, Va., Silver Spring and Rockville, Md., and the District who participated through the National Council of Churches and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Two youths from each of the 19 dormitories at Camp Kilmer were picked for the trip on the basis of class merit, attendance, and conduct, Mrs. Larini said.

Larini is an instructor in the building trades at the camp and his wife, Ruth, is a social activities specialist. James Shickora, a recent graduate of American University, also accompanied the youths as a dormitory group leader.

"They all line up for these trips. They would rather come to Washington than go to New York on weekends," Mrs. Larini said.

The hospitality weekends began last November with the first trip to Washington. Since then, Kilmer corpsmen have visited families in Princeton, N.J., Brooklyn, N.Y., and Oyster Bay, Long Island.

"We try to involve our young people with

the young people of the neighboring area so it will increase the bond of understanding between them," the chaperone explained.

Most of the youths admitted they preferred Washington to other cities. "My mother told me if I ever get a chance to get here, to take it," said Matthew Struckhoff, 21, of Augusta, Mo.

Matthew has been in the Corps 2 months. He is studying auto mechanics in order to operate heavy equipment machinery in highway construction. "I have always liked tractors," he explained. "I am just a farm boy."

Struckhoff's companion, Robert White, also 21, of Houston, was making his second family visit after touring Hyde Park, N.Y., "where President Roosevelt lived."

Struckhoff and White were taken home by Bert H. Cooper of 1313 Porter Street NW., who participated in the first hospitality weekend last fall.

Ethics in the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, since I came to the U.S. Congress in January of 1965, I have been concerned about the need for legislation relating to ethics in the legislative branch. After reviewing the many bills and resolutions introduced in both Houses of Congress during the past 10 years, I felt that proposed legislation did not go far enough in providing the basis for continuing guidelines in this field.

On February 4, 1966, I had the opportunity and privilege to address the New York University Alumni of the New York State Bar Association in New York City. I include my remarks on that occasion in the RECORD at this point:

ETHICS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

When I was elected to the 89th Congress in November 1964, one of my first tasks was to review my personal—my business and real estate investments, and my legal and professional affiliations as senior partner of a New York law firm, to determine possible areas of conflict of interest.

Since this was my first experience in holding public office—I had not been in politics before—I sought the advice of three of the leading Members of the House whom I had known for periods up to 30 years.

While I knew there was no official set of standards to which I could refer, I was amazed to learn that there was no set of unofficial guidelines for House Members to follow.

In my campaign for this high office, I had expressed my interest in legislation, both at the State and Federal level, which would require persons who hold public office to make such disclosures as would protect the best interests of the people who elected them. I favored then and still favor, a full disclosure of financial interests, investments in stocks, bonds, and securities, as well as real estate holdings—and a disclosure of such interests when voting on legislation affecting them.

When I went to Washington in January, I researched legislation previously offered in this area. I found that the main thrust of the pending legislation was to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics to define the conduct expected of Members of the legislative

February 17, 1966

pitals they worked in closed their doors, or food and laundry departments were leased to commercial firms, or they were knocked out of their jobs because of the introduction into the hospital of more scientific equipment.

These glaring injustices can be corrected by the enactment by the Congress of an administration bill which would extend unemployment insurance benefits to this group of workers. The bill, known as the McCarthy-Mills bill, is listed as S. 1991 in the Senate and H.R. 8282 in the House of Representatives.

If enacted, the bill would extend unemployment insurance benefits to the 1 million workers employed in nonprofit hospitals as well as to all nonprofit institution employees.

The American Hospital Association, which employs these workers, is unfortunately opposed to the bill.

But the fact that the American Hospital Association is forever looking backward today when the look is strictly forward should make no difference.

The bill should be passed and passed immediately.

Second Front in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it is important for all Americans to keep in mind that our commitment in South Vietnam and our chances for victory in southeast Asia do not depend on military achievement alone. The struggle to obtain for the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination and freedom is a many faceted struggle having military, social, human and political aspects.

The following editorial from the February 9, 1966, edition of *Newsday* discusses the second front agreed to by President Johnson and South Vietnam Premier Nguyen Cao Ky. I believe my colleagues in the House of Representatives will find the editorial interesting and a penetrating analysis of the depth of our commitment to freedom.

SECOND FRONT IN VIETNAM

President Johnson and South Vietnam Premier Nguyen Cao Ky have agreed to open a second front—a peaceable front. While pressing forward with the war, a program of social and political reform will be undertaken by the United States and South Vietnam in an effort to bring a better life to the people after they have been made secure from the Vietcong.

