

6336

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 24, 1966

and the world today is population control. It is now generally recognized throughout the world that unless prompt and effective steps are taken to check the galloping rate of population growth, awesome consequences are inevitable. Unless effective steps are taken to curb this growth, the world is faced with the stark reality of another dark age, enshrouded in hunger, poverty, overcrowding, wars and famine, ending in human cannibalism or exploding into possible nuclear war.

That is the view of many, including some of the world's foremost scientists and statesmen.

President Johnson has sounded the warning repeatedly, and so have many other world speakers. Here in Congress I have joined with others in the introduction of legislation to set up two sub-Cabinet posts to disseminate birth control information upon request, at home and abroad.

There is a pressing need for a crash program. Nothing less will suffice.

An unequal race is being waged today between human production and food production, with the population growth outstripping food production each year.

Let us look for a moment at this growth rate. It is appalling. In 1930 there were only 2 billion people on this earth. In 1970 it will be 4 billion; and by the year 2000, at the present rate, the figure will reach 7.4 billion, according to the Population Reference Services.

Any good that results from foreign aid in the underdeveloped countries is largely wiped out by the increase in population. Any such aid, to be meaningful, should be tied to education and free dissemination of birth control information. Without that, our assistance becomes an exercise in futility.

We spend billions on poverty, with its effectiveness offset or negated by excessive births among recipients. In the United States we are told that 9 out of every 10 impoverished women still lack competent birth control information and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out. There is no time to waste. Every possible effort should be made to educate the general public and arouse them to the seriousness of this problem, along with the free dissemination of the best birth control information that can be provided.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON ATTENDS THE FUNERAL OF MRS. EMANUEL CELLER

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

Mr. FARBSTINE. Mr. Speaker, it was to pay tribute to a fine American lady and the husband she inspired to great achievements in the Congress that President Johnson yesterday attended the funeral of Mrs. Emanuel Celler. The death of Stella Celler is a personal loss to each of us in New York. She was a woman who would not be defeated by illness or age. She retained her vitality, her dedication and her joy of life to her last moments. We New Yorkers extend

our condolences to the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, the patriarch of our delegation, recognizing fully that we will miss her.

That the Nation shared Mr. CELLER's sorrow was symbolized by the presence of the President at the funeral services in New York. The President stood for the community of peoples and faiths which this country of our represents. He stood for the compassion and understanding of a government which we sometimes think of as too large to be personal. He stood in a Jewish house of worship yesterday as a mark of recognition of the magnificent contributions that the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, has made to the country, contributions to which he was ever urged by his now departed wife.

#### HOSPITAL AND EXTENDED-CARE FACILITIES

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I have very recently addressed a letter to the President and to Secretary Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asking that they set up a national commission to deal with the emergency that may be created by medicare, if hospital facilities do not prove to be adequate.

I have received alarming reports from doctors and social workers in my district. They are short of nurses to operate available equipment, to say nothing of the shortage of hospital beds.

On January 1, 1967, we will be commencing the benefits provided as post-hospital extended care, or nursing-home care. We will be assuming this operation with a national shortage of 500,000 beds in such nursing homes. Many of the existing homes are not up to par in meeting proper standards.

We know that an Advisory Council and a National Medical Review Committee have been provided under the existing medicare legislation. However, neither of these groups has emergency authority to take positive steps to cope with bottlenecks, lack of facilities, personal disappointments and public outcries at the critical times and places when medicare benefits will be demanded, and then prove to be unavailable. In some places and critical situations it may be necessary to set up emergency facilities. Authority for this should be provided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all of us in the Federal Government address ourselves to this problem so that we will not be charged with lack of foresight later this year or next when medicare becomes our obligation.

#### SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the support given the President for his policies in Vietnam has been greatly strengthened of late. The Salt Lake Tribune com-

ments in a recent editorial entitled "Closing Ranks."

It notes the unanimous vote given by the 39 Governors who attended a White House conference, and says this "is further buttressed by the latest public opinion poll which showed more than 7 to 1 approving the President's actions."

I believe a great deal of the recent increase in support approving the President's actions comes from the favorable reaction of the American public to the Honolulu Conference and the recent emphasis of the administration on the social political and economic reforms to be carried on in South Vietnam.

The recent visits of the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of HEW all indicate the importance of the United States supporting the economic and social reforms in South Vietnam to create a strong government.

An important part of this was the recent establishment of former Major General Lansdale as Minister to South Vietnam. This is a great step forward in recognizing the importance of being successful in all parts of the conflict in southeast Asia.

The editorial commenting on the support given the President will be of interest to my colleagues, and with this in mind I shall ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the Appendix.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

#### REDS ADMIT THEIR ROLE IN DOMINICAN REVOLT

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an editorial.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take no real pleasure to bringing to the attention of this body the frank admission of the hierarchy of international communism that they armed and fomented the revolt last April in the Dominican Republic.

Anyone whose head is not in a pink cloud knew that the revolt was their doing as the President said, but for the first time, we have their open admission that they tried it and were blocked only because of the intervention of the United States. There is a group in the executive branch and one in the other body that will not like this public admission because they have stoutly denied that Communists had any part in that upheaval and have bitterly criticized this Government for stepping in to protect this hemisphere from additional Communist encroachment. Not only did this misguided group originally take that position, but they have continued to hew to that line in spite of every evidence to the contrary. It will be interesting, if saddening, to see what this clique has to say now that the Communist confession is a matter of public record.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it would not surprise me too much if they try to ignore this confession and stick to their own little party line to the effect that Communists had no part in the Dominican revolt. Columnist William S. White

The proposal contained in the report prompted the announcement a few days ago that Solvay has been prepared to go much further. The company is very interested in the possibility of joining with the county in the development of a single treatment facility to deal with the industrial waste and the municipal sewage in Nine Mile Creek, the stream into which Solvay's waste water flows. Solvay has offered to pay for the feasibility study. A spokesman for the division terms the action "a growth in company policy," but I believe it is much more than this. At the very least it is an example of Solvay's responsible recognition of a problem, its progressive willingness to contribute to a solution, and an expression of leadership that both other industries and units of government should emulate.

I am hopeful that the true spirit of cooperative federalism, resting, as it must, on local initiative and planning, will bring about in the very near future the long awaited restoration of Onondaga Lake.

#### H.R. 13993, HORTON BILL TO ALLOW AN INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN COSTS OF MOVING

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall the strong support I voiced and voted yesterday in behalf of H.R. 10607, a bill to provide reimbursement to Federal employees for many of the costs they incur when they are required to move from one job location to another. I believe we acted wisely in according Government employees a protection that is already practiced widely in private industry.

However, there is another aspect of these moving expenses that deserves our consideration and constructive correction, and this problem involves all employees, public or private, who receive reimbursement for moving costs. I am referring to the tax treatment of such reimbursement.

Certain categories of reimbursement for employee moving expenses; namely, travel costs of the employee and his immediate family as well as the costs of moving household goods from the old to new place of employment, have not been considered income to the employee and thus have not been taxed. As a logical extension of this tax-free treatment, the 88th Congress provided that these expenses, whether reimbursed by a new employer or paid for by the employee changing employers, in his move from one location to another, were similarly deductible.

The problem presented and that which my new bill seeks to overcome is that the aforementioned expenses do not embrace the total cost burden to a moving employee. Just as we have legislatively recognized in H.R. 10607, he faces—

The expenses of a house-hunting trip for himself and his wife;

Temporary living costs at his new location while he and his family await the arrival of their household effects;

The fees and other costs of selling his old house;

Expenses attendant on the purchase of a new house, such as attorney fees and other closing costs; and

The numerous items commonly considered as a lump sum or miscellaneous figure, including appliance connections, licenses, size adjustments, and other incidentals.

Repeating, H.R. 10607 recognizes these items as a burden on the moved Federal employee that his Federal Government employer should assume. Similarly, many private concerns already make provision for the reimbursement of these costs.

But, the benefit of reimbursement becomes considerably diminished when the employee must treat it as ordinary income. Further, his employer is required to withhold from it and report it in the same manner as the employee's wages.

A taxpayer who carried a case through the courts involving his belief that he should be permitted a deduction for reimbursement received lost out when the Supreme Court denied a review. However, in opposing the review, the Attorney General argued that Congress rather than the Court should decide the issue involved.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is this additional reason for a congressional response to the present unfair tax treatment of thousands of Americans required to move from one place to another each year because such a move is required by the nature of their employment or the mobility of our economy.

For two principal reasons, first, that it is manifestly inconsistent for the Government to recognize the legitimacy of these expenses for reimbursement on the one hand while taxing that reimbursement as income on the other, and second, that it is not proper policy for Government to impose a drag on the necessary mobility of our society and economy.

I urge my colleagues to consider closely the need for this legislation with the hope they will join me in working for its prompt passage.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 268, on September 8, 1965, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection. *OK*

#### TIME TO REPLACE DEBATE WITH SUPPORT

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks there has been a continuous dialog concerning the U.S. activities in Vietnam. While this discussion has disclosed areas of controversy, it has also

demonstrated the fact that most Americans support our present Vietnam policy.

The principle of free speech is deeply ingrained in our American life and it has proven its benefits over the years. The arguments we have heard have served to crystallize the areas of controversy, to define the issues more clearly and, therefore, to give all Americans a better opportunity to understand our course of action.

An editorial appearing in the March 11, 1966, issue of Life magazine comments on this debate. It suggests that we should now call a truce on such divisive debate and give the administration an opportunity to demonstrate what it can accomplish in Vietnam.

