

proved—the way exemplary utilities such as American Electric Power and Detroit Edison have proved—that it is on the same side as the customers.

But then Chairman Eble thinks it has. "In a broad sense," he says, "the goals of Con Edison and the city are in harmony." Then in an odd twist he adds: "But you know, I'd never use Charlie Wilson's phrase, 'What's good for the company is good for the city.'"

After we are assured that a recurrence of the November blackout is remote, perhaps, one day soon, I hope, Fortune magazine will publish an article entitled: "Con Edison: The Company You Hate To Love."

#### FACTS AND FIGURES ON VIETNAM

(Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, to quote a well-known military writer:

A year or two ago a collapse (of the South Vietnamese army) would have been possible, but not today.

This is the opinion by Richard Fryklund, writing recently in the Washington Evening Star.

His article quotes officials as saying it is easy now to rule out a collapse of the South Vietnamese army and adds:

It has never been in better shape. It is fighting at least as well as the enemy. It is growing. It is getting better equipment. Its morale is good.

The facts and figures given by this distinguished writer, and particularly the manner in which South Vietnam desertions are reported, seem most pertinent to our current discussion on developments in Vietnam. For that reason, I am taking the liberty of bringing the full text of Mr. Fryklund's article, from the March 1 issue of the Star, to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

#### VIET DESERTIONS: FIGURES AND FACTS

(By Richard Fryklund)

The Government of South Vietnam has added up the number of deserters from its armed forces during the last year. The total is more than 100,000.

In fact, South Vietnam has counted about 100,000 deserters annually for 3 years.

This is a huge number for a country that has only 875,000 men in all its forces, regular and home guard. In fact, any army that loses 100,000 men through desertions 3 years running simply cannot survive.

Clearly something here does not make sense. Either the Army of South Vietnam is collapsing or the figures are wrong or those men are not really deserters.

Washington officials say it is easy to rule out a collapse of the South Vietnamese Army. It has never been in better shape. It is fighting at least as well as the enemy. It is growing. It is getting better equipment. Its morale is good.

A year or two ago a collapse would have been possible, but not today.

Could the figures be wrong? Certainly not that wrong.

The South Vietnamese Army keeps pretty good statistics now, using methods taught by American military advisers.

The men are fingerprinted and photographed as they are enlisted. The roll is called every morning and anyone who does

not answer "here" is put on the deserter list.

This is where we find a departure from the practices of the American forces. Here, a man is listed as "absent without leave" when he first fails to turn up and becomes a deserter only when it is clear that he does not intend to return.

But even if a missing South Vietnamese soldier returns the next day and apologizes for overstaying a pass, he still becomes a number on the desertion list. No one knows how many of the listed deserters are really AWOL, but there must be many of them.

Under the South Vietnamese system, a deserter can also be a man who transferred himself to another outfit without any legal formalities.

American advisers in South Vietnam say that it is common for a soldier, particularly a new recruit or a draftee, to leave his assigned base, return to his home village and reenlist as a home guardsman or even a regular.

He is listed as a deserter from his original outfit, but the South Vietnamese Government understands the deep feelings of a peasant for his home and for the graves of his ancestors and so it tolerates such transfers.

Some men, of course, are real deserters. They go over to the enemy or go home. What this true figure is, no one can say for sure. Pentagon estimates indicate it has been about 20,000 or 30,000 a year for several years.

This is a high desertion rate, too, but it also is misleading.

Men seem to desert without too many qualms and often without severe punishment from the armies on both sides in South Vietnam.

The Communist forces, regulars, irregulars and organizers who can bear arms, number about 235,000 men now. About 1,600 of these men deserted in January and came over to the Government's side. How many went home is not known. Through February 15, another 1,167 deserted.

On an annual basis, the enemy probably has a desertion rate therefore, of something like 5 or 10 percent. The South Vietnamese rate cannot be any higher.

It is probable, however, that the Vietcong rate is going up while the Government rate is going down. For the last 3 years, the strength of the Government forces has increased from 400,000 at the end of 1963 to 575,000 at the end of 1964 to 875,000 at the end of 1965. But the official desertion rate has been rather steady.

The present high rates on the enemy side are setting wartime records and may indicate an important new trend.

Despite desertions, both sides are able to maintain their strength and even grow, mostly by volunteers.

Draft figures on the enemy side are not known but the South Vietnamese regular armed forces have only 18 percent draftees—a figure comparable with that of the American army. All of the home guard forces, about 100,000 men, are volunteers.

The South Vietnamese people then, must be roughly as willing to fight for their village or country as are Americans.

If, even after all the corrections, the desertion figures for South Vietnam cannot be easily reconciled with American experience, it may simply be because of differences in custom and outlook. The figures may always puzzle us, but they need not be cause for alarm.

#### AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE VIETNAM DEBATE

(Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in the recent debates that have been taking place, both here and in the other body, some question has been raised as to whether historical parallels are really applicable. In that connection I believe a recent column by Mr. Kenneth Crawford, of the staff of Newsweek magazine, may be helpful. Perhaps it should also be borne in mind that Mr. Crawford has a long record of support for liberal causes.

The article from Newsweek for February 28, 1966, follows:

#### YET ANOTHER DEBATE

(By Kenneth Crawford)

The Vietnamese war debate is like the music that goes round and round and comes out here, exactly where it came out before. That is what happened with the campus debate last year. That is what is happening with the congressional debate now raging. When it is all over, the conclusion will be that no better alternative to the President's course—fighting a limited war while continuing the quest for peace—has emerged from the talk. The necessary funds will be voted. The bad business of war and the hopeful business of diplomacy will go on at the old stand.

At the end of the campus teach-ins, their more restrained leaders, those who did not favor a North Vietnamese takeover of South Vietnam, conceded that the United States couldn't honorably withdraw from southeast Asia until some kind of peace had been arranged. Responsible Senators are coming to the same conclusion, some of them belatedly. If the doves choose to believe that it was their protests that inspired the Johnson peace offensive and Secretary McNamara's announcement that Hanoi industry and Haiphong Harbor would not be bombed, nobody will begrudge them that satisfaction.

Senators who decide to vote for war appropriations out of a sense of obligation to the U.S. fighting men already in Vietnam while disavowing sympathy for the President's war policies out of considerations of political expediency will be understood, if not necessarily admired. As Senator WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT has suggested in mitigation of his weakness on civil rights, a politician must make concessions to the prejudices of his constituents to survive in public life.

#### THE CRITICS' CASE

Actually, the area of disagreement between critics of Mr. Johnson as a war President and administration spokesmen is quite narrow. The critics' case is more clearly and thoughtfully delineated by Columnist Walter Lippmann than by witnesses appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee or by Senators speaking at the hearings and on the floor. In lucid newspaper commentaries printed last week, Lippmann agrees that "the containment of Red China today, like the containment of Stalinist Russia after the World War, is necessary to the peace of the world and is a vital interest of the United States."

But he goes on to say that the difference between successful containment of Stalinism after the Second World War and the present attempt to contain Red China lies in diplomatic policy. In the case of Europe, he contends, the United States led an alliance of Western Powers while in the case of China it is virtually alone. The fact is, however, that when Truman policy was initiated to save Greece from a Communist takeover, America's only active ally was Britain. Italy was paralyzed by communism, France by instability, and most other U.S. allies by a state of postwar shock.

#### CONFLICTING VIEWS

Lippmann opposed Truman policy at its inception in Greece as he now opposes what he

## THE POLITICAL PRICE OF POWER

With the election of John Lindsay, Con Edison's relations with city hall may not be quite so smooth as they have been in the past. For one thing, Lindsay is death on clubhouse politics, and has bitterly attacked partisan political patronage and the "power brokers" who, he charges, have long manipulated city government. One of his first actions—a call for the abolition of all coal burning in order to cut down air pollution—would have a direct effect on Con Edison, which burns approximately 5 million tons of coal a year in its city plants.

One of Con Ed's most furious political battles was fought and—by its management's lights, at least—won 7 years ago. The opponent was that old nemesis, public power. The three powerplants the city had owned since La Guardia's day needed to be modernized. Faced with an expenditure of \$100 million, the city had either to take the plunge and possibly extend power distribution to other public agencies and authorities, or to sell the plants to Con Edison. But before the city could sell the plants it needed enabling legislation from the State capital. In Albany, Con Edison put on a display of political lobbying that professionals still recall with awe and admiration. The bill was finally passed with only a handful of dissenting votes.

But if the political generalship was masterly, the price paid for the obsolete generators was extraordinarily high. Con Ed gave the city the book value of \$126 million for the three 50-year-old plants, whose real value was probably much lower. Moreover, the company since has had to spend heavily to maintain the equipment, and as the picture on page 123 indicates, even that has not been enough. Former Chairman Harland Forbes admitted that the economics of the powerplants was questionable, but that it was important for Con Ed to get the city out of the power business.

It was not the first time that Con Edison paid dearly to stifle the threat of public power. In the mid-fifties a group of powerful legislators were fighting hard in Washington to lead the Federal Government into the ownership of nuclear powerplants. To stave off this threat Con Edison made a surprising decision. The company plunged headlong into its plans for the construction of the first privately owned nuclear power station in the Nation, at Indian Point, on the Hudson River. Con Ed refused all Government assistance and subsidies, except for the \$500 million Federal indemnity insurance that is mandatory under the Price-Anderson Act. It also rejected the thought that it might share the cost of a pilot plant with other public utilities, as was done by utilities in New England and the Midwest.

The first estimate for Con Ed's spectacular plant was \$55 million. But it was plagued by engineering difficulties, took 4 years to build, and finally cost \$127 million. A conventional plant of the same capacity would have cost about \$190 per kilowatt of capacity; Indian Point cost between \$450 and \$500 per kilowatt. To make matters worse, the State public service commission has decided not to include the plant in the company's rate base. "There simply is not sufficient evidence," said the commission, "to reach a proper conclusion on appropriate and proper treatment of the costs of Indian Point operations, either capital costs or operational costs."

## IF AT FIRST YOU DON'T SUCCEED

Despite the jolting experience with its first nuclear plant, Con Ed is determined to try again. It is convinced that in its area, where fuel costs are high, nuclear power will be competitive with energy produced from coal or oil. This summer Con Edison expects to receive a construction permit from the

Atomic Energy Commission for an 873,000-kilowatt plant that will be located near Indian Point I. This time, however, having been burned when it acted as its own general contractor, Con Edison is buying a turnkey installation from Westinghouse at a cost of \$125 per kilowatt. "By running Indian Point II at 80 percent of capacity," says Senior Vice President Mowton Waring, "we can deliver power at 5 mills, about as low as you can get with any conventional system."

Placing the plant 24 miles upriver from New York City is a bow to public opinion. In 1962, Con Edison applied for a license to build a nuclear plant in Queens, then had to abandon the project because of fierce public opposition. But executives like Waring are so enthusiastic about nuclear power that they plan to make another attempt to locate a generator within city limits in the 1970's. Such a plant would enable Con Edison to scrap some of its inefficient coal-burning stations. (Steam from the boilers could also be sold for heating and air conditioning.) "We're going to fight to put the next nuclear plant right in the city," says Waring. "We know it's safe, and the Atomic Energy Commission is convinced. The public has yet to be persuaded."

Another of Con Ed's ambitious projects whose outcome is questionable is the proposed construction of a 2-million-kilowatt pumped-storage plant at Cornwall, 8 miles upriver from the nuclear generator. On paper, this hydroelectric scheme seems to make sense: it would, Con Edison told the Federal Power Commission, provide large blocks of power at low cost, alleviate air pollution, provide reliability of service, pave the way for use of large nuclear plants, and improve the company's bargaining position in purchasing other fuels. "I do not know of any project the company has undertaken," intoned Harland Forbes, "that offered so many benefits of such great significance to the public as the company's Cornwall pumped-storage project."

## THE EVER STUBBORN CITIZENRY

But in this case also the public has yet to be persuaded. Although the FPC granted a permit for the construction of the \$162 million plant, conservationists carried the case to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, which has set aside the FPC decision. The FPC must now, at the direction of the court, undertake a study of other methods of power generation, such as gas-turbine plants. Nobody at Con Edison is betting on the final decision.

Besides giving consideration to the Cornwall project, Con Edison has been negotiating with the Quebec Hydro Electric Commission for the purchase of 1,500,000 kilowatts of Canadian power. Talks have bogged down on costs ("We're about half a mill apart," says a Con Edison executive). However, in a prospectus issued last November, the company said that conditions are promising for the importation of Canadian power sometime in the 1970's.

Currently Con Edison is revamping its system to guard against another disaster like the November blackout. The company has purchased 28 diesel generator sets. They will provide an emergency source of power to insure a safe shutdown of turbine generators and help start up smaller units. Larger generators have been ordered to provide start-up power for units in the newer stations. Company executives are also working out a method of providing emergency power for the city subway system. The cost of this backup service will be an estimated \$10 million.

All this expansion is intended to do more than just to supply the needs of Con Edison's customers. By extending capacity and its high-voltage ties with other utilities, the company hopes to become a major regional

supplier of power. It is already connected with upstate New York and New England. A new interconnection will link Con Ed with plants in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and New York. The benefits of such interconnections are obvious: each utility can use the most economical source of power within the pool, and large generating plants can be operated at high capacity.

In the past Con Ed attempted to acquire the neighboring Long Island Lighting Co., a more profitable utility with both the industrial and residential growth that Con Edison lacks. Both attempts were blocked, first by the regulatory agencies, and then by Long Island Lighting's directors. But with the promise of high-voltage interconnections, Eble no longer see a need for the acquisition. "We can really get the same results under separate managements through cooperation and joint planning," he explains. "That way, you don't get into trouble politically, and you don't antagonize people."

## THE PLEASANTNESS OF CHANCE

This state of affairs would be a nice change for Con Ed, many of whose customers feel a good deal of antagonism at the moment. The long series of rate increases has brought some customers, at least, to the belief that they are being penalized for management's ineptitude. Some of the largest real estate companies in the city evidently shared that view. The real estate companies, banding together in the Owners Committee on Electric Rates, Inc., have spent \$320,000 over a 12-month period fighting the company's last major rate application. Although the court of appeals upheld the \$27 million increase, the group considers that its tactics were well worth the cost: The delay saved the group \$22,500,000. Con Ed's growth depends on future construction in the city, and this battle has probably been a deterrent to other builders.

Charles Eble takes such opposition in stride. A prodigious worker, Eble has come to symbolize Con Edison to what he considers its most important constituents—Wall Street, the political power structure, and community organizations. In his spacious office on the 16th floor of Con Ed's command post, Eble puts in a 12-hour day, mainly on financial matters. Since the company must borrow constantly for its construction program, Eble juggles deftly to keep the capital structure in balance, to avoid an overload of debt, and to pave the way for an equity issue tentatively scheduled for 1967. And since all construction projects must be coordinated with other companies, Eble spends a considerable amount of time shoring up relations with other utility executives. Eble also lends his talents to a number of outside business and community organizations. Among other posts, he holds the position of chairman of the once moribund Greater New York Safety Council, designed to promote safety on the roads and in industry, and reactivated it by increasing its budget and by persuading some prominent businessmen to serve on the board.

Some of the intense pressures on Con Edison, and on its facilities, may be alleviated in a few years if the company's expansionary plans are translated into reality. But Con Ed also has a conspicuous weakness: a consistent reluctance to find within itself the reason for its consistent unpopularity. That failing is likely to endure, partly because the company has no visible second-line young managers to generate new ideas along with the generation of more power. Executive Vice President Otto Manz seemed to recognize the weakness when he said recently, "We're always the whipping boy. We just don't sit here in the tower and decide to do in the customers. We must find a way to show people that we don't have horns." In fact, the company has never

believes to be too broad an Asian commitment. He advised American leaders not to get entangled "as partisans in a Greek civil war" until diplomatic explorations had been conducted in Moscow and satellite capitals and only then to consider defense of Crete and other maritime areas off the mainland. So he is consistent in saying, as he has, that the United States should recognize that it is a sea, not a land, power and comport itself accordingly in Asia.

Lippmann is against what he calls an unlimited commitment in Vietnam because he thinks the United States can't win without destroying the country, is making a land war with China well-nigh inevitable, and can't prevent similar wars elsewhere. All of which is reminiscent of his warning that Truman in Greece was projecting a vague global policy and an ideological crusade that has no limits. As it turned out, what Truman started in Greece saved Europe.