This is a vital part of our struggle for freedom in South Vietnam. While there is strong anti-Communist feeling among many South Vietnamese, large numbers of villagers have either been "reeducated" or terrorized into cooperating with the Vietcong. Unless the Ky government, with American aid, can undercut the Reds' hold on these people, the stability of South Vietnam will remain in jeopardy even if our side is victorious in battle with the Communist forces.

About 25 percent of the country is so firmly in control of the Vietcong that no program of pacification and rural improvement can be carried out. Another 20 percent is being fought over, and a substantial amount of the remaining territory is in delicate equilibrium. Thus the second front program is to be concentrated in one-third or fewer of the rural villages and hamlets the South Vietnam Government claims to control. That is a fairly small beginning, but it is the philosophy behind it that counts.

President Johnson, with his dramatic meeting in Honolulu, has chosen a new approach to the Vietnam problem that is bound to win public support in this country and, hopefully, will achieve concrete results in South Vietnam. American troops have saved South Vietnam from a Communist takeover. But as our forces continue to fight for military victory, there must be an equally aggressive fight to win the minds and hearts of all the people. The Johnson-Ky "second front" is an imaginative idea, and one that deserves endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, while our President, our Vice President, our Ambassador to the United Nations and our ambassadors around the world continue to search for the road to the conference table and ultimate peace which appears to be so elusive, the opening of a second front as outlined in the *Newsday* editorial will bring comfort to the Vietnamese who have suffered so much for so long a time.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

February 17, 1966

A837

The duties to be assumed by this new office are specified in section 4 of the bill:

"Upon the request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Administrative Counsel shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than [the President, Congressman, judicial officers, and officials of the District of Columbia]. * * * Upon the completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member or committee by whom the claim was referred."

Finally, the Counsel is authorized in section 7 to make interim reports to Congress "on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act," and is directed to submit an annual report to Congress:

"Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate."

ADVANTAGES AND ORIGINS

The Counsel would have other advantages besides that of allowing Members of Congress to devote more time to legislative and policy matters.

With a small staff of experts, the Counsel could do a better job than Members of Congress in protecting citizens' rights. As it is now, Members of Congress and the men-of-all-work on their staffs must be generalists who find themselves at a distinct disadvantage in dealing with the administration's experts. Centralizing congressional "case-work" in the Counsel would be far more efficient and less costly than indefinite expansion of the 535 individual congressional office staffs.

While the ombudsman idea inspired the proposal for an Administrative Counsel, the Counsel also parallels existing American institutions. In the Offices of the Legislative Counsel and in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Congress has given itself the advantages of expert, centralized assistance in legislative drafting and research, respectively. During 1964, for example, the Legislative Reference Service's 150 experts responded to 105,000 congressional inquiries.

Congressional oversight does not, of course, relieve the executive branch of the responsibility to keep its own house clean. A new broom was created on the executive side in 1964, through the establishment by Congress of an Administrative Conference of the United States, composed of the head or deputy of each executive department and independent regulatory board or commission, as well as of lawyers and scholars appointed by the President or the Chairman of the Conference.

The Chairman of the Administrative Conference might function as a kind of ombudsman himself. He is empowered "to make inquiries into matters he deems important for conference consideration, including matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government." The grievances of private citizens would fall under this blanket, as would the information and recommendations supplied as public documents by an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

STATE PROPOSALS

Meanwhile, at the State level, the more manageable size of populations would seem to permit a more direct implementation of

the ombudsman concept. Three of the largest States and two of the smallest are working in that direction.¹⁶ In the 1965 session of the California Legislature, for example, Speaker Jesse M. Unruh introduced assembly bill No. 2956, providing for the establishment of an office of ombudsman. Speaker Unruh has also called for the creation of a nine-man Citizens' Advisory Committee "to investigate the feasibility of incorporating into the structure of the State government an official similar to the ombudsman."

All of these proposals—State and Federal—are signs of widespread concern with individuals' rights and individual justice in administration. This concern is a wholesome sign. It should not exhaust itself, however, in righteous indignation or hopeless resignation. Rather, concern should lead to continuing appraisal of the adequacy of our political institutions to the needs of man in an increasingly depersonalized society. Appraisal, in turn, should lead to carefully tailored proposals for specific reform.