I suggest that such a pause would be wise and would serve our Nation's interest well. While we recognize that there is not total unanimity of opinion on all phases of our Vietnam policy, there is substantial agreement by a great majority of Americans in support of it.

Let us now get on with the job. Our position has improved, our troops have the initiative. Let us spend the next few months determining how to give them the maximum support rather than engaging in a great debate which will gain no material purpose.

The editorial follows:

[From Life magazine, Mar. 11, 1966]

#### TIME FOR A PAUSE IN THE BIG DEBATE

The overwhelmingly favorable vote on the President's request for an additional \$4.8 billion in funds for Vietnam shows that most Congressmen recognize the need to pay for our commitments. Even so, the action was not accomplished in a spirit of pure unanimity. Senator FULBRIGHT cast an approving vote only because he belatedly decided that a money bill is not the proper place to amend policy. Seventy-five Members of the liberal House Democratic study group thought it necessary to explain their "ayes" did not mean that they favor unrestrained or indiscriminate enlargement of the military effort in Vietnam (as if anyone did).

Congress reflects the undercurrent of dissent and controversy that continues to flow beneath our Vietnam policy. But for all their qualms and misgivings most Americans seem convinced that the hard course chosen by the administration is the correct one. The conviction of this majority deserves to be honored too.

The debate during the last 2 months has been enlightened, and enlightening, in our tradition of free speech. FULBRIGHT's forum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, succeeded in defining the main issue as whether or not we can or should contain Red China. Answers to this come no easier, but the questions make more sense than they often did before.

Now that the hearings are complete, and the money deposited to account, perhaps the time has come to recognize that we are engaged in a war in Vietnam which can in fact be won. President Johnson observed a 37-day pause in the bombing at the beginning of this year, to give North Vietnam a chance (which it ignored) to respond with some pacific gesture. How about a 37-day pause in the criticism to let the President's policy go forward unhindered? Or better yet, a 137-day pause, during which time the administration should have a real opportunity to show what can be accomplished militarily and otherwise in Vietnam. After that, criticism might be appropriate or even—who knows?—unnecessary.

March 24, 1966

6340

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND  
CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 6845.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1347)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845), to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered (1): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1) and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2 of the House engrossed bill, strike out line 13 and all that follows down through line 13 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“(c) Section 5 of such Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(c) On or before the 15th day of January in each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following information—

“(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

“(2) the number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

“(3) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

“(4) the number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

“(5) the number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military department;

“(6) the number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

“(7) the number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) three years or more and (B) five years or more;

“(8) the number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

“(9) the number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States.”

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered (2), (3), and (4): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), (3), and (4) and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,  
J. H. MORRISON,  
MORRIS UDALL,  
H. R. GROSS,  
JAMES T. BROYHILL,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

MIKE MONRONEY,  
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,  
By M. M.  
FRANK CARLSON,  
HIRAM L. FONG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. (1): This amendment struck out subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill which contained provisions to the effect that a teacher shall not be eligible to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for any period exceeding 5 consecutive years with the exceptions (1) that any teacher who returns to the United States for not less than 1 year shall be eligible again to hold a teaching position or positions overseas for an additional period not exceeding 5 consecutive years, and (2) that the Secretary of Defense may extend such 5-year period to not more than 8 years, when necessary in the public interest in individual cases.

The House recedes from its disagreement to amendment numbered (1) and agrees to the same with an amendment which adds a new subsection (c) to section 5 of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act requiring annual reports by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to teachers subject to such Act.

Specifically, the new subsection (c) provides that, on or before the 15th day of January of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of the conference agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives the following information:

(1) The number of teachers separated from teaching positions subsequent to the close of the immediately preceding full school year;

(2) The number of such separated teachers who returned to the United States;

(3) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States following such separation;

(4) The number of such separated teachers returned to positions as teachers in the United States under voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States;

(5) The number of such separated teachers placed in positions as teachers in the United States through special placement assistance programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments;

(6) The number of such separated teachers who (A) were separated at their own request and (B) were separated involuntarily;

(7) The number of such separated teachers who had served in teaching positions (A) 3 years or more and (B) 5 years or more;

(8) The number of new teachers appointed to teaching positions at the beginning of the school year current at time of the report; and

(9) The number of such new teachers obtained through voluntary reciprocal interchange agreements with school jurisdictions in the United States.

In reaching agreement with respect to amendment numbered (1), the committee of conference makes several observations with respect to the intent of such agreement.

This conference amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to report annually, to the respective Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives, certain statistical data with respect to the numbers of teachers who are appointed to overseas teaching positions, who are separated from such positions, who are returned to the United States after such separations, and who are placed in positions as teachers in the United States after such separations, as well as with respect to the number of years served by teachers in overseas teaching positions.

This amendment recommended by the committee of conference is intended, and is needed, to provide the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service complete, accurate, and timely information each year for the exercise of their legislative oversight responsibilities with respect to the programs for the improvement and revitalization of the overseas dependents school system and its corps of teachers which are to be placed in effect by the Secretary of Defense as set forth hereafter.

This part of the conference agreement was adopted in the light of strong and persuasive reports from the Department of Defense, the three military departments, and organizations of teachers that the “rotation” system provided by subsection (c) of the first section of the House bill is unworkable. To operate any plan or program of rotating employees between Federal positions overseas and in the United States, there must be a reasonable number of positions of the kind involved not only in overseas areas but within the 50 States. The military departments have over 6,000 teaching positions that must be filled overseas, whereas the Government operates only a relatively few schools in the United States. It is clear that the number of possible vacancies in federally operated schools within the United States would be completely inadequate to support a rotation program.

The managers on the part of the House feel, however—and conferees for the Senate expressed agreement—that the fundamental rotation principle involved in subsection (c) of the first section of the bill, as passed by the House, is sound and desirable and that its purpose should be implemented to the extent possible. An alternative to contribute to the achievement of those purposes, developed in negotiations with representatives of the Department of Defense, was considered

"I think they will liquidate it by themselves in the course of time."

Mr. Kennan was talking exactly 1 month after the Tri-Continental Communist Conference in Havana.

Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, called that conference a "Mein Kampf" of international communism.

Seven hundred and eighty-two Communist delegates and observers from 95 countries were present.

They produced what was termed by the Organization of American States a "declaration of war" against the governments of Latin America.

The U.S. representative at the OAS conference called the Havana meeting "the latest, in some respects, the most blatant and open effort of the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and Cuba \* \* \* to extend their power and influence in the free world."

Not a word of this in Kennan's testimony. Listening to him, the conference never took place, or at least was too unimportant for comment.

On the contrary, he assured us that we can now "sit back."

"It was just a year ago," wrote the Washington Report of the American Security Council on January 17, "that the Soviet Embassy in Havana summoned Communist Party delegates from 22 countries of the Western Hemisphere to a secret conclave. Solidarity plans were mapped for fomenting revolution and guerrilla warfare in six Latin American countries and a fund of \$100 million was set up to finance the objective."

Was there any mention of this in Kennan's testimony?

Not at all. On the contrary, he rejoiced because "someone else pays the bills in Cuba." The fact that the money spent is aimed at destroying us doesn't seem to bother Kennan.

This kind of testimony from Senator FULBRIGHT's "expert" is frightening.

**McNamara—Gloom, No Doom**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. DONALD RUMSFELD**

OF ILLINOIS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was any evidence that a credibility gap does exist today, that evidence can be found in the remarks of various Federal Government officials in recent years.

The following article published in 1965 in the New York Herald-Tribune illustrates the crisis in credibility on the part of one Government official:

**McNAMARA—GLOOM, No DOOM**

(Five times before, Secretary McNamara has traveled to Vietnam. Five times he has reported to the President. These are comments reported after the conclusion of each trip: "Progress in the last 8 to 10 weeks has been great \* \* \*. The Government has asked only for logistical support." —May 1962.

("The major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." —October 1963.

("We have every reason to believe that (U.S. military) plans will be successful in 1964." —December 1963.

("We are confident these plans point the way to victory." —March 1964.

("This is a war for the confidence of the people and the security of these people, and that kind of war is a long, hard war.") —May 1964.

(By the Associated Press)

SAIGON.—Defense Secretary Robert McNamara said yesterday the Vietnamese situation has deteriorated in many ways in the last 15 months but "the picture is not all black."

Mr. McNamara, ending a 5-day survey of the Vietnam war, spoke at a news conference hours after Vietnamese police had seized four suspects in an apparent attempt to assassinate outgoing U.S. Ambassador Maxwell Taylor.

The Defense Secretary later flew back to Washington to report to President Johnson on his sixth trip to Vietnam since May 1962.

He refused to discuss how many American servicemen may be added to the approximately 75,000 now on duty in South Vietnam, saying: "I can only tell you that our recommendations will be directed toward fulfilling the commitment of our Nation to support the people of Vietnam in their fight to win their independence."

**Byelorussian Independence Day**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON**

OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a most persistent theme of Soviet propaganda has been that in the Soviet Union racial and ethnic groups enjoy perfect freedom to pursue and develop their distinct national cultures within the framework of the Soviet system. This clever move had deceived millions of people, but all well-informed people of the free world know that it is a hoax, a mere sham. We know that what the Soviets do is almost the opposite of what they say in this as in many other respects. Not only are the nationality groups within the Soviet Union denied the freedom to follow their own national cultural, artistic and educational development, but this is also forbidden even in the allegedly sovereign Soviet satellite countries. The leaders in these countries do not even contemplate, for fear of brutal reprisals by their masters in the Kremlin, doing anything that would arouse the wrath of their Communist overlords.