The President trusts that his Vietnam policy can do as much for south Asia. He is probably no stranger to the kind of forebodings Lippmann shares with several Senators, including Fulbright. But the Commander in Chief cannot permit himself to be dominated and immobilized by a doomsday reading of the uncertain future. Like Truman, he will do the necessary and hope for the best.

### CAB ZOOMS IN

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the February 26 issue of Business Week has a story I think all of us in Government should be interested in because it pertains to regulatory functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Written by Bruce Agnew and entitled, "CAB Zooms in on Thriving Airlines," the article is an excellent story on the Board's role in promoting and regulating the airline industry. In am aware that the story has been well received both in the industry and at the Civil Aeronautics Board, an indication that the story is fair and accurate.

The article follows:

**CAB ZOOMS IN ON THRIVING AIRLINES—WITH INDUSTRY PROFITS SOARING, THE AGENCY WINS PROMOTIONAL FARE CUTS, AND PREPARES TO COPE WITH LONG- AND SHORT-HAUL FARE DIFFERENTIALS, AND THE SUBSIDIZED LOCAL CARRIERS**

Airline profits are the time and the tide that govern the affairs of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Bad times mean CAB must play the role of solicitous parent, and try to nurse the industry back into the black even at the extreme of calling for fare boosts.

But good times mean elbow room to work in. These days, with airline profits soaring past 13 percent on invested capital, CAB is flexing its muscles.

The Board this month chalked up one major policy objective. Without bogging itself and the industry down in the costly redtape of a general fare investigation, it pressured airlines into proposing a package of promotional fare cuts that one airline estimates could save travelers \$74 million a year—while attracting enough new business to increase revenues.

#### HOLDING THE LINE

The promotional fares, unforeseen outcome of a 7-month debate with industry over the traditional fare increases when new jets are brought into service, have satisfied the

Board's demand for a "hold the line" policy. No new pressure on the overall fare level is likely.

However, the Board will devote increasing attention to two deep-rooted problems of adjustment and balance:

Should changes be made in the relationship between fares for long-distance and short-distance flights, possibly lowering the fares on some long hauls and boosting the price for some short hop?

Can the still-subsidized local service airlines be strengthened by changes in their route structures, even though the changes might mean more competition for the moneymaking long-haul airlines?

At the same time, the everyday run of business will present the Board with a series of policymaking opportunities. Among them:

Now in process or soon to get underway are four major route cases affecting the east coast, the Pacific Northwest-Southwest, and links with South America and across the Pacific.

Proceedings are on tap to develop a new subsidy formula for local service, to set a new nonsubsidy rate for carrying mail and to determine a new, probably reduced, rate for military passengers and freight.

In an international doubleheader next week, bilateral talks on air right will begin with Britain, and international airlines flying the Pacific will begin meetings to discuss transpacific fares, which CAB for years has wanted to have chopped.

Any Board-induced adjustments in the fare structure will be selective and slow in coming. Chairman Charles S. Murphy—a longtime Government hand and former attorney for the Democratic National Advisory Council—says the staff "has just made a good beginning" in its study.

#### MAYBE A YEAR

"Maybe in 2 or 3 months we'll have something we want to get accomplished," Murphy says, "but I would not expect any major results in terms of changes being made for maybe a year."

The premise behind the CAB exploration, however, is simple. Long hauls are by their nature more profitable than short hauls. Maintenance, reservations, and other fixed costs can be spread thinner; even the planes can be operated more cheaply on a long, non-stop flight. But, says CAB member Whitney Gilliland, "at the same time, if we'd permit an air carrier to charge a profitable rate for a short haul, we'd probably drive him out of business."

Current fares reflect the disparity. In varying degrees, the long-haul earnings of the profitable trunks internally subsidize some of their shorter routes. And CAB directly subsidizes local service airlines, which just don't have enough long hauls to make ends meet.

#### OUT OF LINE

The degrees of such long- and short-haul differentials vary widely. And in a fare structure that was laid down, and is changed, route by route, there is a growing suspicion within CAB that some of the fares are out of line with the overall pattern.

"We think this thing is pretty much out of balance in the air carrier industry," says Gilliland, who was appointed to the Board by President Eisenhower in 1959 and served as Chairman in 1960 and 1961. But he adds: "We need to know more about it than we do now."

Not all the members of the Board are convinced that major changes are needed.

Airline spokesmen welcome the Board study. Murphy, for his part, has made clear that no decisions will be made on theory alone, in the vacuum of the CAB boardroom: "I suspect that before we reach any conclusions," Murphy says, "we will have some fairly extensive, comprehensive exchanges of

views with the carriers—both written comment and oral discussion."

#### RESTRICTIONS

The problems of the local service airlines, which still require about \$75 million Federal subsidies annually, reflect not only the difference in profitability between long- and short-haul flights but also another built-in handicap: System for system, the regionals are required to serve a much higher proportion of low-volume points than are the trunks.

There is no chance that the regionals will be able to fly without subsidy any time soon—or for that matter any time in the foreseeable future. But with the new twin-engined jets, which can operate profitably on hops as short as 100 miles with a standard of service equal to that of the trunks, Board members see new opportunities for fattening local service route structures.

"Among the top 300 domestic markets," Murphy recently told a meeting of local service airline officials, "there are 101 markets under 300 miles in distance. These are markets for which your equipment and experience would appear especially adapted. Yet the total traffic in these markets is less than 6 percent of the trunkline revenue miles."

#### EASING UP

In more than half the markets Murphy has in mind, local service airlines are competitively hobbled by route restrictions, such as puddle-jumping requirements that make them touch down at cities en route instead of flying nonstop. But Murphy makes clear that the Board would consider pleas for authority to fly nonstop after making a minimum number of touchdowns daily at the cities en route—or in some cases even to break into a new short-distance market.

Such steps presumably would increase competition between the local service airlines and the trucks on some segments. Murphy and other Board members insist that the local service airlines' routes could be strengthened without biting deeply into the trunks' business.

"The trunks are so much bigger in relative terms than the local service carriers," Murphy says. "I think there's room to strengthen the routes of local service carriers without impairing the opportunities of the trunks."

#### RIVALRY

The prospect of increased competition apparently will not be a major bar. Vice Chairman Robert T. Murphy, appointed to the Board from the Senate Commerce Committee in 1961, notes: "I'd much rather depend on competition to do the regulating than on a series of rules, reading like an insurance policy, emanating from a regulatory body."

Whatever steps CAB takes are certain to be taken in close communication—perhaps even harmony—with the industry. In comparison with other regulatory agencies, the board has unusually close contact with company executives, and has easy access to unusually detailed management data.

Carriers subject to CAB regulation file quarterly financial reports so detailed that they even show the cost of inflight meals. The Board also can send its own auditors into airline offices to check the books—which it does regularly for subsidized airlines, and occasionally for the trunks.

#### TRAFFIC SURVEYS

The airlines also voluntarily submit surveys at passenger origin and destination, so that the Board can compile industrywide traffic figures. These are circulated among the airlines.

CAB depends heavily on all segments of the industry—manufacturers, airlines, and crew members' organizations—in its role as investigator of accidents. In major crashes CAB technical investigating groups are headed by Bureau of Safety staff experts but

March 9, 1966

flushed out by industry representatives. The practice serves two aims. It gives CAB investigators access to industry expertise, and it guards against snap conclusions about the probable cause of the crash.

#### CLUBBISH

Board staff officials tend to share one quality that eases communication with airline executives: They're aviation happy, to the clubbish degree of sporting aerospace tie-clasps and dressing up their offices with plastic desk models of aircraft. A current favorite seems to be the Air Force's experimental supersonic RS-70.

The five Board members, all lawyers, came to the Board from different routes:

Chairman Murphy, who had served as an assistant to President Truman in 1947 to 1953, was moved to the CAB from the post of Under Secretary of Agriculture last summer.

Vice Chairman Robert T. Murphy, a Democrat whose term runs out at the end of this year, had served as an aid to the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee before his appointment by President Kennedy in 1961.

G. Joseph Minetti, a Democrat and senior member of the Board, had held a number of New York City positions and was a member of the Federal Maritime Board when nominated for the CAB by President Eisenhower in December, 1955.

Gilliland, an Iowa district judge in 1938 to 1941, served briefly in the Agriculture Department in the Eisenhower administration, and was chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for 5 years before being named to the Board in 1959. He was CAB Chairman in 1960 and 1961.

John G. Adams moved up to Board membership last summer from the post of Director of the Board's Bureau of Enforcement.

#### NOTABLE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer has hailed the international leadership and distinguished public service of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson in her energetic campaign for highway and roadside beautification.

The paper says a recent speech she made in Denver did not deal in abstract theory but that it was "highly pertinent and applicable to imminent decisions in current highway planning."

I think we can all be grateful for the leadership being furnished along these lines and for the attention being given esthetic values. Because we are all concerned about these values, I insert the editorial on the subject in the RECORD:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Feb. 27, 1966]

#### FIRST LADY'S ADVICE TO ROADBUILDERS

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson continues to provide inspirational leadership and perform distinguished public service in her energetic campaign for highway and roadside beautification. She directed some excellent advice in the right direction last week in an address to the American Road Builders Association, meeting in Denver.

The First Lady called for greater cooperation between Government agencies and the general public in planning highway projects. She urged that openminded and sympa-

thetic hearing be given to citizens who seek to safeguard communities and landmarks against the ugliness and blight threatened by badly located or poorly designed highways. She appealed to highway planners to give more attention to "esthetic values."

We believe that Mrs. Johnson's remarks are timely and to the point. Public-spirited organizations and individuals who are interested in making new highway construction as pleasing as possible to the eye, and compatible with surrounding landscape—find it enormously difficult to get their message across to the engineers who prepare highway plans, often with insufficient regard for scenic considerations.

A prime example, in Philadelphia, was the original "Chinese Wall" design for the Delaware Expressway, calling for an elevated monstrosity through the historic Independence Hall area. The design, after a hard fight, was modified, but there still is uncertainty whether the highway will be an unsightly open ditch or will have an attractively landscaped cover that will be a credit, instead of a detriment, to historic shrines nearby.

Mrs. Johnson's notable speech in Denver does not deal in abstract theory but is highly pertinent and applicable to imminent decisions in current highway planning.

#### MEKONG DELTA PITS HOME GUARD TROOPS AGAINST VIETCONG

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more apparent that the South Vietnamese are adopting a tried-and-true method of home guard defense. The article which I shall include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks indicates that a system of what we have known for many years in this country as the National Guard under control of the several States is arising as a main force for defense in South Vietnam.

I submit the article at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1966]

#### MEKONG DELTA PITS HOME GUARD TROOPS AGAINST VIETCONG

(By Ward Just)

MYTHO, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 2.—More than the infantry regiments of the Army of South Vietnam, more than U.S. advisers or the jet-powered bombers of the Air Force, the war in the Mekong Delta is fought by low-paid, lightly equipped, erratically trained troops: called regional forces and popular forces.

They get almost no publicity, but to the extent that there is stability and security in the Delta, the PF and RF are the reasons. "They are the most courageous people here," says Maj. Homer Stapleton, an American adviser to PF units.

In the 40-square-mile subsector called Chauhanh, which includes the capital of Dinhhuong Province, Mytho, there is an 86-man company of regional forces and 800 in the popular forces. These troops are spread over 30 outposts in the subsector.

#### RECRUITING DIFFICULT

It is indicative of the difficulty of recruitment and the subsequent leanness of the PF and RF units, that the subsector chief, Maj. Ho Van Trinh, is authorized 17 companies of RF and has 1.

The reasons are partly pay (an RF soldier receives less than \$35 a month, even with a wife and child. Popular forces earn less than that, and both must provide food and lodging even when on an operation) and partly the terms of employment. They play a very dangerous game.

Regional forces are at the disposal of the

district or province chief, and are sent on patrols or used as a security force following large ARVN operations. Popular forces, recruited from the towns and villages where they live, are posted as a kind of home guard. Popular forces are controlled by the subsector chief.

In the delta, where the military situation has been mostly static for the past year after a long deterioration, the PF and RF forces are the most vulnerable. The Government controls the major population centers, and most of the roads, but the Vietcong controls the countryside and there are vast tracts of Dinhhuong Province in which the enemy moves freely.

#### OUTPOSTS ATTACKED

Every night, at official briefings in Saigon, there are two or three sentences devoted to this or that outpost which was hit or overrun with a few casualties—and with the Vietcong withdrawing at daybreak. The PF or RF defenders then move back in.

The point is that in the delta, the Vietcong can seize—for the moment—almost anything they want to seize. Their firepower and their training is superior to both PF and RF forces. ARVN troops are often unavailable. There are no U.S. units in the delta, only advisers.

The PF static defense posts are sometimes only that: static posts around which the Vietcong move freely, on a kind of you-leave-me-alone and I-will-leave-you-alone basis.

Major Trinh, an ARVN veteran, has been building up new outposts at the so-called New Life Hamlets that are strung around Mytho.

These are supposedly secure areas in which peasants can live without fear of Vietcong terror or taxes.

One of these outposts is at Luongthien, a neat, carefully laid out, narrow string of grass huts. It is on the main route from Saigon to Mytho, and extends perhaps 2,000 yards in from the road, across narrow canals, through palm groves and tree stands.

At the outermost edge stands the Popular Force fort. It is made of dried mud and contains 20 men. Three strings of barbed wire surround it.

The men are equipped with M-1 rifles, grenades, a few Thompson submachineguns, and a Browning automatic rifle. The fort, with its peepholes for weapons, its barbed wire, its trenches and battered yellow and blood-red flag, looked like a movie set for a bad Rider Haggard novel.

In the silence of the noon heat, the men had been lying in hammocks and listening to transistor radios. The atmosphere was tranquil.

This is in an area that is secure enough for the Vietcong that they sometimes use it as a rest and recreation center. One hundred yards east, the territory is theirs. Last month, in actions in the subsector, the Vietcong lost 68 dead, the PF and RF lost more than 100 killed, wounded, and missing in action.

#### MOVE OUT AT NIGHT

But the 200 people of the Luongthien hamlet are said to feel secure. In the evenings, the 20 men of the Popular Forces shoulder their weapons and move off into the banana groves in small units. They camp there overnight, waiting and listening for a Vietcong attack on the hamlet, and return at dawn.

It was explained that they could not stay in the fort itself, for the fort is vulnerable to mortar fire.

"They are much safer if they disperse," said an American major advising Trinh, "and they are in a much better position to trip Charlie if he tried an attack on the hamlet."

What the major said was substantiated by his associates and by the Vietnamese with whom he works.

Yet it was an indication of the state of Dinhthoung Province that Government forces, even in a fort, are not safe from attack. And it is an indication of their courage that they remain.

**VIET GENERAL OPPOSES ROLE FOR GI'S IN DELTA**

SAIGON, March 2.—Gen. Dang Van Quang, commander of the South Vietnamese 4th Corps area—the Mekong Delta where American combat troops have not been committed—has given notice that he'd like to keep it that way.

The delta, the richest rice-growing area in South Vietnam with a population of about 5 million, is the only one of South Vietnam's four Corps areas defended entirely by Government troops.

In the 1st Corps area, for instance, around Danang, there are more American Army and Marine troops than there are Vietnamese troops.

Quang is reportedly concerned about an American "pacification" program that might bring a great invasion of U.S. advisers into the area.

In an interview with the Agence France Presse, Quang said he feels that the "presence of foreign troops in the delta may give the Vietcong the pretext to propagandize that the Americans are replacing the French in that area."

**ALIEN VETERANS—FULFILLING AN OBLIGATION**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a week ago President Johnson signed into law the cold war GI bill which extends benefits, similar to those granted World War II and Korean veterans, to veterans who have served after 1955. In keeping with this spirit I today have introduced legislation which would grant to aliens serving in the U.S. Armed Forces after January 1, 1963, exemptions from the normal naturalization process.

This country has led the way for the world in caring for her veterans and survivors. It has in the past, out of gratitude, welcomed alien veterans who have borne the battle as true sons. This privilege should not be denied to those who already have fought, and are still to fight, in Vietnam. The dying there is no easier than it was in the Argonne Forest, the Battle of the Bulge, or Porkchop Hill.