Article I of the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution directs:

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people * * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

If this guarantee is to be meaningful, we must insure that the channels of communication are kept open and effective. The voice of the ordinary citizen must be selectively amplified in the Halls of Congress and the State legislatures. Adaptations of the ombudsman give promise of high fidelity.¹⁶

¹⁶ "Parliamentary Debates," N.Z. (1961), p. 96.

¹⁷ See Stanley V. Anderson, "The Scandinavian Ombudsman," 12 *The American-Scandinavian Review*, No. 4 (December 1964), pp. 403-409. Upon request, the author will supply reprints of this survey article.

¹⁸ "The Ombudsman: A Bibliography," published by the Northern California Friends Committee on Legislation, San Francisco, February 1965.

¹⁹ HENRY S. REUSS, "An 'Ombudsman' for America," *The New York Times* magazine, Sept. 13, 1964, pp. 30, 134-135, reprinted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, Sept. 23, 1964, pp. 21839-40, and in Joseph S. Clark (ed.), "Congressional Reform: Problems and Prospects" (New York: Crowell, 1965), pp. 292-297.

²⁰ John Bainbridge, "A Civilized Thing," *The New Yorker*, Feb. 13, 1965, pp. 136-151.

²¹ George Kent, "Where You Can Fight 'City Hall,'" 103 *The Rotarian* (July 1963), pp. 38-40, condensed as "Watchdog for the Common Man," *Reader's Digest* (August 1963), pp. 82-85.

²² An African proverb, taken from Cecil V. Crabb, Jr., "The Elephants and the Grass: A Study of Nonalignment" (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).

²³ "Government Aids to Consumers," *Consumer Reports* (December 1964), pp. 259-265.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

²⁵ A name which surely would warrant another "ha-ha" if it had been presented to the New Zealand Parliament.

²⁶ Charles L. Clapp, "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954), p. 84. The title of this excellent work calls to mind the jibe of Adlai Stevenson at a reunion with a prominent classmate: "Well," he said, "we have both gone out to do the Lord's work, you in your way, and I in His."

²⁷ *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, Oct. 16, 1961, pp. A8204-A8205, excerpted in Norman C. Thomas and Karl A. Lamb, "Congress: Politics and Practice" (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 42-43.

²⁸ Henry S. Reuss, "We Need an American Ombudsman," *Christian Century*, Mar. 3, 1965, pp. 269-271, reprinted in the *CONGRES-*

SIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1965, pp. A1165-A1166.

²⁹ Estes Kefauver and Jack Levin, "A Twentieth-Century Congress" (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1947), p. 194, excerpted in John P. Roche and Leonard W. Levy (eds.), *The Congress: Documents in American Government* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), pp. 204-208.

³⁰ See Stanley V. Anderson "The Ombudsman: Public Defender Against Maladministration," 6 *Public Affairs Report*, No. 2 (April 1965). This is the bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley. The institute is carrying out a study of the suitability of ombudsman institution for adaptation in California.

³¹ A lengthy symposium on the ombudsman appeared in Canada after this article was written. It is Donald C. Rowat (ed.), "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).

Unemployment Insurance for Hospital Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, unemployment insurance should no longer be considered a privilege. It is a right. No category of workers should be excluded from its benefits. So it is shocking that people who work in voluntary hospitals are not awarded unemployment insurance.

In an editorial last Saturday, February 12, the *New York Amsterdam News* eloquently criticized this inequity in the present law. It pointed out that 1,500 Negro and Puerto Rican workers have been laid off in the last 2 years; they received no insurance. It urged the Congress to support H.R. 8282, the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS].

The editorial follows:

CORRECTIVE MEASURE

During the recent transit strike considerable publicity was given to the fact that workers who couldn't get to work should apply for immediate unemployment insurance benefits to tide them over that rugged period.

This applied to all workers except those employed in voluntary hospitals.

Does that make sense? Is it fair?

We say it doesn't make sense and it certainly isn't fair.

There should be no glaring exceptions such as these in the attitude of our local, State, and Federal Government between any group of workers.

But these exceptions do exist and some of the ill informed, when told that this group of hospital workers were not covered by unemployment insurance, quickly asked why hospital workers need unemployment insurance. After all, they said, "they don't have any layoffs."

This is simply not true.

Last year Mount Morris Park Hospital closed its doors. What happened to the workers who couldn't get jobs right away? They were left to beg or go on relief.

Reliable reports state that some 1,500 Negro and Puerto Rican hospital workers have been laid off in the last 2 years because the hos-