The story of the Byelorussians is a case in point. These gifted and genial people, today numbering more than 10 million, have had their ups and downs in their turbulent history. In modern times theirs has been a sad and tragic lot. After enjoying relative peace and prosperity through the Middle Ages and in early modern times, their country was overrun by the Russians in the 17th century and it became part of the Russian empire. For centuries they strove to maintain their distinct national traits and national traditions. They kept alive their sentiment of nationality, and the spirit of freedom they never allowed to shrivel. And in the First World War, when the Russian empire was crushed in

the Revolutions of 1917, these people saw their chance to free themselves and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918.

That memorable event took place 48 years ago. Since then untold numbers of catastrophic events have overtaken the Byelorussians, but these events have no extinguished their long-cherished spirit of national independence and freedom. Their independence lasted for about 2 years; and soon Communist Russians put an end to that, making Byelorussia a part of the Communist Soviet Union. There the Soviets imposed their rigid and inflexible tyranny, and turned the country into a large prison house. Amid all the misery and suffering prevailing there for more than four decades, it is encouraging to know that the Byelorussians still cherish their national goal, their freedom and independence. On the 48th anniversary of their independence we ardently hope that some day and soon they will cast off their Communist yoke and regain their freedom.

**Rescue Service in Space?**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from a recent edition of the New York Times, as I believe the proposal for a space rescue service merits study, as does any suggestion that would increase the safety of those intrepid men who are expanding the limit of man's understanding of the universe.

**RESCUE SERVICE IN SPACE?**

American and Soviet disclosures last week of specific hazards in manned space travel have indicated at least the outlines of needed next steps in space safety.

The Gemini 8 astronauts, it has now been made clear, were in extreme peril while their capsule was rolling wildly. A short-circuit of the type that caused their plight can never be totally eliminated as a risk in the complex electronics of space. From Moscow, meanwhile, has come word that a malfunction a year ago forced two Russian cosmonauts to land in a snowbound forest far from their target area. They could not be rescued for 2 days.

No doubt, engineers will make further progress in building protective and back-up equipment to reduce the danger of breakdowns in flight. Yet, the likelihood that mishaps will occur even with the most ingenious safety system makes it desirable that consideration be given now to the practicality of organizing a space rescue service, preferably under cooperative auspices of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Its function would be to send space craft, on very short notice, to aid a space vessel marooned in orbit and incapable of returning to earth under its own power. In some cases the need might be for additional rocket fuel or replacement parts; in others the primary function might be to save lives by taking aboard the crew of a disabled capsule.

Man has already demonstrated that his basic capabilities in space hold out the po-

entiality for such an emergency road service in the heavens. He can "walk" in space; he can make precise calculations for the rendezvous and link up of space ships; with relatively little development, tow trucks of the cosmos may be a regular part of the safety arrangements for each new step on the road to the moon.

### Mr. Dubinsky's Well-Earned Rest

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as were his multitude of admirers and friends, I too was saddened to learn that David Dubinsky is retiring as general president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers.

The news was unexpected and constitutes a tremendous loss to the labor movement. I was saddened because of the great contribution David Dubinsky has made not only to the cause of unionism but to his country, and because it is hard to imagine the international and domestic scene without his active participation. Although no giant in physical size, he is indeed a giant among labor leaders in our country.

Of the many articles, editorials and columns I have read concerning Mr. Dubinsky's retirement, John Herling's recent column in the Washington Daily News seemed to me to express unusually well the essence of the man David Dubinsky is and the sense of loss his members and so many of his friends must feel. I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

David Dubinsky has unquestionably earned the privilege of spending his latter years in a less strenuous life, undoubtedly pursuing interests of special concern to him. It is my hope that he will continue to give to his members and the American people the benefit of his vast experience and wisdom.

Fortunately, Mr. Dubinsky's successor, Louis Stulberg, brings a wealth of experience to his new position. Happily, ILGW's petite representative on Capitol Hill, Miss Evelyn Dubrow, will continue to advise us and charm us as we consider legislation of interest to her union and to the welfare of the country. In spite of her own sadness about Mr. Dubinsky's retirement, I am sure she will continue to serve well in her dedication to the principles for which he fought for so many years.

The article follows:

DUBINSKY BOWS OUT  
(By John Herling)

The announcement of the presumed retirement of David Dubinsky as general president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union comes under the head of unbelievable news.

At the age of 74 D.D. seems to be able to go

on forever, with the acquiescence of members, leaders and the public itself. He has made remarkable contribution to the life of his city, State and Nation. His effectiveness in his American field of interests was matched by his ready response to international causes.

All of this comes quite naturally to him. For in his career there run the streams of several lives. First, as the young teenage revolutionary in Russian Poland, he literally fought czarist tyranny all the way to prison and worked for the unionization of workers.

When he finally escaped from the Russian police, he came to the United States in 1911, burning with zeal for carrying on the work of social justice. He did this through the Socialist Party as well as through the cutters local. Local leadership led to larger responsibility in his international union.

By the middle 1920's, he was deep in a hand-to-hand conflict with the Communists who nearly destroyed the ILGWU. If ever it could be said that history was written—or made—by survivors, it could be said of Dubinsky.

When he succeeded to union presidency in 1932, he was on the eve of yet another career: The reconstruction of his union, its enlargement of purpose, and identification with public causes. No union responded more creatively to the stimulus of Roosevelt's New Deal, whether it was through bringing coherence to a chaotic industry or by stimulating the cultural life of the country through the fantastic success of "Pins and Needles," a musical show of social significance which has become a part of the American theater tradition, or through the aggressive support of the anti-Fascist and anti-Nazi efforts at home and abroad.

He became important in and to the American labor movement. He brought to it sophistication and a sense of maneuver. He participated in the early stages of the CIO and then withdrew from it. When he and his union rejoined the A.F. of L. he became active in unifying the labor movement. By this time his friendship with F.D.R., Governor Lehman, and Mayor La Guardia moved him into the limelight which he has never shunned. Over the past three decades, his sharp jibes and shouting, ebullience have brought laughter and light to occupants of the White House as well as residents of Unity House, his union's summer resort.

We are not attempting here a comprehensive evaluation of David Dubinsky. As a man he can be generous; as a union official penny-pinching. He is by turns effervescently candid or annoyingly secretive. He fluctuates from a mood of bouncing, chasidic enthusiasm to the calculating role of a tight-lipped, cold-eyed cardplayer. His pride has often led him to excesses of affection or to ruthlessness in his relations with his colleagues. With a group of staff employees who took his organization example too literally and organized a union of their own, he became an implacable foe. But he bled a little in the process.

Above all, Mr. Dubinsky has brought clan to his many environments and his friends. His zest is infectious. If you disagree with him, he is apt to regard you as one suffering from an illness of some doubtful origin. Even when you agree with him, he expects you to agree absolutely. He won't take a mere "yes" for an answer, as some of the employers in the garment industry have learned.

Now the ILGWU will be facing real trouble—it will have to learn how to build a life without father. Most of its officials and nearly all of the union's membership have known no other president. What is certain, they will never know another such.

### Export Controls on Cattle Hides

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues who have expressed deep concern over an injustice to our livestock producers resulting from a Department of Commerce order imposing export controls over cattle hides.

I am no longer shocked when agriculture is singled out to take the loss in a back-door attempt to impose Federal price controls. I do wonder, however, just how long the American farmer will be able to exist on a smaller and smaller share of the consumer dollar.

In a statement presented to the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the House Agriculture Committee, I attempted to show that the entire livestock industry has been adversely affected by the export control order.

I am taking the liberty of inserting my testimony in the Record to call attention to the need for a careful reconsideration of the matter:

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND FEED GRAINS, BY MASTON O'NEAL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Mr. Chairman, like so many of my colleagues who are concerned over any development adversely affecting the American farmer, I was surprised to learn of the decision of Secretary of Commerce Connor to impose export quotas and validated license control over cattle hides.

I have been advised by a number of constituents that the order has already resulted in the reduction of prices on live cattle by the equivalent of 25 cents per hundredweight.

I am deeply concerned over the fact that our livestock producers are suffering as the result of a seemingly arbitrary decision by Secretary Connor. And I should add that the decision is totally inconsistent with previously announced departmental policies to promote the exports of livestock by-products.

It should be pointed out that the quota does not just affect livestock producers for we do not know with certainty from where the 25 cents per hundredweight on cattle is coming. We are all representatives of consumers and should be particularly interested in the answer to such a question.

Mr. Chairman, I for one question the wisdom of imposing export controls on cattle hides when it seriously affects the entire cattle industry.

The Department of Commerce says its move was designed to check an inflationary trend in leather prices. However, I deem the move unwise and unnecessary, for we are apparently dealing with a temporary situation that should correct itself within a year or so, or perhaps less.

Evidence indicates that the increased demand for exports resulted from the serious drought in Argentina. The reduced exports of hides from Argentina are already being reversed. The South American Republic has

stitutes nothing short of a high-handed shakedown," BYRD said, adding that those who do not honestly believe home rule to be the best solution for Washington's troubles "may get their windows smashed."

Not every Senator is willing to lay it on the line like that. That's why our respect for Bob BYRD continues to grow. In a disagreeable task that has nothing to do with West Virginia, but one that has to be done nevertheless, he is doing what he always does—a conscientious job without fear of the consequences.