If we can draft a man who is not a citizen and send him off to Vietnam or elsewhere to fight for this country, the very least we can do in return is offer him the chance to immediately enjoy the benefits of citizenship. We have passed legislation in the past to advance this privilege to aliens who fought in World War I, World War II, and Korea. It is fitting that we do the same for those called upon to presently serve.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RONCALIO, for 6 days, on account of death of Jane Hynds Griffith, of Cheyenne, Wyo.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

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

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 20 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McDOWELL, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. ROONEY of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 30 minutes, on March 10.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

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

Mr. MADDEN and to include his statement before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado in the body of the RECORD following the President's message on crime.

Mr. RONCALIO in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT to extend his remarks on the subject of the President's crime message.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) to revise and extend their remarks—and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REINECKE.  
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.  
Mr. GURNEY.  
Mr. QUILLEN.  
Mr. MCCULLOCH.  
Mr. MORSE in three instances.  
Mr. CLANCY.  
Mr. CEDERBERG in two instances.  
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. ERLNBORN.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.  
Mr. YATES.  
Mrs. KELLY in three instances.  
Mr. KEOGH.  
Mr. RODINO.  
Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.  
Mr. MULTER in three instances.  
Mr. GALLAGHER in two instances.  
Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.  
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.  
Mr. CALLAN.  
Mr. DULSKI in two instances.  
Mr. GIBBONS in six instances.  
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

**SENATE BILLS REFERRED**

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2266. An act to authorize the Attorney General to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to certain objects of art; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2540. An act to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an in-

ternational flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2729. An act to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**ENROLLED BILL SIGNED**

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2627. An act for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

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

2160. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports covering the same number of violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to the provisions of section 2679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2161. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 4, 1961, in order to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2162. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 51st annual report of the Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2163. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Revision of the Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2164. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a consolidated Federal corrections system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2165. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Law Enforcement Assistant Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2166. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims settled during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk



for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1311. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13417. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 13418. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain increased amounts received as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to be disregarded in computing income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13419. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13420. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 13421. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 13422. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13423. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13424. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to place limitations on the amount which may be expended for housing accommodations and meal allowances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13425. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13426. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, purchase, sale, and handling of dogs and cats in commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13427. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 13428. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13429. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13430. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13431. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13432. A bill to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13433. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 13434. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13435. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 13436. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 13437. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 13438. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13439. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13440. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend for an additional year the eligibility of certain areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 13441. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 13442. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13443. A bill to require that certain officers in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture be filled by appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Visitor Center and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13445. A bill to provide for a con-

gressional comptrollership to promote fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13446. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Registry of Art for the purpose of maintaining and administering records relating to the origin, transfer, and ownership of works of art; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13447. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 13448. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13449. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13450. A bill to amend title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit the Commissioner of Education to carry on institutes to improve the qualifications of junior college teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13451. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13452. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 13453. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 13454. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13455. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for podiatrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 13456. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13457. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution designating February of each year as American History Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5191

and pay the cost of transfer. Let me say, parenthetically, that I said as much in London last fall when this move by France seemed to be on the horizon. The cost of such a transfer will be approximately \$1 billion, a necessary price to pay for the continued security of Europe, a reasonable price which must be paid for the linchpin of the Free World, a small price considered in relation to the expenditures of the struggle in Vietnam.

If President de Gaulle, wants SHAPE out of Paris, we must begin making preparations to move it to the Low Countries or to Great Britain. The organization must never stop functioning for a moment.

I am proud to say that I support the President's rejection of President de Gaulle's offer for bilateral talks and bilateral arrangements with France. NATO is an organization not an ad hoc committee. The members are committed to acting together as a unit and not on a bilateral basis. The precedent of bilateral negotiations could lead to a breakdown of the whole NATO framework. Special arrangements will destroy the common purpose and create confusion.

President de Gaulle has raised the call to nationalism in an age of internationalism and multilateralism. I have confidence that the French nation will find a way to get along with the other 14 nations in NATO and that the 14 other members of NATO will not be lured by the call.

VN

**VIETNAM: THE WAR IS WORTH WINNING**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Hedley Donovan, the editor in chief of Time, Inc., has written a vital editorial in the February 25, 1966, issue of Life magazine. Mr. Donovan makes a convincing case on two counts: First, that our military task is a feasible one in Vietnam and shows likelihood of success; and, second, that our cause there is a just one and is worth pursuing. Many myths have grown up around the struggle in Vietnam, about the invincibility of wars of national liberation, about our objectives in the area, and about the meaning of the war in general.

Mr. Donovan's careful attention to the facts of the military situation should go a long way to dispel these myths. He points out that pacification is only the first step and must be a prelude to the next and longer phase of the economic, political, social, and psychological construction of the country. He concludes—and I am in full agreement with him on this—that the real meaning of the conflict in Vietnam is the future of Asia.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Donovan's editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

**VIETNAM: THE WAR IS WORTH WINNING**  
(By Hedley Donovan)

The war in Vietnam builds up. It is often called a war without "fronts" or "lines," but there are authentic battles, and all too au-

thentic casualties, in rising number. There is a quickening of ambush and counterambush, patrols, sweeps and armed convoy runs, up and down the 900-mile curve of this lovely, tortured land. The buildup is felt from the sector of the "Paddy Rats," the 21st ARVN Division (Army of the Republic of Vietnam), at the tip of the steamy Mekong Delta country, all the way north to the U.S. 3d Marine Division encampments in the wildly complicated terrain around Danang—jungles, canals, rice fields, swamps, red clay hills, sharp little mountains, teeming towns, broad sand beaches. In shabby, swarming Saigon, people speculate about all the VIP traffic from Washington; many of them work prodigiously hard; some profiteer and racketeer, and at least a few work for the Vietcong at night.

The supply lines pump harder. They stretch back halfway around the world, through the Philippines and Okinawa, through Hawaii, to the training camps in California and Georgia, the factories in St. Louis and Cleveland.

Vietnam begins to dominate the public life of the United States and the private thoughts of many an American family. It dominates the Presidency of Lyndon Johnson, the economic outlook, the intellectual climate.

But it is still a mystifying war to many Americans, despite heavy press coverage, loud public dialog, and all the earnest exposition of Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, and Dean Rusk. It is certainly not a popular war (though it may be noted, to the general credit of mankind, that there aren't many popular wars nowadays). Some of the country's misgivings are reported elsewhere in this issue, not the sloganeering of the well-publicized "Vietniks," but the thoughtful, responsible dissent and doubt.

In this article Life offers its own general judgments and guesses about Vietnam. What might it take to end the business? What would be victory? What is this strange war all about?

For all the war's strangeness and difficulty, and for all the dangers and uncertainties ahead, our side in fact is doing fairly well.

The war need not last a generation, or 10 years or 6 or 7 years (to cite one curiously precise guess that recent press stories attributed to unnamed Pentagon observers). There is a reasonably good chance the present phase of the war can be successfully wound up in 1967, or even late 1966.

President Johnson's peace offensive was well worth trying, and there is still a remote possibility that the diplomacy he set in motion could lead to a satisfactory negotiated settlement of the war.

The likeliest ending is not around a conference table, however, but in a quiet withdrawal of main-force North Vietnamese units, after they have been hurt enough, back to the north, and a gradual tapering off of the Vietcong military effort in the south.

This would not leave South Vietnam fully pacified by any means; there would still be strong VC pockets and sporadic violence and terrorism. But the war of battalion- and regiment-size battles, and big airstrikes, would be over.

In the next phase of the struggle, though there would still be shooting, the war would be essentially economic, political, psychological. Heavy U.S. economic aid would still be required, and some continuing U.S. military presence. This phase might indeed last for some years.

We are not bogged down in Asia. We are deeply, inescapably involved with Asia and have been for decades. The involvement has its perils; it also holds high promise.

The war in Vietnam is not primarily a war about Vietnam, nor even entirely a war about China. It is a war about the future

of Asia. It is very possibly as important as any of the previous American wars of this century.

In fact this ugly, maddening, big-little war may some day be remembered as a historic turning point. Many peoples of the West as well as Asia could have reason for gratitude to the extraordinary generation of Americans now serving in Vietnam (their harassed chiefs in Washington might even rate a word or two of thanks), and to the long-suffering troops and people of South Vietnam.

In the United States the most persistent question about Vietnam is why the injection of 200,000 Americans has seemingly made so little difference.

The injection of the 200,000 has in fact made an enormous difference. It prevented what otherwise might have been the collapse of the South Vietnam Government and Army, late last spring, and the defeat of all the previous years of American effort.

When Senator FULBRIGHT and Walter Lippmann and other opponents of the administration policy say, as they frequently do, that our side controls no more territory today than we did a year ago despite all the buildup and fighting in 1965, they are being technically accurate and totally misleading. A year ago, the South Vietnam Government's grip on what it ostensibly held was beginning to disintegrate very rapidly. The start-up of U.S. air operations against the North in February 1965, and the arrival of the first few thousand U.S. Marines in March, briefly slowed but did not halt the deterioration. The Government continued to lose territory and population through spring of 1965, and more fatefully, the ARVN was losing its last thin reserve of mobile battalions, while the people were losing their last shreds of confidence that the Vietcong could ever be defeated.

Perhaps because they never confessed how desperate the situation was last May and June, neither the Saigon government nor the Johnson administration has given any detailed accounting of how much better the situation is today. In the United States, this leaves critics free to argue that no amount of U.S. effort and sacrifice seems to accomplish anything in Vietnam, so we should disentangle ourselves from a hopeless venture on the best terms we can get.

A turnaround did begin in early summer. By that time the United States had 75,000 troops in South Vietnam, and on July 28 President Johnson made his announcement that another 50,000 were on the way. The announcement itself had a salutary effect on the stability of the Saigon regime and on the attitudes of the fence-sitters, a numerous element, understandably enough in the Vietnamese population.

Today, although there is no such thing as total security anywhere in the country, including the most heavily guarded military bases, the Saigon government has reasonably good control of territory containing about 50 to 55 percent of the country's population. This contrasts with a highly precarious control of about 45 percent last June. The territory under the government's control includes all the cities, all 43 of the provincial capitals, all but half a dozen of the 241 district capitals. There has been a decided extension of government control in the populous Mekong Delta area, source of most of the country's rice supply and in the past a rich recruiting ground for the Vietcong as well as the ARVN. About 20 percent of the country's population is in disputed or fluid territory or places that neither side is bothering with at the moment. The rest is under fairly solid Vietcong control. The Vietcong dominate at least half the country's area, but much of its domain is jungle, mountain, and mangrove swamp.

March 9, 1966

The 10-man military directory headed by Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky has now been in office 8 months, which nobody would have dared predict last summer. It can scarcely be described as strongly entrenched or broadly popular, but it looks much more effective than the revolving-door regimes that followed the fall of Diem (nine of them in 19 months). It has lived down the bombastic pronouncements of Ky's first weeks in office, suppressed one minor coup attempt, and made some fairly convincing announcements about the drafting of a new constitution and the introduction, perhaps next year, of a limited measure of democracy. With powerful prodding and backing from the U.S. Embassy and AID mission, it began an ambitious new program of economic reconstruction in the more or less pacified parts of the countryside. There have been previous efforts—and failures—in this field, the strategic hamlets program, the new life hamlets, etc. The Ky regime has been going at it quite seriously, however, and its program now has the direct and insistent patronage of Lyndon Johnson himself, as announced at Honolulu and amplified by the new wave of emissaries he sent to Saigon.

Meanwhile, South Vietnam's badly battered army has had a chance to catch its breath. A number of understrength units have been considerably beefed up in men and equipment. The desertion rate has been reduced, though it is still shocking. There has been an encouraging pickup in defections from the Vietcong—11,000 in 1965 versus 5,000 in 1964. One of the most sensitive indicators of all—the willingness of people out in the countryside to furnish intelligence on VC movements—points to a healthy increase in popular confidence in the ultimate defeat of the VC.

Where does the war go from here? The most urgent need right now is to break the bottleneck in port facilities. Saigon itself is a second-rate river port, 50 twisting miles upstream from the South China Sea, with antiquated docks and stevedoring techniques. Until a few months ago virtually all ocean-borne supplies for the South Vietnam economy and the war had to pass through this one congested port. Last June, U.S. Army Engineers and civilian contractors went to work at the superb natural harbor of Cam Ranh Bay, previously untouched, and before the end of this year it will be handling more cargo than Saigon. Construction work continues at a furious pace at Cam Ranh Bay; facilities are being expanded at Qui Nhon, Danang and lesser ports; and some improvements are in progress at Saigon. At most of these places, however, ships still wait 30 to 40 days for unloading. It will probably be another 2 or 3 months before the ports are fully equal to the support of the troops already in Vietnam, and capable of supplying new arrivals. Almost equally high priority must go to the enlargement of military storage facilities, and improvement of the highways in the major operating areas.

How many more U.S. troops will be needed for the big-unit phase of the war? Fewer than half the U.S. troops now in Vietnam are actually available for offensive operations against the Vietcong on the ground. As in any war, the men up front are supported by a long train of medics, truck drivers, construction battalions, headquarters, staffs, etc. And in this particular war, where VC suicide squads can turn up almost anywhere, we have thousands of combat-unit men tied down by static-defense duties around our major bases. Perhaps 80,000 to 90,000 of the Americans now in Vietnam are available for serious offensive action; only about 50,000 of these can range far from their bases to seek out the VC.

Total strength of the South Vietnam armed forces is generally put around 650,000 to 700,000 men, but this total must be stripped down even more drastically. There

are perhaps 25,000 to 40,000 South Vietnamese troops, including some tough marine and airborne battalions, that could be considered fully mobile offensive forces, unencumbered by fixed-defense responsibilities. Adding in a robust little Australian-New Zealand contingent, and the marine brigade and Tiger Division that Korea has sent, the allies have a total striking force of 150,000 men at the most, and by the maximum mobility test the total would be more like 100,000.

They are up against a fanatically brave and highly resourceful army of about 90,000 men, Vietcong main-force units plus perhaps a dozen regiments of the North Vietnam Army, always free to group and strike against a weaker force wherever they can find it, since they themselves hold no intrinsically valuable territory that ties them down to defense. (The VC may have another 100,000 men in small local cadres, in porter gangs along the supply trails, part-time guerrillas, etc.)

The much quoted dictum that it takes a 10 to 1 superiority to suppress a determined guerrilla force is not regarded as gospel in Vietnam. No modern counterinsurgency army has ever operated with such a tremendous margin of firepower and mobility as the United States has introduced into Vietnam. But it is generally agreed that we will need a manpower superiority of at least 2 to 1 and very possibly 3 to 1 in mobile offensive forces.

Most of the reinforcements will have to come from the United States. Among the Vietnamese themselves there is not very much young manpower not already in one uniform or another, though some existing ARVN units can probably be upgraded into a higher offensive capability. No very significant allied contributions are in sight. We must be prepared, therefore, for the total U.S. commitment in Vietnam to rise from the present 200,000 men to at least 400,000 men, assuming that half or more of the new forces are in ground combat units that can seek out the Vietcong. This would mean a commitment about on the scale of the Korean war at its peak.

But what if the enemy simply feeds more and more men into the war? The fact is he would find it very difficult to match our buildup. The VC have pretty well scraped the bottom of the barrel in recruiting within South Vietnam. From the north it is possible to infiltrate only 2,000 to 4,000 men a month over the Ho Chi Minh trail, and the capacity can't be much increased as long as we keep up our air attacks.

Conceivably, North Vietnam might decide on overt, all-out invasion of the south, and launch the rest of its army—perhaps a dozen first-line divisions, totalling more than 200,000 men, across the demilitarized zone along the 17th parallel. Then there would indeed need to be a big American Army in Vietnam—perhaps the million men who figure in some of the forebodings here at home. But for the enemy to pour men down the narrow coastal corridor, or in fact try to get large bodies of troops into the south by any other route, would be to sacrifice most of the advantages of the hit-and-run jungle warfare he is so expert at. Every time full regiments have been brought to battle by U.S. forces, the enemy has been badly beaten. If North Vietnam went all-out, it would have to offer us concentrated targets—massed troops, big supply depots, clogged roads and trails. Ho Chi Minh would be risking his whole army, and with it his rule. The repeated U.S. assurances that we do not seek to overthrow the North Vietnamese regime would surely be the first casualty of any all-out attack from the North.