Reasonable and responsible people of whatever political persuasion admire him for it.

### Correct Approach

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News comments editorially on the thesis that while containment of Red China is essential, it would be desirable to end China's isolation from the family of mankind.

The paper believes:

The reexamination of American policy is all to the good if it illuminates the difficulties standing in the way of a change in American-Chinese relations as well as the desirability of such a change.

The editorial on "The Unreachable Dragon" sheds light on a timely matter of great concern to us all, and believing that others will want to peruse its contents, I offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

#### THE UNREACHABLE DRAGON

It is still uncertain whether the reexamination of U.S. policy toward Red China foreshadows a shift in that policy. Some shift of emphasis is evident, however, in the attention paid the hearings last week before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in the weekend statements of Vice President HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY appeared at least to adopt the thesis that while containment of Red China is essential, it would be desirable to end China's isolation from the "family of mankind."

Peking's answer was prompt and ugly. The Communist Party publication Jenmin Jih Pao said HUMPHREY offered a "kiss of Judas" that "cannot fail to disgust the Chinese people."

This exchange should dispel any illusions that Red China is ripe for offers of friendship, or that dealing with Peking on any rational terms will be easy. The reasons for treating Mao Tse-tung and his crowd as outlaws are still valid, and underlined by every move and statement Peking makes.

But an outlaw that already has some nuclear capability and is rapidly expanding in that field cannot be ignored. If it is true that the United States and Red China are on a collision course, a change of course by one or the other or both is imperative.

While the experts differ on how to "contain" China, there is essential agreement that this phase of our effort is correct. The main drive for a shift of course on our part will come, then, as it applies to isolating Red China. The suggestion is increasingly heard that we welcome Peiping into the United Nations, and perhaps work toward diplomatic recognition of the Communist regime.

But to do either would mean abandoning the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa, whose cause we have espoused since the Communist takeover on the mainland. Even if, in the long run, Nationalist China should weaken in its contention that it is the lawful ruler of all China, there is no sign that Peking will abandon its claim to Formosa.

It is this issue, more than any other, that has isolated Red China. In the periodic Warsaw talks between representatives of the United States and Red China, nothing of substance is talked about because Peking sets as a precondition our abandonment of the Chiang Kai-shek government on Formosa. In short, the isolation of Red China is largely of Peiping's own making, and Mao seems to prefer it that way.

There is, in fact, much internal benefit to Peking in its hostility toward the United States. As long as the people can be persuaded that the United States is a mortal enemy, the Government has a lever for making them work harder to build up the Communist state. A show of friendship on the part of the United States clearly calls for fast rebuttal such as that directed at Vice President HUMPHREY.

The reexamination of American policy is all to the good if it illuminates the difficulties standing in the way of a change in American-Chinese relations as well as the desirability of such a change. But it is hardly a time for believing that a few kind words or simply wishing for better relations will bring them about.

### The Question of Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following article on Vietnam which appeared in the February 4, 1966, issue of the Weekly Nation, one of the foremost magazines of the Philippines. It presents a view of the Vietnamese conflict from a nation that has long been a staunch friend.

The article follows:

#### THE QUESTION OF VIETNAM

(By O. S. Villadolid)

(NOTE.—We have chosen the path of helping an ally fight in a war that is as much to the interest of the Philippines as it is to the free world. The alternative, which is to disengage completely from the Vietnam conflict, is unthinkable.)

"As far as I am concerned," said President Marcos last week, "the Philippines is already involved in the war in Vietnam."

Meeting newsmen at Malacañang, Mr. Marcos said all that has to be decided is what kind of aid to send the South Vietnamese: Engineers? Combat troops? Engineers guarded by combat troops? The President, who is also commander in chief of the armed forces, underscored that the very presence of a Filipino contingent in Vietnam reveals involvement of the Philippines in the Vietnamese war. "The Philippine colors are showing in South Vietnam," he said.

Indeed, as debate over expanded Philippine assistance to South Vietnam headed for early consensus, the question may well be asked: Are we or are we not involved on the side of the free world in the war in Vietnam?

The view of the President represents one side. The other side, shared by exponents of noninvolvement in the "dirty" war next door, maintains the fine distinction that Filipinos are merely engaged in humanitarian efforts and warns that dispatch of combat engineers will automatically involve the Philippines in the Vietnam war.

In a very real sense, President Marcos upholds a point of view which commonsense dictates. This can best be illustrated by the case of a Filipino aid official last year in Vietnam who, caught by the Vietcong guerrillas during a raid, raised his hands in surrender and asked that his life be spared because he was engaged in humanitarian work.

"I am a Filipino," he was reported to have said. But the Vietcong raiders shot him just the same. His body was found riddled with bullets—and his throat slit.

#### NO EXCEPTION

This is the grim reality of any war, and Vietnam is not an exception. While many of us would wish to think that our "non-involvement" in Vietnam could save our men, the ugly reality is that men and nations on opposite sides of the ideological fence are locked in a bitter, desperate struggle in Vietnam for supremacy in Asia. It is a war where the doctrine of Mao Tse-tung's "protracted struggle" through wars of national liberation is meeting its severest test, the outcome of which holds untold consequences for the remaining free countries in the Asian rimland and in southeast Asia. It is not difficult to imagine what the stakes are. Vietnam, a chunk of the former French colony of Indochina, forms an indispensable part of the rice bowl of Asia. It has, for centuries, been the gateway to southeast Asia, where conquering armies, the most recent being the Japanese, passed to bring Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines and the Pacific Islands near Australia down to their knees. With its archipelagoes, southeast Asia abounds with rich natural resources which any ambitious nation must covet to hold power. Geographically, its strategic importance cannot be overlooked. For it dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans, flanking the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia and New Zealand on the other. Indeed, the loss of southeast Asia to communism would upset the balance of power against the free world in this area. And South Vietnam's loss would not only make defense of the rest of southeast Asia very costly but unmanageable.

#### REPERCUSSIONS OF FALL

The importance of South Vietnam to Philippine national security can best be appreciated in the light of the assessment of the recently concluded chiefs of mission conference. The envoys agreed that Philippine defenses against communism would be weakened by South Vietnam's fall, that a Communist victory in that area would encourage the Communists to step up subversion of free governments in southeast Asia, including the Philippines, and that the presence of Asian troops would help win support for South Vietnam. No less than President Marcos, in an interview with the Weekly Nation, said that the Philippine people have a big stake in South Vietnam. "For this reason, the Philippines should participate more actively in cooperation with the free world in stemming the tide of communism in that part of the world," the President said. Obviously to underscore his point beyond equivocation, Mr. Marcos said that "at this stage, I believe that the Philippines should take active part in the Vietnam war, and I intend to convene the council of leaders to resolve dispassionately the pressing need for a more active Philippine role in the protracted struggle for supremacy between our

# Appendix

## Bicentennial Anniversary of Declaration of Independence

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution adopted at the 1965 convention of the Communications Workers of America to plan for bicentennial observations of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

I feel that the interest of the Communications Workers in planning a fitting commemoration of this important landmark in our Nation's history deserves our attention.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 27A-65-18, BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

The signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, not only marked a turning point in the history of the Nation which has since become the United States of America, but it also marked a decisive and dramatic moment in the history of the entire world.

The ringing words of this famed document signaled the call to arms which led to the founding of a new and great nation. It also sounded the death knell for the long era of colonial expansion in the Western Hemisphere by the nations of Europe. Even today, the historical process begun on July 4, 1776, is continuing in other parts of the world where old colonial structures are crumbling and new and dynamic countries are being born.

In a few years we will have reached the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It would be fitting that the year 1976 be devoted to a year-long observation of the bicentennial anniversary of this important date in world history.

Like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence is a document revered throughout the world. We would do well to show the world that its words are deeply honored today in the Nation in which it was signed nearly 2 centuries ago.

This Nation recently gave impressive observation to the centennial anniversary of the Civil War. Countless new histories and studies of this period were published. Battles were reenacted. Fitting ceremonies were held at such places as Gettysburg and Appomattox.

These observations, which were well planned and coordinated, made an important contribution to our awareness and understanding of that chapter in our Nation's history.

A carefully planned bicentennial observation of the signing of the Declaration of Independence could serve a similar and equally important function, reminding the entire world of the Nation's revolutionary heritage through which our freedom was won and our nationhood was established.

The full-scale observation of this 200th anniversary will require much study and preparation. Although the anniversary is still 11 years off, it is by no means too early to begin laying the groundwork for its observation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this 1965 convention of the Communications Workers of America urges that plans and study begin as soon as possible to prepare for the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

CWA firmly believes a nationwide campaign to win congressional approval for the establishment of a commission to undertake this important project is in order.

As loyal, patriotic, and proud Americans, the members of this union pledge themselves to play their part in such a program so that this important historical anniversary will receive the honor it so richly deserves.

### Senator Robert C. Byrd

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, distinguished himself during his service in the U.S. House of Representatives, and following his election to the U.S. Senate, he has proved himself to be one of the most effective Senators ever produced by the State of West Virginia.

He is one of the most progressive Senators ever to honor our home State in the august Chamber of the other body.

His performance as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia has been the most outstanding leadership ever afforded to the residents of our Nation's Capital. Yet, a blind and unthinking minority has felt complete unrestraint in launching vicious attacks against this outstanding, hardworking, and brilliant man.

The people of West Virginia, however, as I am sure is the case with the majority of the residents of the District of Columbia, recognize the unjustness of these attacks against Bob Byrd as evidenced by an editorial which appeared in the March 21, 1966, issue of the *Sunset News-Observer* of my home city of Bluefield, W. Va.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with the Members of the Congress this editorial, which recognizes the stature of this dedicated statesman:

BYRD, SNCC, AND CLERGY

We have commented in this space before about the problems West Virginia's Democratic Senator ROBERT C. BYRD has encountered in his position as chairman of the U.S.

Senate's Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Recently he has been having new troubles in this thankless job. Because of his long and effective effort to clean up welfare abuses in the Nation's Capital, he is being viciously attacked and vilified by leaders of the "Free D.C. Movement," an activity of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC for short, which seeks home rule for the District.

A scurrilous handbill has been distributed by this group against Senator Byrd, Congressman JOHN W. McMILLAN, of South Carolina, and a figure labeled "D.C. Power Structure." The three are pictured pulling chains tightly about the neck of a Negro figure.

"Who keeps D.C. in chains?" the inflammatory poster asks. Byrd is accused in its text of "keeping children hungry" and sending welfare investigators into homes "in the middle of the night violating the rights of our women."

What the Senator has done among many other things, of course, is to crack down on the practice of some women of bearing illegitimate children as a means of gaining additional welfare payments.

For this and his other cleanup efforts he has also been bitterly assailed in so-called liberal newspaper and magazine articles, he has been threatened by pickets and demonstrators, and, we are sorry to say, denounced by some clergymen.

He hasn't backed up an inch. Instead he has gone on the offensive against his attackers. In a recent statement on the floor of the Senate he said leaders in the Free D.C. Movement indicate that "a campaign of extortion, intimidation, and coercion will be leveled against all businessmen and merchants—large and small, Negro and white—who refuse to sign the (mayor-council form of government) petition and place cold cash in the hands of the committee."

Leaders of SNCC are seeking \$100,000 for their war chest and have threatened a boycott of all stores and businesses that won't contribute or go along with their plans.

In other words, BYRD said, "while the leaders of this movement speak of the right to vote, they publicly deny the individual merchant's right to his own opinion about home rule." This threat, he added, "is ominously reminiscent of Los Angeles."

Noting that SNCC charges the District has "lousy schools," BYRD said it chooses to say nothing of the 27,689 windowpanes smashed in D.C. schools by rock throwers last year, the replacement of which cost the taxpayers \$112,868.

But what should "cause serious soul searching," the Senator said, "is the support given to such an irresponsible, questionable, and dangerous movement by certain members of the clergy."

He referred specifically to a statement in the press which quoted Suffragen Episcopal Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., as saying he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary," but that all other means of dealing with the problem had failed.

"In other words," BYRD commented, "you do what he directs or he will apply militancy tactics. This does not sound like the religious leadership, understanding, and tolerance that give significance to our Christian inheritance."

The demand for \$100,000 from D.C. stores with the threat of an economic boycott "con-

free way of life and the Communist ideology in Vietnam."

What the Philippines will finally give to South Vietnam as expanded assistance is a big question. The South Vietnamese Government has a year-old request for an engineer battalion with its own security support involving 2,000 men. But Senator Jovito Salonga, back from a trip to South Vietnam, announced a desire of Saigon's head of state, Lt. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, for more medical and civic action teams. In this light, President Marcos has correctly decided to send a Philippine survey mission to Vietnam to ascertain what the Saigon government really needs from the Philippines in the anti-Communist struggle.

**CAMPAIGN DAMPENED**

Dispatch of the mission has dampened a well-organized campaign here of misinformation against the sending of any form of additional assistance to the beleaguered South Vietnamese. Charging that the administration had a commitment with the United States to send combat troops, outspoken advocates of noninvolvement, most of whom are pressing for neutralism in foreign policy here, said President Marcos was doing the bidding of the "dirty American imperialists" to fight in the "senseless American war." "The Marcos administration finds itself locked between the horns of a dilemma," proclaims the propaganda line of the neutralists. They argued that Mr. Marcos' dilemma was "whether to send some 2,000 combat engineers to Vietnam and so please the Americans that they will readily provide this country with a badly needed stabilization loan, or refuse to do so and incur the displeasure of the Americans." This line conveniently obscures the fact that the South Vietnamese themselves have not asked for combat troops from the Philippines, but merely engineers who would help in repairing broken bridges, destroyed schoolhouses and construction of various public works projects vital to the civic-action phase of the anti-Communist campaign.

The resort to obscurantism is not without basis. The idea is to secure early polarization on the hazardous Vietnam problem. By insisting, through false representations, that Philippine combat troops have been promised on pressure from the United States to withhold economic assistance, the neutralists had hoped to draw severe public reaction to their cause of preventing any dispatch of additional help to the South Vietnamese. The maneuver aimed to bring back memories of parity, in which Filipinos, economically prostrate after World War II, allowed their constitution to be amended giving Americans equal share in the exploitation of their national patrimony. To bolster public hatred, the proneutralists went even to the extent of utilizing a top secret document containing the working draft of the chiefs of mission conference 4 weeks ago to mislead the public into believing that even those in the high echelons of government oppose the sending of combat troops to South Vietnam. Mislabeling the working draft as a preliminary report to the President, the proneutralists insisted on the existence of a consensus against troop commitments. Actually, the consensus was in favor of expanding Philippine assistance to Vietnam and that if congress should decide on sending troops, the Philippines must shoulder their keep to uphold national dignity.

**CORRECT PERSPECTIVE**

The report of the survey mission to visit South Vietnam is expected to set in correct perspective the debate raging on the burning question of combat troops. It is not impossible that the Saigon Government, as contended by Senator Salonga, will now prefer additional medical and civic action teams from the Philippines. If this should happen, there will be little argument even in the

Senate where the sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of technical and economic assistance. The pro-neutralists will, naturally, complain for it is their goal to prevent the sending of any form of assistance to the South Vietnamese. But a real problem will arise if the Saigon Government should insist on troop commitments, even on a token basis. It will arise not so much from a desire to concentrate on noncombatants, but from the lack of funds with which to support an expeditionary force. It is possible that the Philippines will allow the United States to bear the expenses, as she did during the Korean war and in the Congo action. But the inhibiting factor is that both actions were under the auspices of the United Nations.

This, then, is the dilemma for the Philippines on Vietnam. For we have chosen the path of helping an ally fight a war that is as much to the national interest of the Philippines as it is to the free world. The alternative is, of course, unthinkable. It is to disengage completely from the Vietnam conflict and avoid any involvement whatsoever. This will mean that the government shall have changed one of its basic postulates in foreign policy: commitment to the cause of anti-communism. It is a situation furthest from the thinking of President Marcos. "What threatens humanity in another area," he said during his inaugural, "threatens our society as well." He added: "We cannot, therefore, merely contemplate the risks of our country without coming into any decision on our own. Wherever there is a sight for freedom we cannot remain aloof from it." The fight is—certainly—in South Vietnam.

**Federal Assistance Spurs Expanded Local Action in Resource Development**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's land and water resources offer abundant economic opportunities if properly developed. Recognition of this has been reflected in much of the conservation legislation passed by the Congress in this decade.

Resource development in my congressional district in Oregon is a good example. The Upper Willamette resource conservation and development project is one of the first 20 such projects to be carried out as a result of legislation in 1962.

The Oregon project covers 3 million acres in four counties. It has opened many avenues for communities in the area to develop unexplored potentials of their land and water resources. The products of land-use adjustments, forest land improvement, and changes in cropping patterns will lead to the need for new manufacturing and processing enterprises. Expansion of recreation facilities, development of agricultural and municipal water supply, enhancement of wildlife, and protection of the area from crippling and costly floods will improve economic opportunities.

I have been close to this project as the local people have planned it. I have

visited the area and talked to the local people. Their interest has been beyond expectation. The project has brought public and private agencies and local people together for a common purpose, and they have each contributed to planning the project. They now look forward to making the plans a reality, with each doing his part.

Stimulated by the enthusiasm of working out the plan, local people have already started many projects that require no Federal cost sharing and some that require only a small amount of technical help. I understand that the other 19 resource conservation and development projects have created this same kind of enthusiasm, with people going ahead on their own before the program actually got underway. Just the act of getting together and bringing out the potentials of the area has given them new life and new hope.

The concentration of conservation and development activities of all the public and private agencies and the local people has promoted closer working relationships among them. It has also served to inform communities of what assistance is available and how programs of the various levels of Government fit together.

I believe this group approach is an especially effective tool to resource development. It enables local people, by their own initiative, to make full use of their resources. It gives support to the concept that local people should be the mainstay of such an undertaking.

The Upper Willamette project is sponsored by six of the local soil conservation districts, which are locally formed and managed units of State government. It is an endeavor in which towns and cities and rural people are participating. When completed, the area expects a \$15 million a year increase in their economy, with more than 200 new businesses in the area.

The door has been opened. These people are showing what can be done with a little help. They have my support.

**Closing Ranks**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. BROCK ADAMS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article referred to previously today in my 1-minute speech:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Mar. 15, 1966]

**CLOSING RANKS**

The unanimous vote of 39 Governors attending a White House conference in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policies is the best indication that the administration has surprised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's intensive examination of that policy with support strengthened, if anything.



March 24, 1966

A1704

Such a conclusion is further buttressed by the latest public opinion poll which showed more than 7 to 1 approving the President's actions.