Let us guess, then (there are no guarantees about Vietnam), that the North does not come down in a big way, that the U.S. buildup proceeds, that the bottleneck in the ports is largely overcome this spring. By

summer the effects of all our effort should really begin to be felt on the battlefields. A point comes in a war when momentum develops; cumulative and multiplying effects spread across a whole theater; one action goes well, and things seem to go better in half a dozen other places. The momentum was running strongly for the Vietcong in early 1965. It could be running strongly for our side in late 1966.

Barring a negotiated settlement, nobody will ever be able to name the exact date when the present phase of the war came to an end. But the day should come, late this year or next, when it will be possible to add up some such set of facts as this: dwindling southbound traffic on the Ho Chi Minh Trail for several months; increase in northbound traffic; no firm contact with a full VC regiment or battalion for several weeks; occasional capture of VC or North Vietnam regulars now operating with small local guerrilla units; extension of government control to territory containing 75 percent of the population; decline of VC incidents within this territory. This would be the end of the big-unit war, and the first installment of victory, and this the United States does tacitly recognize. To turn the South over to communism which would almost certainly be the consequence of a peace negotiated from a few enclaves, would be defeat.

Assuming we will not settle for that, and that we persevere through the big-unit war, we should then see Hanoi quietly deescalate. We would presumably stop bombing the north, and perhaps announce a provisional and gradual schedule of withdrawals of a major part of the American force. (The north could come back in, of course, but so could we.) In the new phase of the war, more and more of the military responsibility would revert to the rebuilt ARVN, which by then should include a number of highly equipped, trained and seasoned units, increasingly capable of dealing with the small-scale VC attacks which would doubtless persist for some years, or moving against some of the remote VC redoubts. Increasingly, the American support of South Vietnam would be channeled into economic, medical, educational aid. In civil terms as well as military, the Vietcong are deeply entrenched in considerable areas of the countryside. Their political, economic and psychological hold on village life will not necessarily disappear just because their troops go underground. The Saigon government will have to prove that it can provide the villagers physical safety from the VC, but more important for the long run, that it is not simply a rival gang of tax collectors.

So the second installment of victory would come, probably not before the early 1970's, when VC activity in South Vietnam had been reduced to the proportions of a police problem, when all or almost all the American troops could be brought home (we still keep two divisions in Korea), when a thoroughly viable economy was operating, when an independent, effective and stable government (by the standards of Asia, not Switzerland) seemed established. That would be victory for the prodigious American effort in this country of 15 million people some 8,000 miles from San Diego.

In a way, it doesn't sound like much. For these modest purposes, in a far distant place, can the United States really be preparing to send hundreds of thousands of Americans into battle and spend tens of billions of dollars, allowing a bitter diversiveness to come into American life, courting abuse from world opinion, and running a faint risk of war with China, and even world war III?

The Communists say that the Americans wouldn't do all this just for the sake of Vietnam, and in this they are absolutely right. But the Johnson administration has never successfully articulated the broader purposes of our Vietnam commitments and the very promising possibilities it could create.



It is deplorable that such a courageous and far-sighted policy should be so badly explained.

The administration offers a good many dull and lofty generalities about helping to preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. These are not entirely satisfying since South Vietnam is not really a nation yet—it is an artificial half of one of three countries carved out of a former French colony only 17 years ago—and in its short life it hasn't even been fully free, either of Communist aggression or domestic autocracy.

The administration is more eloquent and persuasive when it stresses the importance of honoring our commitments. If we do not stand fast in Vietnam, who else will trust our guarantees? This leads into the familiar domino argument—if South Vietnam falls to communism, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand would go next; Malaysia, Singapore, and Burma soon after; then Indonesia; neutralism, anti-Americanism and pro-Peiping sentiment would spread in India, the Philippines, Japan. The damage to U.S. credibility could spread further—to Berlin and NATO, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Rusk do not themselves spell it out in such lugubrious detail, but that isn't necessary. "Honoring our commitments" has become a kind of shorthand for a whole train of disasters that could ensue if we pulled out of Vietnam.

It is a sound argument, at least as applied to the southeast Asian peninsula, but it is a needlessly grim backs-to-the-wall sort of argument. It casts our whole effort in South Vietnam in negative terms—as something we must do to prevent a catastrophe. This negative argument offers no hint of the very difficult problems that face Communist China today, or the ways in which those problems have been intensified by our stand in Vietnam. It offers no vision of the positive good that could be accomplished in Asia if our Vietnam effort succeeds.

You would never know it, from listening either to the Johnson administration or its critics, but China had a very bad year in 1965. Despite the advance hand-wringing in the United States, the fears early last year that China might come in if the United States bombed North Vietnam or put ground combat units in South Vietnam, China did not come in. Nor did the growing U.S. effort in Vietnam prove to be "the one thing that would bring China and Russia back together." If anything, China-Russia relations are worse than a year ago, and Vietnam seems somehow to have inflamed matters.

Vietnam is precisely the kind of war of national liberation that China has proclaimed to be the wave of the future all through the underdeveloped regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the Communist revolutions that would sweep the rural areas of the world and eventually bring down the world "city" of Western Europe-United States-Japan. (The Soviet leadership sometimes wonders whether Russia is considered part of the city, too.) China has given loud polemical sponsorship to the Vietcong-North Vietnam cause, and it supplies a good part of the north's arms, but it has been very careful to avoid any move that might bring a direct confrontation with the growing U.S. power in Vietnam. And this certainly had something to do with the decline last year in China's prestige among the underdeveloped and uncommitted. In the India-Pakistan skirmish in September, China attempted a kind of ultimatum to India, but India paid very little attention, and China had to back down. China has suffered several recent rebuffs in its courtship of the new African states, and is even having a noisy quarrel with Castro. The upheaval in Indonesia, starting with the suppression of the Communist coup attempt on October 1, has been a major defeat for China, repac-

ing what had been an increasingly Peiping-oriented policy with a strongly nationalist independent line.

South Vietnam is one of the last major positions not buttoned down, all around the rim of China. Laos is mushy, of course, though its neutralist and pro-Western factions have been doing fairly well in their exotic little war against the pro-Communist Pathet Lao. Neutralist Burma also seemed last year to respond to events in Vietnam and began acting as neutralist toward China as it long has toward the West. The most sensitive of all China's frontiers, of course, are the long reaches where it faces the Soviet Union. The state of Soviet-Chinese relations must contribute, to say the least, to sensations of isolation in Peiping. But if South Vietnam is held, China is substantially "contained," on the borders facing the non-Communist world. This could open up a whole new era of promise and growth for the potentially prosperous and stable nations of south-east Asia.

South Vietnam itself could be a dazzlingly successful country. It has immense food and timber resources, limitless water, hydroelectric possibilities, rubber, superb beaches and scenery, energetic, attractive people. Along with the tragic destruction of war, it is also acquiring, willy-nilly, the best port facilities between Hong Kong and Singapore, and half a dozen first-class jet airfields. It shares the great Mekong Valley system with Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos. President Johnson, in one of the few really affirmative specifics he has ever put before Asia, made a generous offer of U.S. aid for a big Mekong Basin project in his Johns Hopkins speech of last April. In a situation which permitted some degree of trust among these countries, an international effort to harness the Mekong could be one of the most exciting engineering and political ventures in the world.

If southeast Asia, instead of being a temptation to aggression and a threat to world peace, became a strongpoint of economically vigorous and fully independent states, the beneficent effects would spread well beyond the peninsula itself. Communist China would be contained in the best sense, not just in military positions but in terms of performance, by the dynamism of Japan on the northeast and this healthy new growth center to the south. South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Burma, Indonesia, would all benefit to some degree; even India's staggering problems would look a little less hopeless.

It might be that these vistas will be opening up at the same time that the first major changes in the Chinese Communist leadership take place. Mao is 72, and said to be sick, Chou En-lai is 67; most of the rest of the Politburo, old comrades of the long march of the 1930's, are in their late sixties. If the defeat of the Communist attempt to take over South Vietnam comes around the same time that new men are moving into power in Peiping, this could be a very interesting moment in history. In several interviews with foreign visitors, Mao has expressed with startling frankness his doubts as to the revolutionary militance of the next Chinese generation. They might even be men with whom the West could attempt a comprehensive settlement of the major issues dividing us: nuclear proliferation, China trade, the partition of Korea and Vietnam, the status of Taiwan, admission of mainland China to the U.N.

In the past 25 years Asia has experienced three epochal changes that would have filled up several centuries' worth of slower-paced, old-fashioned history. World War II, the first war ever to sweep all of Asia, brought all of Asia irrevocably into the main currents of world politics. The breakup of the British, French, Dutch, and Japanese colonial empires created a dozen new nations—total population 800 million—of meager civil experience but powerful aspirations for a better

life. Meanwhile the Communist takeover of China gave the earth's most populous country the most strongly centralized government it has known since the Ch'in dynasty fell in 207 B.C. Out of all this upheaval a new Asia will form. The pattern is not yet set. Vietnam is one of the places, at the moment the most crucial place, where the next Asia is being shaped.

Less than a year ago Cam Ranh Peninsula was little more than a hook of sand locked around a magnificent but totally neglected natural harbor, 185 miles northeast of Saigon. Today the expanding port is the logistical gateway to the war. At least half of the American troops committed to the struggle—and many of South Vietnam's forces as well—soon will be wholly dependent for supplies on Cam Ranh. Cam Ranh's new port facilities expand almost hourly, pressed along by the seething activity of Army roustabouts and engineers who work day and night in temperatures that often soar to 130°. Though the port is not yet fully operational, warehouses and supply dumps already sprawl along the peninsula as far as the eye can see. The mountains of material are destined mainly for combat troops operating across central Vietnam.

The 12,600 men who keep the port functioning—their job is considered the toughest in the country short of combat—handle the beans, bullets, and black oil routinely required by an expeditionary force. Through their hands also pass such sophisticated field expedients as pods for flying cranes and inflatable warehouses. \* \* \*

This is the theater of war, unique in U.S. military history. Connected by a few roads and thousands of hidden trails, it stretches for 900 miles through jungles, mountains, and rice fields. The enemy is dedicated and tough, expert at surprise and hit-and-run guerrilla fighting. For years he has been winning the war. To respond to his tactics, the United States and South Vietnam have devised a two-part strategy, necessarily difficult: (1) Organize their striking power in order to expand their territory and keep the enemy off balance; (2) remain even more mobile than the enemy—not only to respond to his thrusts but also to track him down and destroy him.

The overall scheme is shown on this map. The Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) has divided the country into four corps areas, each with its own command. To augment this pattern the United States has strung a series of enclaves along the coast. Each serves a multiple purpose. It is a port for bringing in supplies. It is an airbase for planes that constantly harass the enemy. And it is a fortress so well defended (with support from U.S. Navy carriers and guns offshore) that it could withstand a combined assault of enemy troops and planes.

The scheme is expensive in its use of manpower. Because the enemy infests every corner of the land, some 90 percent of the 680,000 South Vietnamese troops are tied down in static defense or by local militia duty. Of the 200,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, some 7,500 are assigned to ARVN units as advisers. Thousands more are engaged in truckdriving, air supply and other logistical chores—leaving only about 90,000 U.S. troops for actual fighting. Thus the United States will probably send at least 200,000 more men to Vietnam to build up the ratio of combat troops.

The enclaves are not passive, Magnot-like turtles, maintained solely for defense. These are dynamic offensive installations, designed to force the enemy out of the area. The men not required for guard duty are sent out in actions ranging from squad patrols to major amphibious and helicopter assaults, to hunt the Vietcong and keep them on the defensive. In recent weeks the Marines and U.S. Army troops carried out the

largest operation of the war so far. It took place in the central highlands, a key tactical area that both sides are fighting to control.

HOW THE ALLIED AND ENEMY FORCES ARE DEPLOYED

The enemy directs his war from the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi. Much of his Chinese- and Soviet-bull weaponry arrives through the port of Haiphong and over two railroads running from China to Hanoi. Soviet surface-to-air missiles (SAM's) help defend Hanoi against U.S. jets flying out of Thailand and South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese Air Force (VNAF) shares some bases with the United States. Though Soviet Mig's have seldom appeared in combat, these are poised on the Chinese mainland and the island of Hainan and at bases in North Vietnam. Most enemy troops and weapons enter South Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Most U.S. supplies come by ship and are unloaded at ports ringed by enclaves.

The key to victory in South Vietnam lies in the central highlands area shown here—and in marked rectangle on preceding page—a mass of mountains, trails, and tiny villages dotting the valleys. For even when the Marines succeed in expanding their enclaves in the north and other allied units control the Mekong Delta rice fields in the south, the enemy could still frustrate the total strategy by holding these highlands in between. For this would cut South Vietnam in two, disrupt communications and prevent the kind of national unity South Vietnam must achieve.

This is precisely what the enemy has been trying to do, and the terrain is a factor that works heavily in his favor. The Ho Chi Minh Trail spills right into the area, providing a steady stream of men and weapons. The mountains and jungles afford excellent hiding places for units as large as regiments.

The tide is now beginning to turn. The mountainous area does lack food, and in recent weeks enemy units from the highlands have had to move down to the coast where other Vietcong have long controlled the rice fields. The allies were waiting for this. Mounting Operation Masher, a large-scale attack that included U.S. Marines landing by sea and U.S. Army troops coming in by helicopter, they forced entire enemy regiments back into the mountains.

Infiltrating over the Ho Chi Minh trail, North Vietnamese troops have joined up with Vietcong units in the central highlands. Some have hidden out in staging areas (across-hatched red zones) or settled down in organized units with several regimental and at least one divisional headquarters (see chart at left for unit designations). To meet this challenge, the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) has set up a corps headquarters at Pleiku and stationed battalions at Kontum. Special Forces camps, manned by local troops under U.S. advisers, are situated at key points near Laos and Cambodia to guard communications and set up islands of resistance along infiltration routes. The enclave of Qui Nhon, supervised by the 1st U.S. Logistical Command and guarded by ARVN and South Korean divisions, provides most supplies for the area. The biggest U.S. unit is the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) with headquarters and a huge helicopter field called the golf course at An Khe. It constantly sends forces along the An Khe-Quy Nhon road to keep it open. Recently 5,000 troops from the 1st Cavalry moved overland by copter or north along Route 1 to launch Operation Masher in the vicinity of Bong Son. Some 5,000 marines made an amphibious assault 20 miles to the north. Then the Marines and more 1st Cavalry troops linked up in the An Lao Valley. Bad weather hampered further operations and many of the main enemy force estimated at 8,000 men escaped. But they left 1,300 dead, 300 prisoners and had taken a stiff beating.

The tactics of the elusive enemy and the difficult terrain on which he operates have forced the United States to exploit a method of infantry warfare which could prove to be the most effective means of putting down guerrilla brush wars. Its essence is the mobility provided by fleets of highly specialized helicopters—with the superior firepower they can deliver—that can gain the initiative against the enemy.

There are now more than 1,600 helicopters operating in Vietnam. These include armored gunships bristling with machineguns, troopcarriers like the *Chinook* that can set a platoon down almost anywhere, and "flying cranes" which can pick up loads as heavy as a 105-millimeter howitzer. Recently a pair of U.S. chopper pilots chatted with a Frenchman who had served during the Indochina war. "Ah, my friends," he said, "if only we had had your helicopters, it might have been a very different story."

Helicopter at work: Returning from a mission in the central highlands, gunships of the 1st Cavalry come in near Pleiku to gas up from doughnut-shaped "refuel bladders." In a thicket too dense for the *Chinook* to land, troopers climb down a ladder.

Troops disembark from the rear of *Chinook* which has found a clearing. Helicopters stand by on division's main base at An Khe, the biggest chopper pad in Vietnam. Field was dubbed the "golf course" because it was hand cleared.