At the White House conference, the Governors were briefed on the current Vietnam situation by Mr. Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, Defense Secretary McNamara, and military leaders. Utah's Governor Rampton, who was present, described the briefing as thorough and frank, and he said he was heartened to learn "the picture in Vietnam is a lot better than when we were here 8 months ago."

"That is heartening news, although it must be tempered with the knowledge that the fighting continues viciously and costly, with no reason to hope that the end is in sight. But while public debate of American policy relative to Vietnam is fully justified when the debate ends, it is well to close ranks in the face of any enemy all too ready to interpret debate in terms of indecision and weakness.

Besides, there is work to be done in Washington—and it is good to have Majority Leader MANSFIELD report that after the weeks of debate, Congress is now "getting into the groove."

### Tobacco Referendum

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 of this year, the Department of Agriculture held a referendum to determine the standards for tobacco allotments for 1966.

The tobacco growers in my district and in the State of Tennessee voted overwhelmingly against the acreage-poundage program, advocated by the Department of Agriculture.

Because of their negative vote, which I wholeheartedly supported, most of the tobacco growers will now receive a 15-percent reduction in acreage, which they did not want. The tobacco farmers would have preferred that the standards remain the same as they were for 1965.

I do not feel that any cut is justified, and the Department of Agriculture should leave the allotments as they are.

I am hopeful that, in the future, we can prevent the Department of Agriculture from blackmailing our tobacco growers by supposedly giving them a choice, but in actuality, forcing them to take a stand that can do nothing but hurt them.

I insert at this point in the RECORD two editorials, commenting on the meaning of this vote:

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Mar. 13, 1966]

#### BLOW FOR FREEDOM

Burley tobacco growers emphatically rejected in their vote this week a proposal by the Department of Agriculture that would have substituted acreage-poundage limitation for the plan long in use under which growers were free to market all the leaf they were able to raise on a fixed acreage allotment.

Having rejected the Federal agency's acreage-poundage proposal, most growers will now face a 15-percent reduction in acreage.

The vote of the burley growers will be interpreted by some of us, at least, as striking a blow for freedom to the extent that this is possible under any federally imposed marketing control plan. Individual enterprise, which is to say the quality and skill devoted to the production of a burley crop, will continue to be the main factors in determining the profitability of each grower's crop.

Incidentally, a factor in this election was that a substantial number of growers already have only the minimum acreage allotment so that they will not be affected by the 15-percent cut proclaimed by the Department of Agriculture.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, Mar. 13, 1966]

#### QUITE A MESSAGE

Tennessee tobacco growers put on a display of independence last Thursday by voting against the acreage-poundage program while growers of 12 other States were voting for it.

So overwhelming was the anti sentiment in Tennessee that it swung the balance overall, and acreage-poundage failed to get the two-thirds majority it had to have.

Kentucky tobacco leaders are reported stunned, and some are saying growers in our State have "cut their own throats." They may have, at that, since many now face a slash of 15 percent on their acreage allowances. Yet in rebelling against the idea of having poundage as well as acreage controlled, Tennessee growers undoubtedly were showing their weariness over controls in general. And in doing that, they have achieved some personal satisfaction if nothing else.

Acreage-poundage may have been just what the doctor ordered, but the individual farmer in Tennessee is chafing under the doctor's continued ordering and prescribing without being requested to do so by the patient. That, we think, is the meaning of the heavy negative vote (6 to 1), and we hope the message gets through.

Meanwhile, the efforts of all concerned should be directed toward making the present program work. If changes are needed, there will be another day and another vote and another decision. That is the American way.

### Housing Legislation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. PAUL A. FINO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to require local public housing agencies to ignore certain income in computing income levels and resultant rent levels for tenants in federally aided public housing projects.

This bill would require local public housing agencies to exclude from tenants' income such part of any governmental pension increase—Federal, State, and local pensions—which the agency shall find to represent a cost-of-living increase, as well as such income as the tenant family spends for medicare coverage.

One of the greatest difficulties in public housing today is the continual readjustment of tenants' rent levels based on changing income levels. Each time a tenant's income goes up, his rent must go up.

This is particularly unfair as regards the many old people in public housing who live on small social security and other pensions. When these people receive a small pension boost, it is often to cover a rise in the cost of living or the expense of a new program like medicare. This type of pension hike should not be gobbled up in increased public housing rents.

My bill provides that the contract between the Federal Public Housing Administration and the local public housing agency must provide that in calculating tenants' income, and rentals based thereon, the public housing agency must omit the amount spent for medicare coverage and also that part of any pension increase which the agency shall find as corresponding to a rise in the cost of living.

Government pensioners living on small fixed pension incomes have it hard enough in these inflationary days without having to see any cost-of-living pension hike they get eaten up by rent boosts. My bill would keep cost-of-living pension hikes and boosts to cover medicare expenses from being counted in income so as to cause public housing rent rises. I think that this exclusion is in the true spirit of the public housing program.

### Some Ideas Are Unreal

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, Mar. 8, 1966]

#### SOME IDEAS ARE UNREAL (By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—When I listen to George F. Kennan and Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, CHURCH, and ROBERT KENNEDY, I wonder if they live on the same planet, if they have seen this 20th-century world in which we toil.

Let's concentrate on Kennan. His views expressed before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee make me wonder if he has found an island or an ivory tower where facts and events never intrude on his philosophical notions of communism.

Here is an example of Kennan's views on Cuba, taken from the record of the hearings:

"Mr. KENNAN. A great many Americans are concerned, for example, about Castro in Cuba, and at times they have had good reasons to be, and I do not for a moment underestimate the seriousness of the crisis we faced there some years ago.

"But it does seem to me that we must carefully stack up our advantages against our disadvantages in these situations. For the first time in a long, long time, someone else pays the bills in Cuba, someone else is getting milked, someone else has the problems of dealing with the Cuban regime. For once we can sit back and personally I do not think the Russians are going to have any great satisfaction out of their involvement in Cuba over the long run.

A1710

that Greece might still be free," lived on to inspire the Greeks to continue their fight for freedom.

The years between 1821, when the struggle began, and 1827, toward the close of the war, were marked by a series of both victories and defeats for the Greeks.

Finally, on October 20, 1827, the British, French, and Russian fleets intervened in the Bay of Navarino and dealt a crushing blow to the Ottoman naval power. Sixty out of 89 Turkish-Egyptian vessels were destroyed, the Greeks seized the initiative, and the tide was turned irreversibly in their favor.

Although the Battle of Navarino made the independence of Greece a certainty the fighting continued for another 2 years and almost 5 years elapsed before the new state took shape. In 1832 the Treaty of Constantinople was signed, and with the signing of this treaty, the Turks renounced their claims and recognized Greek independence.

The Greek ideal of democracy, born in ancient Greece over 2,000 years ago, once more prevailed, and Greece took her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to participate in the 145th observance of this significant event, and wish to express my admiration for the indomitable courage of the Greeks and to pay tribute to them for their enduring and universal contributions to civilization.

### Informed Attack on Grain Dumping

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial March 22, 1966, in the Chicago Tribune gave richly deserved recognition to Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, for his able informed attack on the dumping policies of the Johnson administration policies which adversely affect the farmer.

Here is the text of the editorial:

**WHERE FARM PRICES ARE MADE—OR BROKEN**  
Those farmers who look to the Johnson administration to advance their economic interests may find it instructive to consider some statements that have come out of Washington relating to the controversy over Government sales of surplus corn, which caused corn prices to drop.

Representative ANCHER NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charged in the House recently that since last January the Government had sold nearly 250 million bushels of corn on the open market for the express purpose of holding down corn prices. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman responded by terming NELSEN's charge "a lot of political noise."

But Gardner Ackley, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, put the matter in clearer perspective in a recent televised interview:

"Increased supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn"; said Ackley, "and we're trying to hold down the price of corn."

Earlier this year President Johnson had occasion to tell Congress that under present law the Secretary of Agriculture "must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures."

It is obviously inconsistent with orderly marketing procedure to dump Government-owned grain on the market in quantities so huge as to cause prices to drop. That would seem to indicate the Department of Agriculture is guilty of flouting the law.

It would also indicate that when supply and demand forces in the marketplace dictate corn prices higher than the Government thinks they should be, it is just too bad. The real dictation comes from Washington.

VN

### Vietnam: Why We're There

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY**  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield, Ill., State Register quotes an American general as saying that if we should abandon our commitment to South Vietnam, we will "face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand."

The paper adds:

This train of events would put aggressive communism much closer to the Western World.

The officer quoted by the paper, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, replies to the question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" and because his answers seem pertinent, I have permission that the article to which I have referred be included, in its entirety in the RECORD:

**WHY WE MUST FIGHT: VIETNAM PULLOUT WOULD WRECK CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES**

There are still some people who profess they don't understand why the United States is fighting in Vietnam.

They say they don't understand the nature of this strange and undeclared war.

Some even maintain we ought to pull out. For all of these doubters, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, commander of the Fleet Marine Force in the Pacific, recently gave some clear and illuminating answers.

Why are we in Vietnam?

"The answer," said Krulak, "in one word is 'freedom'—the freedom of others and our own freedom; we have a selfish reason; our freedom is at issue."

In the general's view, if the United States should abandon its commitment to South Vietnam, it will "face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand."

This train of events would put aggressive communism much closer to the Western World. The Philippines would be flanked. Our bases in the Pacific would be imperiled and even Hawaii would be in the sights of what Krulak called "creeping, predatory, vicious communism on the march."

And that is exactly what the fighting in Vietnam is against.

This is not a spontaneous uprising, such as was our Revolutionary War, as some contend.

As to the peculiar nature of the war in Vietnam, Krulak said:

"This is not a battle for hills and mountains, towns and rivers. The battlefield is the people."

And this has imposed a dreadful ordeal on the people of South Vietnam. They are the ones who bear the brunt of the kidnaping, extortion and terror inflicted by the 100,000 guerrillas who supplement the 50,000 hard-core Red troops in South Vietnam.

These sorely beset South Vietnamese plead for our protection. We are giving them all we can. They want schools and hospitals. We are responding. And, says Krulak, "little by little we have won their confidence."

If the United States now were to pull out of Vietnam, as some insist we should, this painfully won confidence would be shattered.

Throughout southeast Asia, if this unthinkable and unlikely retreat were to take place, it would indicate to friends and foes alike that we cannot be trusted.

General Krulak has incisively explained why we must stand and fight.

VN

### Mission Hailed

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WALTER H. MOELLER**  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in a Washington Star editorial hailing the value of HEW Secretary Gardner's visit to Vietnam.

The mission reflects "an awareness that something more than success on the battlefield is needed," the Star believes, and it quotes one general as having said:

We could kill the last Vietcong guerrilla and still lose the war unless the people can see something worth living and striving for.

The Star adds:

The Gardner mission should be appraised in this spirit, as a token of our good faith in pledging that we will do what we can to make certain that, after the fighting is over, there will be something worth living for in Vietnam.

The editorial, on this subject of such vital concern to us all, is offered for publication in the RECORD—where it may be read in its entirety:

**MR. GARDNER'S MISSION**

This week's arrival in Saigon of HEW Secretary Gardner with a team of 22 specialists adds more than lipservice to the announced intention of the United States to rehabilitate South Vietnam's war-stricken civilian economy. It suggests that the fine words which followed the President's meeting in Honolulu with Vietnamese officials will be followed by action.

The rehabilitation program looks toward the provision of such things as schools, clinics, hospitals, better sanitation facilities, and the like. Something is being done in these areas now, more perhaps than is generally known. But the big part of the job remains to be done, and the importance of getting it done should not be underestimated. It is essential to the attainment of our stated goal—a free and independent Vietnam.

At the top of the priority list, of course, is the matter of getting on with the war. Repair work on the South Vietnamese economy can begin on a major scale only in areas which have been freed from Communist control and which are secured against the return of the enemy. But this does not mean that

March 24, 1966

culture, and national pride. They are clearly and simply a ward of the Kremlin.

As freemen who do not take our freedoms and liberties for granted, we are a link between the principles of freedom and self-determination and those who aspire to be free and guide their own destiny. On this 48th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, let us reaffirm to the Byelorussian people that their hopes have not been forgotten by the free world.

### Cure for Crisis of Credibility

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the only cure for today's crisis in credibility concerning Government information would be a little more candor on the part of Federal Government officials.

The ideal of "truth-in-Government" would be hastened immeasurably by passage of a public records law by the Congress. The presence of such a law would give Government officials an excuse for being less devious in their information policies.

Columnist Richard Wilson commented on the cure for the crisis is credibility on January 21, 1966. His column follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1966]

#### THE CURE FOR CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

(By Richard Wilson)

"Crisis of credibility" is the kind of phrase Washington gets enamored of from time to time. What this currently used phrase conveys in the present context is the suspicion that the Johnson administration isn't leveling with the public.

The "oh, yeah?" and "since when?" responses to presidential utterances are proliferating in an embarrassing way. So embarrassing, in fact, that White House staff members are inquiring into the scope of and reasons for this skeptical phenomenon.

U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg is the father of the thought that the credibility of Johnson policies on peace in Vietnam was in question. There was, the Ambassador frankly admitted in explaining the vigor of the question. There was, the Ambassador frankly admitted in explaining the vigor of the quest for peace, a question about the credibility of U.S. eagerness for negotiation which had to be answered.

Perhaps the word credibility in connection with what President Johnson says and does is not precise. Devious may be a better word, or any other word that conveys the impression of artful aims not fully exposed, or a constructive coloration on unpleasant events, or simply the telling of part truths in the pursuit of masked purposes.

It is possible to recite at length instances wherein what Johnson says might be considered at variance with what he does. There was no visible resemblance between what the White House was saying about aluminum and steel price increases and what President Johnson was doing about them. Little believability may have rung through his belated

statements on the New York transit strike and the inflationary effects of the wage settlement. A dash of gullibility helps in swallowing his budget forecasts.

But are the maneuvers and techniques of a President in getting what he wants to be judged by the standards that his critics wish to impose? By these standards all questions would be answered with complete frankness regardless of the consequences. The simplest among us could demand from the President the whole truth and nothing but the truth, the exposure of his purposes and methods in the most delicate of negotiations, as well as every thought and act while waking or sleeping.

These standards demand no nonsense or diversions from White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers, such as not telling exactly what the President did or intends to do or not responding in precisely the way his questioner desires.

Such standards are obviously both unrealistic and undesirable. They are unrealistic because no President has ever operated that way, and undesirable because if he did he would then frustrate justifiable aims and sometimes the national interest.

But that really is not the question in the present circumstances. The question is whether or not the President's methods are so often devious and circuitous that they arouse skepticism that he is headed where he says he is going or reveal where he has been. It must be this that is of concern at the White House, for it is not likely that confidence in a President can be maintained at the highest level if his credibility is continuously in doubt.

It is absurd to say that the President's credibility has created any kind of crisis, or that he is in imminent danger of losing the confidence of the American people. This is familiar Washington talk, arising in large part from those who disagree more with what the President has done, or may do, than with what has been said.

Johnson is not likely at his age to go through a reformation of the methods and techniques that kept him in command of the Senate for so many years. He does depend upon a certain amount of naturally endowed flim-flamery that often enough meets, with dazzling success, and other times falls flat.

It would take very little to dispel the Washington talk about a "crisis of credibility." Just an ounce or two more of frankness and openness would help. A return to the preoperative Johnson when he saw and talked with many more people in various pursuits outside the official family would be good.

### The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 145th anniversary of the struggle for Greek independence. The concepts of freedom and democracy given birth in ancient Greece were the same goals of those valiant Greeks who, many centuries later, took up the cause of freedom against the hated repression of the Ottoman Empire.

Our admiration for the courage and fortitude of the Greeks in response to Communist aggression in the hills after

World War II played a major role in the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Greece is a valuable and respected member. Even now Greece's geographical proximity to the Soviet Union serves as a constant reminder of the struggle for freedom.

The free world can never fully repay its debt to the values and ideals that have come down to us from the Greek heritage. Our repayment is made even more difficult because of the many contributions that are being made to our Nation by the million and one-half Greek-Americans. They are active in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in social, civic, cultural, and community enterprises; they are valued citizens and trusted neighbors.

On the occasion of the 145th anniversary of Greek independence, let us join in thanking our friends of Greek ancestry for their many contributions to our national life.

### The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 25, 1966, we commemorate the 145th anniversary of Greek independence from four centuries of oppressive rule under the Ottoman Turks.

Traditionally, March 25 is regarded as the day when a small band of patriots, under the leadership of Ypsilanti, struck the first blow for Greek liberty. Because the Ottoman Turks greatly outnumbered the Greeks, Ypsilanti suffered an initial defeat, but the struggle continued both on land and on sea for 7 succeeding years.

In the meantime, world events were gradually changing the balance in favor of the Greeks. Such occurrences as the American and French Revolutions, the decline of the Ottoman Empire, the fall of Napoleon, the outbreak of nationalistic revolutions in other countries such as Serbia, and most important of all, the awakening of a strong nationalistic feeling among the Greeks themselves, served to give a cohesiveness to the Greek struggle and to rouse the sympathy and support of Europeans and Americans alike.

Among the Americans who took an active part in the Greek fight for freedom were Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Gen. George Jarvis, Capt. Jonathan Peckham Miller, and Lt. William T. Washington, who lost his life in July 1827, during a factional outbreak.

And, of course, it is fitting that we remember here the contribution of England's illustrious poet, Lord Byron, who went to Greece in 1824 to help the Greeks and who did much to popularize their cause. Lord Byron finally lost his life from exposure, but his most important poem about the Greek struggle, in which he wrote the immortal line, "I dreamed

a significant start cannot be made, and made now.

Secretary Gardner's remarks upon arriving in Saigon suggest that he understands the real nature of the problem. "Our presence here," he said, signals "a vital new phase" of the effort to improve Vietnamese health, welfare, and education programs. "We are not here to provide overnight answers. We are here to learn, to observe, to try to understand \* \* \*. There will be many followup missions that will build on our findings."

These comments, if one chooses, can be dismissed as generalities. But we think there is substance in them. They reflect an awareness that something more than success on the battlefield is needed. One general has put it this way: "We could kill the last Vietcong guerrilla and still lose the war unless the people can see something worth living and striving for."

The Gardner mission should be appraised in this spirit, as a token of our good faith in pledging that we will do what we can to make certain that, after the fighting is over, there will be something worth living for in Vietnam.

**Resolute Washington**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has commented most favorably on the vote Congress gave the President to conduct the difficult yet honorable struggle in which the United States is engaged in Vietnam.