Airborne hospital: At its home base at An Khe, a flying crane helicopter swoops down in a swirl of dust. Clutching onto a mobile surgical pod it soars away on an urgent medical mission into the thick of battle. The fatality rate among the wounded in Vietnam is far below that of World War II and Korea, largely because the techniques of evacuation of casualties have been keyed to the new concept of mobility. The pod is an emergency clinic, with X-ray, laboratory and all-purpose surgical facilities. Within minutes of being hit a man can get surgical care even before he is evacuated.

Interlude: Logistics is a sweeping term that includes the import of stateside entertainers to boost the morale of the troops. At Cam Ranh Bay, GI's, who are allowed 1 day off every 2 weeks, cluster around a girl from back home—and are momentarily distracted by photographer's helicopter. She is Leigh Ann Austin, Miss Texas of 1961, who was flown out to Vietnam to sing for the Americans and got her own taste of the war's swift mobility by being whisked from one U.S. base to the next.

#### UNITED STATES ENCOURAGES DOMINICAN MILITARISTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is now almost a year since more than 30,000 men of our Armed Forces were sent into the Dominican Republic—enough almost to sink that little island.

I said at that time and, I consider it a sound statement now, that the threat of a Communist takeover was misrepresented and greatly exaggerated. I think it was nonexistent. Our President ordered this action on the advice of Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, who was on that day in charge of our Embassy in the Dominican Republic. President Johnson is not to be blamed for relying upon Mr. Bennett's poor judgment. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett became panic stricken and unduly excited when it appeared to him that the military junta which had taken over the Government from the duly elected civilian President was about to be chased out of the island.

Now, almost a year later, our servicemen are still in the Dominican Repub-

lic and there is still unrest in that unhappy island. It is time that we established a clear and definite policy toward the Dominican Republic and fulfill our pledge to bring order, stability, and a freely elected government to that nation.

It is unfortunate that we have in our State Department some officials who seem to denounce as Communists Latin American leaders who take action in opposition to the wealthy economic royalists of any Latin American country. They failed to distinguish between the Communist elements and the truly democratic elements in the citizenry seeking to release the people from the stranglehold of absentee landlordism and to help free the impoverished, underprivileged laborers and peasants from misery and squalor. W. Tapley Bennett and others misrepresented the facts claiming some 58 Communists were among the thousands of rebels seeking to oust the military junta. It later developed there were duplications of names in this list of 58 and that only a few—2 or 3—Communists or Communist sympathizers were among the leaders of some thousands in the rebel forces.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Cleveland Press of February 15, 1966, an outstanding article on this subject entitled "United States Encourages Dominican Militarists" by Clayton Fritchey, one of our Nation's outstanding journalists. I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, at this point, as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Feb. 15, 1966]

#### UNITED STATES ENCOURAGES DOMINICAN MILITARISTS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—It's about time for a showdown on American policy in the Dominican Republic. The question, which the administration has been persistently evading, is whether or not we are going to support the provisional government we installed with the avowed purpose of paving the way for a new democratic system.

The test of our sincerity, which many still doubt, revolves around the defiance of a group of officers, supporters of the former military dictatorship, who have been ordered to leave the country by the provisional President, Garcia-Goody.

The renewed rioting in Santo Domingo is a warning of what's ahead if the United States continues to shirk its responsibility. Many weeks ago President Goody assigned a group of constitutionalist rebel officers and a rival group of regular army officers to diplomatic posts abroad, so that preparations for the proposed June elections could be carried on peacefully.

The constitutionalists departed, but the ex-Trujillo army clique has refused to budge, showing its traditional contempt for a civilian president. Not having an army of his own, the provisional President must rely on the Inter-American Peace Force (a euphemism for U.S. troops) for support in attaining the objectives to which the United States says it is so devoted.

But the United States, which has cooperated with the military junta ever since it overthrew Juan Bosch, the country's only elected president, has been strangely impotent. In fact, long after he had openly defied President Goody, one of the leaders of the

March 9, 1966

5199

all they can to insure that the benefits are utilized by all.

I also believe that after the 31st of March, a full report on the numbers signing up for the medical benefits should be sent to the Congress by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

At that time, with the full details available, the Congress should consider the possibility of taking further steps which fully implement the legislation passed last year.

**AN ORATION ENTITLED "DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME"**

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a young lady from Nebraska is visiting Washington to learn more about our Government and the system of democracy under which we live. She came here because she won the Nebraska Voice of Democracy oratorical contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the ladies auxiliary of the VFW.

While she was here learning more about the way we function I feel she contributed greatly to the understanding of our heritage and our responsibilities in her oration entitled "Democracy: What It Means to Me." Therefore, I am asking unanimous consent that her oration be printed in the RECORD. This is the text on the speech given by JoAnn Frickenstein, of Creighton, Nebr.

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

**DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME**

America and democracy—perhaps the two most cherished words ever spoken; certainly these are two words that have become almost synonymous today. Yet, the term "democracy" usually only relates to a form of government. But, to me, it means much more than this.

Democracy is more than just a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. To me, democracy is my life, my home, my school, my church, my community, and my country. Democracy itself gives its followers faith and hope in greater tomorrows yet to come. As a young American citizen I know that I must in the near future choose my position among the adult citizens of these United States. It is comforting to know that I will be able to do this freely and without fear.

In this country I am assured of many rights which are taken for granted in these modern times. I know that I am free to voice my opinions, to say I agree or I disagree. I am free to worship my Creator in any church or in any manner I so desire, free to stand up and proudly say, "I am a Republican, or to say I am a Democrat," and free to do what I know is right without any fear of oppression.

These are the rights that fill each and every one of us with the desire to live, to learn, and to love. No other form of government in the world could offer me such great privileges and honors.

I consider these and other rights granted to me by a democracy to be of far greater value than anything money could possibly buy. These rights have been purchased by the sweat and bloodshed of our loyal and brave ancestors whose only goal was to create a situation in which their followers might live happily as free individuals in a free society.

Democracy to me is a privilege which enables me to live in this great land of opportunity. But I also realize that with every right goes a corresponding duty. I believe my duty in the society is to help preserve these rights and privileges which our forefathers so nobly fought for. We must maintain these rights that have been so abundantly bestowed upon us. It shall be my sacred duty as well as that of my young fellow citizens to safeguard these rights for coming generations.

The torch of democracy must be held high by those of us who will soon be tomorrow's leaders in this land of the free and home of the brave. My home, my school, my church, my community, and my country are all a result of democracy. They are my pride and joy for they will create my tomorrows. I must help safeguard democracy not only for me, but for all future generations.

Democracy means that I must work to instill or to strengthen, whichever the case may be, the values of democracy among my fellow citizens. I will be joining other loyal Americans in a united effort. Our democracy must be a candle, spreading light to dark and troubled portions of the world. I am confident that we will have nothing to fear.

Democracy is a task laid in hand of each and every individual today for it is truly a task of preservation. To me, it means work and wholeheartedness to today's world of turmoil. The results will be most rewarding, for they will mean generations of continued happiness. When our forefathers achieved democracy for this country, I am sure that they never dreamed it would be what it is today. Everywhere we look we see their democracy. We live and breathe it. Therefore, democracy is my assignment for it is truly my American way of life.

**EDITORIAL APPROVAL OF HEARINGS ON VIETNAM CONDUCTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, every Senator hopes that his actions in the Senate will be received with approval in his home State. I am no exception. Consequently, I was greatly encouraged by editorials which have appeared in some of the fine newspapers in the State of Arkansas. These editorials endorse the decision of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings on our problems in Vietnam and the role of Communist China in these problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the following newspapers be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

Arkansas Democrat, February 10, 1966; Northwest Arkansas Times, February 15, 1966; the Baxter Bulletin, February 17, 1966; and the Arkansas Democrat, February 23, 1966.

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

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Feb. 10, 1966]

**BENEFICIAL DEBATE**

Without the blessings of the administration, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and his Foreign Relations Committee are doing an admirable job by their forthright inquiry into President Johnson's Vietnam war policies.

While much of the testimony has been extremely tedious for the public to follow, it

is of unquestioned value to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and to the other lawmakers.

It is imperative that Congress know all that should be known about the war and about the administration's policies regarding it. After all, Congress is responsible for appropriating funds for the war, and while it has not refused any money requests, it is aware of the need to know the full picture, so that it, as well as the executive branch of the Government, can act in the best interests of the Nation.

The pressures being placed on President Johnson by the hawks and the doves is fairly understandable, and he must weigh gravely the options he chooses. He is explicitly committed to seek peace as well as to carry out his pledge in war. His is the problem to scale up the American attack or to scale it down. In reaching his decision he should properly consider the views of the Senate. Those views were not being expressed 6 months ago as they are today. We uphold the debate as a means for the President's decision to be influenced and guided by the best judgment of Congress.

[From the Northwest Arkansas Times, Feb. 15, 1966]

**OPPORTUNITY TO KNOW**

The people of the United States have reason to thank the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate for the inquiry it is conducting concerning the Nation's role in the Vietnam war.

The people need to know the circumstances and reasons for the developments which have taken place to date. And they need to be able to understand what future steps are likely, why they may be taken, and the probable results.

This is a most peculiar war in its relation to those who will fight and pay for it—the country is full of people who don't know why American soldiers are being killed in battle 10,000 miles from home, how many will be committed before the year is out, what accomplishments these men are supposed to record, or where the present war may lead.

Headlines from day to day report half a hundred or so Vietcong troops are killed by United States and South Vietnam forces; the enemy escapes traps carefully laid; American planes and pilots are lost to North Vietnamese groundfire; villages are overrun by troops searching the countryside for northern fighters; the jungle is smashed by bombs from the air and shells from warships. American forces are being stepped up in numbers soon to reach a half million or more Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force personnel.

Where it will lead nobody knows. Whether it will bring Red China into the fray is unsettled. If the Chinese Communists fight Americans, what will Russia do? How close to a nuclear war will it take the world?

These things deserve the closest kind of attention, not only by policymakers in the American Government, but by the people, who will pay the piper. They need to know the present aims of the administration in Washington, what it will mean to them for this Government to achieve its stated aims, what may occur if the goals are reached.

There is great danger in the air today. War fever definitely is discernible among a portion of the American population. Some say: Bomb the rascals where they live, attack their strongholds, show Red China some real power, spread the assaults further north. There is even some sentiment to hit China itself "before that country gains a nuclear force."

As long as this philosophy is preached and practiced by a weak minority it is not a menace, but it is spreading as the Vietnam war stretches out in time and grows in size. It

could make enough noise to influence policy of those directing the war effort—and this could lead directly to a third world war.

All this might be prevented if the people of the United States discern the possibilities—and the Senate committee, under the able leadership of Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, is alerting them so they can exercise some judgment.

The United States now has troops on the alert in Korea, Germany, Santo Domingo, and fighting in Vietnam—to name a few of the more urgent situations. The people of this country are told all this is done to halt the spread of communism, to stop aggression, to prevent expansion of a form of government alien to our own.

American forces are killing in pursuit of this policy. The spread of fighting is imminent. Where it will take us is a most pressing question which the people of the United States must consider before they become committed to a policy of victory or surrender—a sentiment which is being accepted by a growing portion of the population as the fighting is extended.

The duty of the Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman is entirely clear—and they are pursuing the correct course. The people have the right to know and to discuss and to decide, and the only way this decision should be made is with a knowledge of the present situation and what may follow. A difference in convictions among the Members of Congress exists, just as is evident among the people themselves. Both sides deserve a hearing.

Citizens of this country owe a debt of gratitude to the committee which is striving to bring to public attention not only details of where this country has gone, but the direction the road leads so that intelligent conclusions may be reached. If the public can understand what is involved, commitment to further escalation of the war to a highly explosive point may be averted.

Americans deserve to know. The opportunity to find out is being provided by the hearings the committee is conducting—thank goodness.

[The Baxter Bulletin, Feb. 17, 1966]

#### FULBRIGHT RECOGNIZES RESPONSIBILITY

Senator BILL FULBRIGHT has staked out a lonely and exposed position for himself as the Vietnam storm darkens and crackles.

It would be easier to be a follower in this perilous and puzzling time. It would be simpler and safer for the Senator to suppress any negative questions which might arise from his conscience or evaluation, as a number of other Senators have done.

But Senator FULBRIGHT has chosen to lead the Foreign Relations Committee which he heads into a thoroughgoing investigation of the Vietnam war—of how we got into a mounting major conflict on the Asian mainland and of our prospects for success. He also hopes the hearings, which are being televised and include some "star" figures, will reveal the philosophies and trends of overall U.S. foreign policy.

The decision is in the best tradition of legislative responsibility and the Senator is to be congratulated for his courage. He is not against the President; he believes that he is for the American people and that, if they are asked to make great sacrifices, they have a right to know what forces are in motion and what the costs and risks are. The inquiry he is conducting is, in fact, a bit late, because never before has a commitment on such a scale been made by this country with so little discussion and debate at the highest levels. The legislative branch has followed in a docile way, but now it is resuming its historic functions.

This is the field in which Senator FULBRIGHT is especially well equipped, through training and experience. If he believes that

the evidence weighs against the Johnson administration's policies anywhere, it is his duty to tell the people what he thinks regardless of whether his statements are politically advantageous. These are the gravest of times and the worst that can happen is perhaps worse than the average person thinks. This is not the year for shallow political calculating.

FULBRIGHT could be wrong, of course, and he is no doubt ready to accept the penalties if time disproves his assessment. He is against the escalating of the conflict, believing that that can easily lead to war with Red China and perhaps with Russia, and that a nuclear exchange could be the final result. He favors a holding strategy and a continuing effort to settle the conflict through negotiations. He fears that the country is already in too deep and that there can be no successful resolution of the dilemma from our standpoint.

If he is wrong, it can be recalled that the prophecies of administration officials have also failed thus far. According to Secretary McNamara's statements earlier in the war, the troops should already have been home. The strategy has not worked as envisioned.

We fervently hope that the Senator is wrong—that the Vietcong will capitulate before the swelling U.S. forces and that South Vietnam will be made into a model Asian democracy, flourishing through programs initiated by this country. Perhaps the United States has the power to make it work out that way. But a good many knowledgeable people believe the odds are not encouraging, and certainly all the facts should be laid out on the table. The President has been unduly sensitive it seems, about full disclosure and criticism.

The Foreign Relations Committee hearings at least are a counterbalance to the hawks who are strong in government and who counsel a plunge into a much hotter and broader war than the President is ready to undertake at this time.

The hearings deserve attention by people in Arkansas and elsewhere. The populace is being given an unusual opportunity, through television, to become informed and to participate in history. And the people have a heavy stake in the policies that are being discussed.

FULBRIGHT is being accused by some people of being an appeaser of communism, but he has no use for communism and believes that he is a realist in matters concerning not only the survival of democracy but of mankind. His ideas are presented impressively in his book, "Old Myths and New Realities," published last year.

He is also an erudite student of history, who knows that wars are almost always popular in their early days, but not always in the lengthening years of combat. History shows that wars of attrition cannot easily be won by the stronger force—perhaps cannot be won at all—if the guerrillas have the support of a sizable portion of the population. The American Revolutionary War is an early example, the French experience in Vietnam and Algeria are later ones. The French suffered ghastly losses in Vietnam, in a military effort largely financed by the United States. They finally threw in the towel in Vietnam because they could not sustain two wars, and their "honor" was committed in Algeria, nearer to home. In Algeria, too, they failed dismally, leaving many thousands of dead behind, because the foundation for any success of their policy was absent.

He remembers, too, that the philosophy in Vietnam has changed radically in a short time. In 1963 President Kennedy said, "They're the ones (the South Vietnamese) who have to win or lose it. We can help them, give them equipment. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it."

The situation is different now, and the men over there have the support of Americans. But that does not mean that all inquiry must come to an end, that alterations in our world policies cannot be critically examined. FULBRIGHT believes he is working for a stay of execution for the human race, and that is no mean motivation.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Feb. 23, 1966]

#### MORE LIGHT ON VIETNAM POLICIES

Senator FULBRIGHT's statement that there was a possibility of another round of discussions on Vietnam before the Foreign Relations Committee is an encouraging one, because such discussions are bound to bring further enlightenment on this grave problem.

Anxiety about the future of administration policy has drawn more Senators into the arena, where eminent critics, as well as leading supporters, of the Vietnam war have been heard. It is highly beneficial to the Nation for the Senate to become realistically engaged in probing the depths of this problem of war.