The paper states:

The size of the vote must have a salutary effect upon those abroad who of late may have been led to believe that there is greater opposition to the President's course than actually exists.

It adds its approval to President Johnson's renewed and urgent plea to "negotiate peace and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam make their choice."

With permission of my colleagues, I make this editorial on a "Resolute Washington" available for the RECORD, where others may read it in its entirety: [From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 4, 1966]

**RESOLUTE WASHINGTON**

The Senate did the right and sensible thing in resoundingly and overwhelmingly voting the \$4.8 billion supplemental Vietnamese war budget (the House voted for it even more strongly) and in keeping the famous Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Although not all those who voted affirmatively support all aspects of America's military policy, the vote gave the President the backing he needs to conduct resolutely the difficult, thankless, yet honorable struggle in which the United States is engaged.

The size of the vote must have a salutary effect upon those abroad who of late may have been led to believe that there is greater opposition to the President's course than actually exists. Things are thus back in somewhat better perspective.

At the same time we welcome with equal warmth President Johnson's renewed and urgent plea to "negotiate peace and let war stand aside while the people of Vietnam

make their choice." We also say bravo to the President's reiteration that America would stand by the outcome of any freely held election.

As we discuss in the editorial immediately following, we hope that there is a growing realization on the Communists' part that they cannot now hope to win the war in Vietnam. Negotiations must someday come. And, frankly, we do not see how they are likely to come on better terms or at a more favorable moment for the Communists than today. Moscow knows this. Peking may be realizing it. Why not Hanoi?

If such a Communist change is possible, might this not eventually lead to a serious study of the latest proposal from Senator FULBRIGHT, who suggests an agreement with Communist China for the neutralization of all southeast Asia? It is hard to think of any achievement which would draw wider and deeper sighs of relief from the world than this.

Yet it would be naive to underestimate the difficulties in the path of such an accord. Neutralization would have to be underwritten by foolfast guarantees. It would require that both Communist China and the local Communist Parties end all armed attempts to change the status quo. It would necessitate that the Communists also end all subversion, placing their future hopes on free elections and peaceful politicking. On the other side, it would require adherence to democratic principles.

The American people and Government yearn for such a solution. The Communists can have a neutralized southeast Asia tomorrow if they are prepared to make the reasonable adjustments required.

**Triumph Out of Defeat—Courage Praised**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I know we are all proud of America's latest pioneers, the Gemini 8's astronauts and their thousands of skilled and dedicated assistants on land and sea.

The Chicago Sun-Times carried a recent editorial praising the men for their courage and self-sufficiency.

The article was written shortly before it was learned what caused the vehicles to gyrate, but the writer points out:

Faced with trouble they could not possibly diagnose (the astronauts), reacted with the highest sort of courage.

The editorial is typical of many which I have seen, and I make it a part of the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 18, 1966]

**TRIUMPH OUT OF DEFEAT**

Despite the failure to accomplish all that had been planned, Gemini 8's astronauts and their thousands of skilled and dedicated assistants on land and sea enjoyed great triumphs.

The precisely scheduled launching of two giant rockets, one following the other into orbit through a tiny keyhole in the sky, was unprecedented. The chase through space at speeds approaching 20,000 miles an hour, the delicate maneuver of joining the space capsule to the target rocket, was a tremendous achievement and a most im-

portant one. In the years ahead, when man continues in his effort to explore space, the docking maneuver will be essential in the joining together of structures in space that will form the bases for further explorations into the unknown.

Whatever caused the two joined space vehicles to gyrate and thus bring an end to the mission is not known. The two astronauts, faced with trouble they could not possibly diagnose, reacted with the highest sort of courage. They extricated their capsule from the target vessel and effected an emergency landing in the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean that came off so smoothly that it almost seemed routine.

That, too, was a great triumph for the detailed planning against emergency, the long and patient training to meet every foreseeable hazard in space or after reentry. Astronauts Armstrong and Scott are safe aboard a naval vessel with their space capsule. The causes of their trouble in space will be explored and solved, as other difficulties have been solved, and new triumphs can be expected in succeeding Gemini and Apollo flights.

By his very nature, man is a pioneer. In days gone by he pushed his frontiers across dread and unknown oceans and into strange lands. His 20th century frontier is the uncharted realm of space. Man brings to that effort the same high level of courage and self-sufficiency possessed by earlier pioneers, as the flight of Gemini 8 so dramatically proved.

**A Good Word for L.B.J.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial recently appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post entitled "A Good Word for L.B.J."

It is comforting to see that a calm, measured, and careful handling of the crisis in Vietnam by President Johnson achieves the approval and respect of an outstanding commentator like Mr. Roscoe Drummond. This excellent editorial merits careful reading:

**A Good Word for L.B.J.**

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war. Obviously, there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression and a great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing wisdom, caution and determination to bear on the conduct of the war.

Surely the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peking is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits; will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out; and will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest

we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis Lemay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that Senator WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis Lemay, and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily, but deliberately; not recklessly, but with great care; not timidly—he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully, but no more.

These ingredients of mind have marked the President's course in Vietnam: deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

They have produced a clear and properly limited objective: to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war, he is not using U.S. airpower to bomb cities in the north; not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy North Vietnam; not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime; not asking for the "unconditional surrender" of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

### The 145th Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. KEN W. DYAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 145th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On this date in 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised a new national flag over his monastery at Kalavryta. This started the bitter climax to the struggle which the Greek people had been carrying on for 400 years against rule by the Ottoman Empire.

The final Greek revolt, against overwhelming odds, lasted 8 years—longer than the American War for Independence. But the indomitable spirit of the brave Greek people prevailed.

On this anniversary we celebrate a triumph of the human spirit over all the obstacles of history. The Greek people have proved their valor repeatedly for thousands of years.

I wish the Greek people peace and prosperity, and I wish all Americans, whatever their national origin, would study and appreciate the reasons for the celebration of this holiday. Our constitutional form of government owes a

tremendous debt to the great political thinkers of ancient Greece whose philosophy has become part of our heritage.

### Future Homemakers of America

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 27 through April 2, 1966, has been designated National FHA Week as a tribute to the Future Homemakers of America. This is a national youth organization of more than 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945 as an incorporated, nonprofit organization, supported by membership dues. It was the outgrowth of various State and local clubs of high school economics students which were known by different names and had no unified program. By the end of that first year the national organization had a membership of just under 100,000 in some 2,500 chapters. By the end of the second year, membership had almost doubled, and now as the Future Homemakers of America begin their 21st year they count well over 600,000 members in more than 11,000 chapters. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

In this age of constant change and challenge, in this era of too much disregard for tradition and precedent, in this environment of population explosion and increased pressures, the need for new patterns in home life is widely accepted. These young people who are in the Future Homemakers of America are serious-minded, community-spirited, fun-loving youngsters who are concerned about the responsibilities of the future and are conscientiously doing something about it. These are the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion molders of this great land of ours.

National FHA Week finds the 11,000 local chapters spotlighting activities and projects concerned with a 4-year national program of work. Its objectives are to help each member recognize her abilities, strive for their full development, and participate actively in family, community, and world improvement projects.

To further these objectives the elected youth officers of FHA developed nine projects which stress individual development; emphasize mental and physical health; encourage serious consideration in choosing and training for useful careers; develop codes of ethics, morals, and manners; further understanding of people of all heritages, customs, and be-

liefs; promote appreciation of all family members and their abilities and problems; teach selective spending; inculcate citizenship responsibilities; and encourage using leisure time for activities beneficial to the individual and society.

In these times when so much publicity is given to juvenile delinquents, beatniks and draft-card burners, all of whom are really a small minority of today's youth, it is good to pay tribute to the Future Homemakers of America who are seriously preparing themselves to be good citizens.

### Southern Africa: Target of Blockade

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article recently appeared in the News and Courier—one of South Carolina's leading newspapers.

In view of the touchy situation in Rhodesia, I found the article to be very interesting. Mr. Thomas R. Waring, the editor, assures me the author's source of information is excellent. Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Congress:

#### SOUTHERN AFRICA: TARGET OF BLOCKADE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this article about a projected blockade and invasion of southern Africa, a foreign military observer who resides abroad, has excellent sources of information in England, Europe, and Africa. He is known to the News and Courier, but prefers not to be identified by name or nationality. His report confirms a recent article by Russell Warren Howe in the New Leader magazine entitled "Showdown in Southern Africa." Mr. Howe, who is traveling in Africa on a Ford Foundation press fellowship, reported February 28 that the Soviet Union is prepared to put its navy at the service of the U.N. for a blockade of southern Africa.)

The British Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, seems to be determined to escalate his vendetta against Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, who 5 months ago declared unilateral independence from Britain. Wilson promised the assembled Afro-Asians at the British Commonwealth Conference in Lagos last year that he would destroy Ian Smith and his government by March. He then imposed sanctions against Rhodesia and persuaded the United States to join in.

The result has been utter failure, and it is even likely that Wilson knew all along that it would be. It is, in fact, probable that Mr. Wilson's ultimate target is the destruction of civilization in the whole of southern Africa, and that action against Rhodesia provides just the excuse which he wanted.

Wilson insists that there should be majority rule in Rhodesia, irrespective of whether the voters are savages straight out of the jungle, whether they are entirely illiterate or not, and whether they know what they are voting about. There must be universal franchise, which in practice means handing Rhodesia over to a government of black leftwing extremists.

It is hardly surprising that the whites are not enthusiastic. Everything other than a