By all means, let the experts on China be heard. Through them it may be possible to develop a meaningful appraisal of China's attitudes, intentions and present capabilities in regard to warring with the United States.

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's position of declining to testify for security reasons is not a valid one. There already has been far too much silence and "cover-up" in the name of national security. Even if the sessions must be closed, the Senators should be able to question the Defense Secretary.

#### THE 119TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THOMAS ALVA EDISON IN MILAN, OHIO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is presently ill, may be allowed the privilege of having printed in the RECORD his remarks concerning an editorial published in the Columbus, Ohio Dispatch, which is a fitting tribute to the 119th birthday anniversary of Thomas Alva Edison, whose birthplace was in Milan, Ohio.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LAUSCHE:

In a recent editorial published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, fitting tribute was given to the 119th birthday anniversary of Thomas Alva Edison, whose birthplace was Milan, Ohio.

I am sure that the editorial will remind my colleagues in the Senate and others of the many conveniences and luxuries of today's modern life which are a result of Mr. Edison's foresight and ingenuity.

[Editorial published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch]

#### OUR HERITAGE FROM EDISON

Today is the 119th anniversary of the birth of the man who gave light to the world. Any schoolboy can tell you that we mean, of course, Thomas Alva Edison.

Possibly no other man in recorded history has had such an impact upon the civilized world as did this former railroad newsboy whose formal education was limited to a mere 3 months in the public schools.

In addition to his most famous achievement—invention of the electric light—Edison either invented, improved or found practical application for the phonograph, the motion picture camera, the auto storage battery, the teletype, the Ediphone, radio and television

mended extension of this program for 3 more years and an increase in the funds to be authorized for construction grants in fiscal 1967. This program will not only help our colleges and universities provide necessary facilities for the growing number of students; it will also assist them substantially in holding down their tuition charges and fees.

Only last week, President Johnson signed into law the cold war GI bill of rights, which will provide educational opportunities to hundreds of thousands of young veterans. This new program exceeded the amount requested by the President by almost a quarter of a billion dollars for fiscal 1967. Over the next 5 years, it will exceed the scope of the President's recommendation by more than \$1.8 billion.

In the face of such programs, no one can argue that we have neglected the field of higher education. In fact, we have done very well for higher education. We have not met every goal. But we have accomplished so much that the need for any further action now must be weighed very carefully against the effect on the budget. This brings me to my second argument against enactment of the Ribicoff proposal now.

We have before us the President's tax program, which will increase revenues by \$1.2 billion during the remainder of this fiscal year and \$4.8 billion in fiscal 1967. These additional revenues will come on top of the revenues generated by greater economic growth—which is resulting in part, from the tax reductions we enacted in 1964 and 1965. Together, the increase in revenue from economic growth and from these tax proposals will total \$11 billion in fiscal 1967.

Unfortunately, most of this increase in revenue will be offset by the demands posed by our defense of freedom in Vietnam. The overriding concern in all our budgetary considerations at this time is, in fact, the Vietnamese conflict.

The President has asked for a supplemental authorization of \$12.8 billion for Vietnam. We have just passed a part of that supplemental authorization totaling \$4.8 billion.

This commitment to the defense and assistance of a brave ally is adding \$4.7 billion to fiscal 1966 expenditures over original estimates. It is expected to add \$5.8 billion above that level to our expenditures in fiscal 1967, making a total of about \$10.5 billion in that fiscal year in additional expenditures for Vietnam.

The war in Vietnam will absorb most of the increase in revenues generated together by economic growth and by the tax program we are considering today. Further, between today and June 1967—the end of the fiscal year for which we must budget now—we cannot know at this time that nothing will occur which will require still greater expenditures.

We hope no such development will occur, but the matter is not ours alone to control.

The President in his 1967 budget did a magnificent job in holding the deficit to \$1.8 billion while providing for foreseeable requirements of our commitment in southeast Asia. His budget is extremely tight. In fact, that is exactly

the point I want to make. There is no room—no slack—anywhere in the responsible forecasts of revenues and expenditures for any program not already contemplated in the budget. Since we cannot foresee what situation we will face in the years beyond, we have no choice but to assume that the budgets will be similarly tight.

We cannot at this time predict that either in fiscal 1967 or at any specific future time, there will be slack in the budgetary equation which will allow for the cost of more than \$1 billion resulting from the Ribicoff proposal.

At this point in time, therefore, we must look at it for what it is, a proposal to spend money which we do not have—a proposal which, without an accompanying and offsetting revenue-raising plan, would of necessity increase the deficit.

Finally, we have still another cold reality which we must face.

For 5 years, we have enjoyed unprecedented prosperity. But even as we in Congress have deliberated the tax proposals before us now, the green light of safe and healthy economic growth has changed to the amber of caution.

There are a number of respected voices within Congress and still others outside which are already calling for tighter reins on the economy. Many respected observers of the economy are urging tax increases in addition to the tax adjustments proposed by the administration.

The proposal of the Senator from Connecticut will have its day in court. I have always supported aid to higher education, both in the Maryland Legislature and in the U.S. Senate, but for the reasons that I have cited, this plan is not appropriate today. The time has not yet arrived for it. Reluctantly, then, I shall withhold my support from it and wait for a more propitious time to cast my lot in its favor.

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, the Chair appoints the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as an additional Senator to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting at Canberra, Australia, from April 11 to 16, 1966.

#### VIETNAM—SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the eminent columnist for the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, has written an excellent article on March 6 entitled "The Sudden Rediscovery of SEATO." Mr. Krock notes, as several of us in the Senate have noted, that the administration has suddenly shifted its emphasis to SEATO as the fundamental source of the President's authority to sustain the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Krock calls the belated argument a fragile claim. He cites Senator George's statement in the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty that "if any course of action shall be agreed, or decided

upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process—of each signatory—is provided for, we have no obligation to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is to consult together about it."

Mr. Krock then takes note of the fact that if we have been acting in Vietnam under SEATO we have been violating the treaty for years because we have not been reporting the measures taken to the Security Council.

But the most interesting part of Mr. Krock's column is the composite he drew up of comments "made by persons interviewed by this correspondent who participated in the drafting of the treaty in 1954." This composite of their comments included the following points:

The reservation requiring constitutional processes in the case of action was written into the treaty at Secretary Dulles' insistence in order to put the other signatories on notice that the final decision to make war was vested in Congress.

Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are not parties and the signatories are not bound to them. They were added to the treaty area by a protocol—not for their benefit but for the benefit of the signatories.

Our trouble in Vietnam is that we have not been proceeding under the treaty, but going it alone.

I think that Mr. Krock's reference to the sudden rediscovery of SEATO is most apt. The latest memorandum of law issued by the Department of State on this subject was, as far as I am aware, dated March 8, 1965. It was entitled "Legal Basis for United States Action Against North Vietnam." This statement does not mention SEATO. Several days before the memorandum was published, the Department of State issued a statement that South Vietnam and the United States were engaged in a collective defense under the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense recorded in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. SEATO was not mentioned.

I believe that Mr. Krock has analyzed clearly and objectively a point of constitutional law. In this case it is the power of Congress to make war that is involved. It is time to rediscover our Constitution, just as Mr. Rusk has rediscovered SEATO.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Krock's column for March 6 printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, as exhibit 1.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as exhibit 2 an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 6 entitled "Agreement with Peiping?"

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. As the editorial points out, those seeking to downgrade and discount the proposals of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for a neutrali-



March 9, 1966

zation of southeast Asia are the same people who profess adherence to the Geneva agreement of 1954 on behalf of the United States. The very purpose of that agreement was, of course, to neutralize a large area of southeast Asia—Indochina. We gave lipservice to it even as we began violating it. Now, our Government officials try to discredit the whole idea even though they are fighting a war for objectives that are supposed to bring about a return to the 1954 agreement.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as exhibit 3 an editorial from the Washington Post of today, March 9, entitled "Hatchet Job."

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. The editorial comments on the calculated, planned operation to rid the State Department of a liberal officeholder, Mr. Abba Schwartz. It is not to be wondered at, of course, that a State Department managed by Dean Rusk, George Bell, William Bundy, and Thomas Mann cannot tolerate men in its midst who believe in freedom to travel and freedom of ideas, as a part of American foreign policy formulation.

I do not agree for a moment with the Post's explanation that Mr. Schwartz was a victim of McCarthyism on the Hill. He is a victim of McCarthyism's residue in the State Department. Perhaps the legacy of the McCarthy era on the Hill is involved in that it deprived the American Department of State of most of its top men who were willing to think in terms of optimum freedom rather than optimum security in its most narrow and limited sense.

The hatchetmen who did in Mr. Schwartz are in the administration, and particularly in the Department of State. I wish there were something Congress could do about it; but as with our China policy, which is another product of the residue from McCarthyism in the State Department, I am not very hopeful.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1966]

#### THE SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The citation by Secretary of State Rusk of the Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 as the fundamental source of President Johnson's authority to commit the United States to whatever expenditure of manpower and treasure he deems "necessary" to sustain the war in Vietnam was a shift of emphasis by the administration. And the reason is as plain as the ground is weak.

The reason was that influential senatorial voices were rising in protest against the administration's oft-reiterated claim that the President's open-ended commitment in Vietnam derives from the so-called Gulf of Tonkin concurrent resolution approved by Congress in 1964.

The voices arose from Senators who had been given officially to understand at the time that the resolution would not be so construed by the administration, and some of them had stated this reservation in voting for the measure. It was in the presence of this disturbance that Rusk, in the course of his testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, fell back on the treaty as a sworn national obligation which the President is executing with steadily mounting employment of armed force.

#### ARGUMENT DAMAGED

This belated argument has since been badly damaged in the critical analysis to which it has been subjected. Mr. Johnson appeared to recognize its vulnerability when he interposed in the debate a reminder that he is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and believes this role gives him the obligation as well as the power to make such use of these forces as he considers essential to preserve the national security when he adjudges it to stand in peril.

Though there are impressive constitutional challenges of this interpretation of Commander in Chief power when the United States is not formally at war, it has been established in previous practice. And the Supreme Court has dismissed all such challenges which have reached it for review.

The actual consequences are that (1) any President can involve the Nation in war and maintain it there indefinitely without the formal declaration which the Constitution reserves as an exclusive power of Congress; and (2) count on the declaration being made when and if his conscience or his political necessity induces him to propose it to Congress.

#### UTILIZED PROVOCATION

This is a fixed condition, and not a theory. But for obviously practical and technical reasons Presidents do not concede it on the public record. The alternative chosen by Mr. Johnson was to utilize the provocation of the Tonkin Gulf attack on the 7th Fleet by North Vietnamese gunboats to get a generalized expression of support from Congress. This worked well enough until it was argued, against the public record, as approval by Congress of any expansion of the war the President might make in an unforeseeable future. Then Rusk shifted the major basis for the claim to the SEATO compact.

But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim. In explaining the commitment to the Senate, Chairman George of the Committee on Foreign Relations made these statements:

The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consultation (with the other signatories). If any course of action shall be agreed \* \* \* or decided upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process (of each signatory government) is provided for. It is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence \* \* \* also encompasses acts of subversion \* \* \*. (But) even in that event (the United States) would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation \* \* \* to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is to consult together about it.

In the debate which followed Rusk's new resort to the treaty, Senator Morse made this point: If the administration is almost unilaterally waging the war on a decision that there has been "an armed attack" (that represent "a common danger") on an independent Nation within the treaty's zone of protection, then the treaty requires that the measures taken "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." With respect to this requirement, said Morse, "we have been acting in violation of the U.N. Charter for years." And when the United States at long last went before the Council it was "with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other."

#### FIRST HAND EVIDENCE

But the most effective refutation of Rusk's statement that SEATO imposes on the United States "a clear and direct commitment to the security of South Vietnam against external attack" is made by persons interviewed by this correspondent who participated in the drafting of the treaty in 1954. This is a brief composite of their comments:

The reservation as to "constitutional processes" was written in at Secretary Dulles' insistence to give notice to the other signatories that the final decision as to making war was vested in Congress. He was also a great believer in collective security, and he knew that when the French pulled out of Indochina there would be a vacuum into which the Communists would flow if there was not collective action to prevent it.

All of the parties, including Great Britain and France, are bound to the others to take action under the treaty. Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are not parties, and the treaty signatories are not bound to them. They were added by protocol to the treaty area, not for their benefit but for the benefit of the signatories.

Our basic trouble in Vietnam is that we have not been proceeding under the treaty but going it alone. This is due to a complete misappraisal and underestimate of the military and political considerations involved. We thought it was a minor concern we could handle ourselves without difficulty. So we did not insist that our partners participate.

For confirmation of this background, the persons interviewed cited the report on the treaty of the Senate committee. Hours of effort to procure a copy were, however, unsuccessful.

#### EXHIBIT 2

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 6, 1966]

#### AGREEMENT WITH PEIPING?

Senator FULLRIGHT went straight to the heart of the U.S. problem in Asia in a Senate speech last Wednesday. History and logic and common sense, he said, suggest that a viable settlement in Vietnam must be a part of a general settlement in southeast Asia, and therefore:

"Unless we are prepared to fight a general war to eliminate the effects of Chinese power in all of southeast Asia, we have no alternative but to seek a general accommodation. This is what really causes uneasiness among most of us. The central issue is the contest between Chinese and American power; and the prospect for a lasting peace depends far more upon the resolution of that issue than it does on the matter of who is to participate in the South Vietnamese Government and by what means it shall be formed."

What Mr. FULLRIGHT proposed was a broad agreement with Peiping to neutralize all of southeast Asia. Administration spokesmen immediately termed this idea impractical, though this is what, in substance, the 1954 Geneva agreements provided. We are inclined to wonder whether it is impractical and, indeed, whether there is any other answer.

It is easy to be negativistic. Also, as Mr. FULLRIGHT says, it is easy to advocate military escalation and difficult to endorse accommodation, since the latter is often complex, ambiguous and easily misunderstood. It is easy to cite Chinese verbal belligerence, and Chinese insistence on a prior settlement of the problem of Formosa. But perhaps ways could be found through a greater understanding of China and its problems.

For one thing, what does China think when it sees the United States, already in possession of major bases on Formosa and Okinawa, spending a billion dollars on permanent-type bases in South Vietnam? What does it think when Secretary of Defense McNamara tells Congress one day, "We have done everything humanly possible, both militarily and diplomatically, to make it unmistakably clear there is no justification for Communist China to involve itself in the war in Vietnam," and the next day U.S. bombers attack North Vietnamese targets only 40 miles from China?

Not so long ago Mr. McNamara attended a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization council and issued a warning

about the threat of Communist expansion. Like other followers of a hard line against China, he has been extensively quoting a statement by the Chinese Defense Minister, Lin Piao, which allegedly details the Chinese plan for aggression. As discussed elsewhere in the Post-Dispatch today by Richard Dudman, Lin Piao's words, as interpreted by scholars who know a great deal more about the subject than Mr. McNamara, mean something quite different.

What the United States urgently needs to do is to follow the advice of Roger Hillsman Jr., former Under Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, and look at China dispassionately. We know too little about the problems and intentions of this country, which holds a quarter of the human race. Perhaps if we knew more—and Mr. McNamara should be a good candidate for instruction—we could formulate rational policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT'S Foreign Relations Committee will hear testimony from China experts during the coming week. This should be a contribution to public knowledge and public debate. It should help identify the points on which to base a policy toward China (and Indochina) that would be in the long-range interest of the United States.

#### EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 9, 1966]

#### HATCHET JOB

The Abba Schwartz story might well be headed: "Joe McCarthy Rides Again." And the painful fact seems to be that someone in the White House saddled the horse for him. It is impossible to believe that the State Department reorganization which eliminates his Office and puts control of passport and visa policy in the hands of persons hostile to his views was motivated by considerations of economy. Mr. Schwartz, like so many State Department officials in the unhappy years of Senator McCarthy's reign of terror, appears to be a victim of hatchet men on the Hill—men who, like McCarthy, think that all Americans are patsys for Communist propaganda.

Abba Schwartz has done a superb job in the State Department in leading the long fight for immigration reform. He deserves great credit for a major role in drafting and bringing to realization the wise and decent immigration bill passed last year by Congress. If he made enemies in that fight, they are an honor to him. He has conducted the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs with common sense and humanity, granting passports in conformity with the rules laid down by the Supreme Court and granting visas to foreigners of divergent views, confident that the loyalty of Americans to their own system of Government is not going to be overturned by the arguments of itinerant Communists or Fascists. He is no believer in iron curtains.

A man who has served his Government ably and faithfully does not deserve to have his job abolished while he is abroad on official duty. There ought to be a good, searching look at the Abba Schwartz case—not alone by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate but by the President himself as well.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon for calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that this latest justification for the action in Vietnam does not square with the facts. It does not square with the text of article IV of the SEATO treaty, which is cited as a justification of the

U.S. unilateral military intervention allegedly to repel aggression.

The Senator will recall that the official justification until very recently was that three Presidents had pledged the kind of aid we are now giving South Vietnam and that, therefore, there was a solemn commitment, a national pledge, to do what are doing and that we had to pursue this course or we would be dishonoring that solemn pledge.

The basis for this allegation was presented in a State Department document called "Why Vietnam?" and has been recently cited by several administration spokesmen in defense of our policy there. The State Department document in question quotes in full a letter from President Eisenhower to then-President Diem, written in October 1954, in which, in the first place, President Eisenhower mentioned that the Government of the United States, in response to his request, had assisted Diem in transferring thousands of refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. But that is the only allusion to any request by Diem. Then, the letter goes on to say that President Eisenhower had instructed his Ambassador to explore with Diem in what manner aid could be given by the United States. President Eisenhower stipulated a number of conditions attached to giving such aid. Diem was to make reforms and establish a government respected at home and abroad. Three times in that letter President Eisenhower specified conditions. Those conditions were never fulfilled. But the most that President Eisenhower offered was economic aid. There is nothing in that letter to show that President of the Council of Ministers Ngo Diem asked for it. It was President Eisenhower who initiated the proposal. The letter makes that clear.

So, the statement that we were asked to come in there and responded to a request by a friendly government is shown to be a myth.

Then, we come to the second President, who is alleged to have pledged aid, and that is President Kennedy. He never offered more than military advisers and economic aid and never American troops for combat.

So the official allegation that three Presidents have committed us to what we are now doing in Vietnam; namely, sending our men into combat and bombing Vietnam indiscriminately and using the Armed Forces of the United States to whatever extent the present President decides, is utterly without foundation.

So with that justification exploded, the SEATO treaty was dredged up. As the author of the article read by Senator Morse points out, that also provides no justification for our unilateral military involvement.

Article 1 of the SEATO treaty refers to the United Nations Charter and pledges us to use only peaceful means. If SEATO was to bind us, the most that we could do by its terms was to use peaceful measures and refrain from the threat of use of force. By using force we have violated that treaty.

Article 4, which is now cited to justify our activities in Vietnam, requires that in case of aggression, there must be

unanimous agreement among the signatories in designating the aggressor—which has not happened—and if there is evidence of aggression in the view of one of the parties, these parties shall consult in order to agree on what measures should be taken. Well, we have never consulted. There was no unanimous agreement. We went in unilaterally. Later we were joined tokenwise by not more than four of the seven signatories, Australian, New Zealand, Philippines, and Thailand, after much prodding on our part, and such action as these four have taken belatedly in unwise correspondence to the requirements of article 4 of the SEATO treaty.

Moreover, if a joint decision had been made that all seven signers act together, it would have to have been done by the constitutional means provided for each nation. But the signatories never acted together. But if they had, we, the United States would have to have acted by means of a declaration of war by the Congress, as the Constitution provides. So the second justification falls to the ground. The administration's latest justification for our presence there with a vast and growing Army, Navy, and Air Force finds no justification in the SEATO treaty, and the statements on which that allegation is based are baseless and false.

The American people have been deceived into believing that we have a moral basis for being in Vietnam; that we received a request from a friendly nation for help; that three Presidents pledged that help; and that further, we were obligated under the SEATO treaty to give such assistance. I believe it is important that the American people should know that the basis on which we allege we are in Vietnam is without any foundation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alaska is eminently correct. The State Department is grasping at a straw in its reference to SEATO. The testimony of the Secretary of State, in executive sessions of the committee, both in 1962 and 1964, does not support his present position on SEATO. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has requested the State Department to state whether it would be willing to declassify that testimony.

Furthermore, the argument is made that the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association has alleged, in a resolution, that our Government's course of action in South Vietnam is legal and constitutional. The Committee on Foreign Relations immediately wired the house of delegates to send to the committee the documentation that supports the resolution. The point is that the house of delegates had no authoritative documentation. They held a meeting, someone offered a resolution, and the house of delegates voted for the resolution without thoughtful analysis. Of course, even lawyers sometimes "curbstone" without going to the books. This was a case of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association "curbstoning" without going to the books. The fact is that documentation has been placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the

March 9, 1966

Senator from Oregon from time to time over a period of 2 years, and the case is against the State Department.

But the State Department is now trying to argue on the basis of the SEATO treaty, completely overlooking article 53 of the United Nations Charter, which would require authorization from the Security Council for any such course of action as we have been following in South Vietnam. The United States has never sought the authorization from the Security Council for the good reason that we would have difficulty getting it.

Finally, what this administration does not like to face up to—and the administration will hear about this between now and November—is that no Republican President sent any boy in uniform to South Vietnam to die. American boys have been sent to Vietnam only by Democratic Presidents.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the colloquy between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska the complete text of the SEATO treaty be printed in the Record. My reference to it was only from memory. I think it important that the exact text, particularly the text of article I, which prescribes the use of only peaceful means, and article IV, which is used as the basis for our being in South Vietnam militarily, be clear to all who read the colloquy that has taken place between the Senator from Oregon and me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in that request.

There being no objection, the text of the SEATO treaty was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY AND PROTOCOL THEREON**

Text of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty With Protocol, 8 UST 81; Treaties and Other International Acts Series 3170; Signed at Manila, September 8, 1954; Ratification Advised by the Senate, February 1, 1955; Ratified by the President and Ratification Deposited February 19, 1955; Proclaimed by the President March 2, 1955; and Entered Into Force February 19, 1955

The Parties to this Treaty,<sup>1</sup>

Recognizing the sovereign equality of all the Parties,

Reiterating their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments,

Reaffirming that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and declaring that they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities.

Desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, and to promote the economic well-being and development of all peoples in the treaty area,

Intending to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that any potential aggressor will appreciate that the Parties stand together in the area, and

<sup>1</sup> Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom, and the United States.

Desiring further to coordinate their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security,

Therefore agree as follows:

**Article I**

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

**Article II**

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

**Article III**

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with one another in the further development of economic measures, including technical assistance, designed both to promote economic progress and social well-being and to further the individual and collective efforts of governments toward these ends.

**Article IV**

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the treaty area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

**Article V**

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall provide for consultation with regard to military and any other planning as the situation obtaining in the treaty area may from time to time require. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

**Article VI**

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to

enter into any international engagements in conflict with this Treaty.

**Article VII**

Any other State in a position to further the objectives of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the area may, by unanimous agreement of the Parties, be invited to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. The Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

**Article VIII**

As used in this Treaty, the "treaty area" is the general area of Southeast Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties, and the general area of the Southwest Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, amend this Article to include within the treaty area the territory of any State acceding to this Treaty in accordance with Article VII or otherwise to change the treaty area.

**Article IX**

1. This Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that government to the other signatories.

2. The Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall notify all of the other signatories of such deposit.

3. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the instruments of ratification of a majority of the signatories shall have been deposited, and shall come into effect with respect to each other State on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

**Article X**

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

**Article XI**

The English text of this Treaty is binding on the Parties, but when the Parties have agreed to the French text thereof and have so notified the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, the French text shall be equally authentic and binding on the Parties.

**UNDERSTANDING OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The United States of America in executing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1, apply only to communist aggression but affirms that in the event of other aggression or armed attack it will consult under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

For Australia:

R. G. CASEY.

For France:

G. LA CHAMBRE.

For New Zealand:

CLIFTON WEBB.

March 9, 1966

For Pakistan:  
 Signed for transmission to my Govern-  
 ment for its consideration and action in ac-  
 cordance with the Constitution of Pakistan.

ZAFRULLA KHAN,  
 For the Republic of the Philippines:  
 CARLOS P. GARCIA,  
 FRANCISCO A. DELGADO,  
 TOMAS L. CABILL,  
 LORENZO M. TAÑADA,  
 CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL.

For the Kingdom of Thailand:  
 WAN WATTHAYAKON KROMMUN NARADHIP  
 BONGSFRABANDH.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain  
 and Northern Ireland:

READING.  
 For the United States of America:  
 JOHN FOSTER DULLES,  
 H. ALEXANDER SMITH,  
 MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy  
 of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense  
 Treaty concluded and signed in the English  
 language at Manila, on September 8, 1954,  
 the signed original of which is deposited in  
 the archives of the Government of the Re-  
 public of the Philippines.

In testimony whereof, I, Raul S. Man-  
 glapus, Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs of  
 the Republic of the Philippines, have here-  
 unto set my hand and caused the seal of the  
 Department of Foreign Affairs to be affixed at  
 the City of Manila, this 14th day of October,  
 1954.

[SEAL] Raul S. Manglapus  
 RAUL S. MANGLAPUS,  
 Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs.

PROTOCOL TO THE SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE  
 DEFENSE TREATY

Designation of States and Territory as to  
 which Provisions of Article IV and Article  
 III are to be applicable

The Parties to the Southeast Asia Collec-  
 tive Defense Treaty unanimously designate  
 for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty  
 the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free  
 territory under the jurisdiction of the State  
 of Vietnam.

The Parties further agree that the above-  
 mentioned states and territory shall be eligi-  
 ble in respect of the economic measures con-  
 templated by Article III.

This Protocol shall enter into force simu-  
 ltaneously with the coming into force of the  
 Treaty.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plen-  
 ipotentiaries have signed this Protocol to the  
 Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of Septem-  
 ber, 1954.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration  
 of the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for  
 graduated withholding of income tax  
 from wages, to require declarations of  
 estimated tax with respect to self-em-  
 ployment income, to accelerate current  
 payments of estimated income tax by  
 corporations, to postpone certain excise  
 tax rate reductions, and for other pur-  
 poses.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is  
 my intention to offer an amendment to  
 the tax bill.

During the 1st session of the 89th Con-  
 gress, we passed a program of reduction  
 of excise taxes, including those on tele-  
 phone service and automobile sales. I  
 worked for these tax eliminations because  
 they were proper and long overdue; be-  
 cause they placed an excessively heavy  
 tax burden on lower and middle income

groups; and because the administration  
 had requested their repeal as a stimulus  
 to the national economy.

Now we have before us a bill which  
 would restore the excise tax cuts we all  
 worked so hard to obtain last summer.  
 If excise tax cuts were a good idea last  
 summer, why are they not a good idea  
 now? Are they now any less burden-  
 some to the lower and middle income  
 groups? Speaking quite frankly, is not  
 this proposal just a quick way to raise  
 money to fight the war in Vietnam?

The primary purpose of an excise tax  
 of this type is to curtail consumer de-  
 mand for luxury items. I wish to stress  
 that point. They are designed to curtail  
 the buying of luxury items. This was the  
 reason for their adoption during the  
 Second World War, when it was essential  
 that industry shift its emphasis from  
 peacetime to wartime production. We  
 could ask our people to make this kind  
 of sacrifice then. We were in a life and  
 death struggle with Germany and Japan,  
 a struggle involving the freedom of the  
 world. We could ask our people to re-  
 strict their telephone usage because tele-  
 phones were needed for the war effort.  
 We were producing no new civilian auto-  
 mobiles because we were too busy build-  
 ing tanks. Yes, we could ask our people  
 to make these sacrifices, and we could  
 pass laws to back up our requests.

During the 1940's, when we were fight-  
 ing a two-front war and had millions of  
 men on the battle lines, only 36.9 percent  
 of the households in the United States  
 had telephone service. Even then, and  
 also during the Korean war, excise taxes  
 were a part of a comprehensive tax pro-  
 gram. Today we are living in the 1960's,  
 and we are fighting a different type of  
 war in a faraway country. According  
 to various estimates, about 215,000 of our  
 men are in the field, and today 83.9 per-  
 cent of the households in the United  
 States have telephone service. Thus, the  
 telephone is no longer a luxury, nor is an  
 automobile a luxury. Are we to ask the  
 American public to make selective sacri-  
 fices in the 1960's, using an outdated and  
 piecemeal tax formula, when we have  
 been told repeatedly that Vietnam may  
 cost us a few guns, but not any of the  
 butter?

It is interesting to examine the record  
 to see just what was said last summer  
 when we were asked to cut excise taxes.  
 As President Johnson said in the mes-  
 sage he sent to the Congress requesting  
 the tax cuts:

Unwise tax policy can unduly restrict pri-  
 vate purchasing power; hold back economic  
 growth; stifle incentives; distort decisions by  
 consumers and producers; enlarge, rather  
 than shrink budget deficits.

On the other hand, wise tax policy can  
 raise the purchasing power of private citi-  
 zens; expand production and create jobs;  
 stimulate initiative and improve efficiency;  
 reduce budget deficits by expanding the tax  
 base and increasing tax revenues.

The proposed program of excise tax cuts  
 and revisions will spur growth and move us  
 closer to full employment by removing an  
 unnecessary drag on consumer and business  
 purchasing power. It will also lower prices  
 to consumers; lessen the burden of regres-  
 sive taxes on low-income families; raise busi-

ness profits by expanding sales and cutting  
 costs of tax compliance; cut the Govern-  
 ment's costs of tax collection and enforce-  
 ment; end an unfair burden on many busi-  
 nesses and workers who produce the com-  
 modities singled out for excise taxation; free  
 consumers from the distorting effects of  
 these taxes on their market choices.

AMENDMENT NO. 504

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in or-  
 der to accommodate the chairman of the  
 committee, the assistant majority leader,  
 I call up my amendment, No. 504, so that  
 we might proceed to obtain a unanimous-  
 consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The  
 amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read  
 the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask  
 unanimous consent that the reading of  
 the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-  
 out objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment ordered to be printed  
 in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 52, after line 12, insert the fol-  
 lowing new subsection:

"(b) LOCAL RESIDENTIAL TELEPHONE SERV-  
 ICE.—Section 4252 (relating to definitions for  
 purposes of the tax on communication serv-  
 ices) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the last sentence of  
 subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof  
 the following: "The term 'local telephone  
 service' does not include any service which is  
 toll telephone service (as defined in subsec-  
 tion (b)), private communication service (as  
 defined in subsection (d)), or local residen-  
 tial telephone service (as defined in subsec-  
 tion (e))."; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the fol-  
 lowing new subsection:

"(e) LOCAL RESIDENTIAL TELEPHONE SERV-  
 ICE.—For purposes of this subchapter, the  
 term "local residential telephone service"  
 means the communication service furnished  
 to a subscriber which provides access to a  
 local telephone system, and the privilege of  
 telephonic quality communication with per-  
 sons having telephone or radio telephone  
 stations constituting a part of such local  
 telephone system, if the telephone station  
 which is furnished to the subscriber is lo-  
 cated in a personal residence of the sub-  
 scriber and is not used principally in the  
 conduct of any trade or business."

On page 52, line 13, strike out "(b)" and  
 insert "(c)".

On page 52, line 22, strike out "(e)" and  
 insert "(d)".

On page 52, lines 22 and 23, strike out  
 "subsections (a) and (b)" and insert "this  
 section".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Presi-  
 dent, I have discussed this matter with  
 the sponsor of the amendment. He in-  
 dicated that he would be willing to have  
 limited debate.

I ask unanimous consent that debate  
 on the amendment be limited to one  
 hour and a half, 45 minutes to be con-  
 trolled by the sponsor of the amendment,  
 the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE],  
 and 45 minutes to be controlled by the  
 Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there  
 objection? Without objection, it is so  
 ordered.

Does the Senator from Indiana wish  
 the time limitation to begin as of now?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. I do not believe that those who will speak in opposition to the amendment will use the entire 45 minutes. If the Senator from Indiana finds that 45 minutes is not sufficient time, I shall yield him more time.

Mr. HARTKE. I yield myself 15 minutes. I say to my distinguished friend—and he is my friend—that I do not anticipate needing 45 minutes.

I note that during the debate on the military authorization bill, comment was made to the effect that there was a filibuster or delay on the part of those who wanted to speak on the measure. That urgency seems to have disappeared since the measure was passed. I looked at the House calendar on today and there were no conferees appointed. They were appointed this afternoon, March 9, although the bill was passed by the Senate on March 1. Conferees could not have met on this matter before this time because no conferees were appointed. It was not the fault of the Senate. The urgency seems to have now disappeared.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. HAGAN of Georgia has been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses to the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia, vice Mr. Dowdy excused.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12889) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. BATES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2627) for the relief of certain classes of civilian employees of naval installations erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to misinterpretation of certain personnel instructions, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I did not know that the messenger was going to come in with that message. It was very nice of him to come in with that message at this time.

Mr. President, as Secretary Fowler said, when he appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on June 8, 1965:

Reduction of our selective excise taxes increases the equity of the tax system. Many selective taxes are discriminatory and burdensome on producers, sellers, and consumers of the items subject to tax.

I believe that the Congress and the public have long felt that many of our excise taxes have no place in a permanent tax system. Thus, wherever it is appropriate to remove a particular burden on one product or another, we should strive consistently with other tax goals to provide a freely operating competitive price system, and, repeating the President's words: "end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation."

Excise taxes, unlike income taxes, impose burdens on those whose income is below the level of their personal exemptions and deductions. The present excise tax reduction program will lighten the burden of regressive taxation on low and middle income people. A great deal of the revenue involved comes from extremely regressive taxes, which are a heavy burden on low incomes. These include the taxes on telephones.

And, as my good friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], a man noted for his great record of protecting the consumer's interest with respect to public utility charges, said on the floor of this Senate on June 17 of last year:

The telephone people feel that the tax reduction will mean a saving of \$17 for the average telephone customer in the State of Louisiana. The telephone company is already preparing its publications to advertise and tell the people about the tax cut, and to express their gratitude to Congress on behalf of both the company and user for the tax reduction voted by Congress.

This is what I meant when I asked earlier, why, if the excise tax cuts were a good idea last summer, they are not a good idea now. Or, are they any less burdensome to the lower and middle income groups? I do not think the people of Louisiana are any more willing to pay \$17 a year more in taxes than the people of Indiana. And I do not think the people of Louisiana need to be asked to make selective sacrifices any more than the people of Indiana.

When Secretary Fowler came before the Finance Committee a few days ago to ask for repeal of the excise tax cuts, one of the reasons he gave for asking for an increase in excise taxes was that they were easy to collect. It is apparent to me that the Treasury is more concerned with convenience than the equity of the taxes.

We could have pointed to a number of items on which we did not have the same approach. The excise tax on these items expired on December 31, 1965. These items were not increased. We went instead to the telephone and automobile.

I point out that the telephone, automobile, food, and housing are four of the basic items used by every American household today. However, if we wanted to, we could have said: "Why don't we

extend the tax on these other items?" Really, we are seeking to put another tax on the docket. It could have been said: "Why don't we put the tax back on race tracks? That tax expired last year. Why do we not put the tax back on theaters, cabarets, country club dues, the documentary stamps for stocks and bonds, light bulbs, chewing tobacco, and snuff?"

These taxes expired December 31. However, they did not put the tax on those items. Instead, the tax is proposed to be placed back on the telephones and automobiles. If the tax had been placed on the other items, it would have raised \$303 million, without the equivalent of my amendment. That would be \$303 million compared with \$315 million.

If we want to be fair, why do we not go back to the luxury items, such as I have just mentioned, and put the tax on those items? We might go a little further and put the tax back on jewelry, fur, toilet preparations, and luggage. That would account for another \$550 million. Perhaps we could go further and put on a manufacturer's tax—if we exclude the one before us at this time—on sporting goods, playing cards, air conditioners, and items of that sort. That would be another \$603 million.

The taxes on most of these other categories would have raised \$1.461 billion. The total of these taxes would be \$2 billion more than raised by the total revenue package on necessities of life.

When asking for tax cuts, Treasury was quick to point out that this would cure one of the inequities of excise taxes—their regressiveness. The fact remains that a 10-percent excise tax on a \$6 telephone bill means the user will have to pay an additional 60 cents monthly whether he makes \$3,000 or \$300,000. Twenty-one million households with telephones have less than \$1,000 annual income, and 8 million have less than \$3,000 annual income. Why should these families be faced with an increase in their cost of living, an increase which would weigh more heavily upon them than upon the higher income families?

But the elimination of the inherent regressiveness in the excise taxes was just one of the reasons given in asking for their repeal. Another reason given to repeal the excise taxes on so-called luxuries was to help simplify the tax system. Treasury pointed out that the repeal of the excise taxes on luxuries would leave the remaining excise taxes in three categories:

First, Excises levied on the benefit principle. Included in this category are such taxes as those on gasoline, tires, and tubes. These revenues go to building new highways.

Second, Regulatory excise taxes which are levied on such items as marijuana, opium, and gambling.

Finally, there are excise taxes which are sumptuary taxes, such as those on alcohol, cigars, and cigarets.

An excise tax on telephones falls into neither of these three categories. An excise tax on telephones is a tax on a service, and it is the only service tax levied by the Federal Government. So



looking for ideas which will enhance their capacity and zest for living, for producing, for broadening the scope of their interests. They select magazines—several particular magazines—only because these provide what they want and what will influence them—help them—meet their wants. The magazine influences people because they want it to influence them. That is why people buy them.

Magazines inspire confidence. The printed word, backed by reputation, has a powerful effect on believability. This is heightened by the timespan over which the printed word is expected to be subject to public scrutiny. Broadly magazines meet this test. The magazine departments—archives—of great public libraries daily demonstrate their value as a continuing source of reliable reference.

Magazines encourage selectivity. Some people regard this as the most important manifestation of the magazine character. Advertising makes possible our rich world of magazines. And advertising helps the selective process. But magazines in themselves suggest and inspire improvement in standards and methods of living which excites ambition among many classes of people. Because they are magazine readers, these people generally have or can accumulate the means to pay for desired and desirable improvements. Further, they have the will, the tenacity and the job security which makes possible early accumulation of such improvements. Moreover, they tend to have a plan for developed living which encourages thoughtful consideration of their purchases. They read. They reflect. They compare. And finally they buy. And what they buy and where they buy are strongly influenced by the editorial content which surrounds and often provides essential background for their decision.

It provides background, too, for consideration of well-planned, effectively executed and appropriately placed advertising designed specifically to appeal to the special groups within the heterogeneous 49 million families of loyal and consistent magazine readers.

In summary: The magazine is read. It has timely authority. It increases learning ability. It offers widely varying opinions. It motivates people of means and influence. It covers literally—universal interests. It inspires confidence. Its audience is vast but entirely self-selecting. Finally, it distributes the products, the ideas, and the ideals of our educators, our philosophers, our writers: the sum of our creative talent in the arts and in business and industry.

Anyone aware of the recent changes and impressive growth in the magazine business cannot avoid being impressed by the dynamics of this vast and influential industry. For 200 years magazines have helped mold the minds, the ambitions and the achievements of mankind. Where else, with meaning, can we find a continuously vivid influence on our daily life, with so rich an experience in the past, from which we may resolve our problems of the present; and develop to the full, our opportunities of the future?

And in these achievements, accumulated over more than two centuries and actively and vitally working today, are embodied the real power inside your magazines.

### Travel Gap Widens

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

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

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1966, the following editorial appeared

in both the Gatlinburg Press and the Sevier County News Record in Sevier County, Tenn.

The Great Smoky Mountains area, which these papers serve, is one of the most beautiful natural settings in our Nation and one which offers many recreational and relaxing advantages to our people.

It is understandable that the editorial would speak out on the "travel gap," which is of great concern to the area and which should be of great concern to all of us.

I insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### TRAVEL GAP WIDENS

As was anticipated, efforts of the administration to curb travel abroad and encourage the expenditure of that money in the United States backfired and the public spent more money than ever with other nations.

Purpose of encouraging travel in the United States was to reduce the difference between what visitors from other nations spend here and what our citizens spend abroad.

The travel gap amounted to \$1.9 billion and represents a serious drain on the national economy. Problem is that this greatly exceeds our anticipated balance-of-payments deficit.

However, despite the difference of \$1.9 billion, Uncle Sam does not intend to hamper or restrict travel abroad, and no special effort is to be made to keep our citizens and their dollars from going abroad.

Getting more foreign people to visit this Nation presents considerable difficulty, one important aspect being the restriction which other nations place upon those who visit the United States in limiting as well as restricting the amount of money they can bring with them.

Part of Uncle Sam's problem is that little money is being expended to attract visitors from other nations. In 1961 the U.S. Travel Service was organized to encourage more from other nations to visit the United States but only \$3 million a year has been appropriated to meet the cost—equal to about 44 cents per traveler visiting our Nation in 1964.

Nearby Canada finds it profitable to lure tourists from the United States spending \$6.8 million annually—more than double the amount Uncle Sam has been spending. Greece spends \$4.6 million while tiny Ireland finds it wise to spend \$5.2 million a year to interest tourists in visiting their country.

More effort should be spent nationally to attract tourists and thus reduce the lopsided trade balance which spending abroad creates.

—THE ARCHBOLD (OHIO) BUCKEYE.

### Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past weeks and months about the situation in Vietnam. The Senate hearings, and the discussions on the floor of the House and Senate, have served to air many points of view, but one action, above all else, has clarified where we stand.

The overwhelming approval of the House and Senate of the \$4.8 billion supplemental defense appropriation meas-

ure has clearly given the President the support he needs to conduct the honorable struggle in which the United States is now involved.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 4 upholding both the vote of the Congress and the efforts of the President in Vietnam.

The editorial follows:

#### 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. Peiping 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.

### School Lunch Cutbacks

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GLENN R. DAVIS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if many of us here were

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1317

its annual Magazine Day. John K. Herbert, president of the Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., spoke to a group of 150 Washington advertising executives concerning the role that magazines play in a free society. The magazine industry of the United States is unequaled by that of any other country in the world.

It is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Herbert's remarks concerning the dynamic force that industry has created on our economy and way of life.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, guests of the Advertising Club of Metropolitan Washington, you do the magazine industry great honor in affording me this time and attention.

Yet your compliments and interest perhaps reflect that of another Washingtonian who wrote me:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1965.

DEAR MR. HERBERT: I am particularly pleased to extend my best wishes to the members of the Magazine Publishers Association as they meet in their annual convention.

I do so because few avenues of communication in his country play a role as vital as yours.

The extent to which any society can be free and responsive is equated by the degree to which it is enlightened and informed. In this respect, the American people are a classic example. Nowhere are the people of a single nation as intelligently and keenly aware of the ever-changing panorama of global events.

This, I believe, is a direct tribute to you. Your publications not only inform and educate, but since the days of Thomas Paine, who well deserved the title of publisher, they have been a major force in unifying this country.

The broad spectrum of magazines published in the United States reflects vividly the breadth of interests and concerns of our people. Your publications reach out to every segment of our society to fill an urgent need for the information that is essential in forming the wise decisions on which our democracy thrives.

The American magazine industry is a vital and indispensable force of which we are all proud, and I wish you continued success in your efforts.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

What are the qualities of magazines that have evoked this sincere and perceptive tribute? What are the characteristics which enable them to accept unblushingly the compliment paid them by Henry R. Luce, perhaps a biased but nonetheless professional witness?

I quote: "Magazines have been educative, especially of adults, in many, many ways. We have educated the American people in the sense of providing information for information's sake. We have also been educators: in ways of living, in ways of thinking and believing. In pragmatic terms, magazines have been responsible, to some very great extent, for the standard of living of the American people, the beneficent wonder of the world."

Well, how does this come about? First, the magazine is read. It is read usually at the time and place of the reader's choosing, when the mood, the leisure and the interest coincide.

In this I am reminded of the observations of two oldtime scholars which seem particularly applicable to magazines today.

Noah Porter, when president of Yale Uni-

versity from 1871 to 1886, declared: "No man can read with profit that which he cannot learn to read with pleasure." And the noted English commentator and writer, Samuel Johnson, advised simply and succinctly, "One ought to read just when the inclination takes him, for what he reads as a task will do him little good."

But magazines offer more than selective reading for learning with pleasure. The magazine offers the invaluable act of reading itself, invaluable because reading is the tested and certain path to comprehension, and comprehension is the foundation of learning, of judgment, of decision. Thus, the appealing fusion of text and illustrations produces this component of the magazine character, simply that it is read.

The magazine has timely authority. It also often has enduring entity.

Though the magazine is constantly reinterpreting the lessons of history as new facts and perspectives emerge, it doesn't consume valuable years to do so. Usually it is the first to change ideas which may have been erroneously held for decades.

This quality which gives the magazine its informative vigor is worth emphasis. Day to day changes in the news often relate to central events of major importance. A series of circumstances occurs here or in Asia. Each is reported as it happens.

But the concerned reader is confused. He wants to know what is the sum of these events. Linked together, what do they portend? What is the real significance of De Gaulle? What are the chances of peace in Vietnam? What were the political implications of the New York transit strike? Were any of them national? What is behind the headlines on Soviet commitments in North Vietnam? Medicare? How may they affect the farmer, the businessman, the housewife, the mechanic, the cost of living, a new automobile, a vacation, the children's education?

Here is where the interest lies. Do these bits and pieces of news add up to a passing shower or a Noah's deluge? Where can we get authoritative, reflective answers while they are still meaningful?

The facts must be appraised and interpreted by articulate experts trained in the interests of their readers.

The first place such authority usually appears is in a magazine, to be read at your convenience.

It is, therefore, neither book nor newspaper; neither audio nor visual device, it is a magazine, separate and distinct from all other communication media, and it has authoritative timeliness.

Magazines increase learning abilities among schoolchildren. That's a strong statement—it is also a provable one. A few years ago the National Education Association issued a report on a unique study of the results of effective magazine use in elementary high schools. The only magazines tested were those read widely by the general public. Only one teacher in each school was asked to report. So intense was the interest engendered that replies were received from 900 of the 1,200 schools surveyed.

With the often deplorably slow updating of textbooks—some are used for 5 or even 10 years—magazines were demonstrated to provide a vital means of relating learning to the experience of daily living.

The deep nationwide concern of serious teachers for up-to-date viable learning systems was most aptly expressed by one California teacher who said: "Without magazines our programs would die."

What greater proof that magazines increase learning abilities? They increase them pleasurablely. And, I may add, at all literate ages.

I emphasize the word pleasurablely because learning is an inevitable process of living and living can and should be always a pleasant process. But learning has a deeper

meaning than the discovery of something new. Learning also implies a broadening appreciation of the tested and stanch precepts of the past.

In our youth, studying early American history, we heard about the something called freedom of speech. Coming after some years of parental discipline more or less based on a canon that children should be seen and not heard, the term "freedom of speech" at best elicits a mixed response. It seems that what was right for Patrick Henry may not be right for children; what is right for school-teachers is interpreted differently for pupils. Only very, very gradually do we assimilate the real meaning of Thomas Jefferson's living words: "Freedom of religion, freedom of the press and freedom of person \* \* \* these are the principles which have guided our steps."

I submit that our national magazines today have more effect in sustaining and maintaining such fundamentals to the democracy of our Republic than any other influence available throughout the entire Nation. Since the first American magazine was announced by Benjamin Franklin in 1740, they have strengthened our determination to uphold and forever preserve the only political way of life tolerable for freeman.

Think of this a little, when you think of the 95 million adults who are magazine readers.

Magazines protect and implement national unity. We are a nation; we are not simply 50 loosely federated States or, if you like, a dozen regions. We are a nation and whatever local rights and customs we may stanchly uphold, our national purpose is indivisible.

Magazines may quickly transport the relaxed and comfortable ranchhouse style of home from the West to the East. With equal speed they can and do widen appreciation and understanding of art, of education needs, of religion, and of our place and purpose in this increasingly complex world.

But, in the fundamental principles of our Nation, even those involving abstruse economics and perplexing politics, there is no other interpretive means whereby widely divergent opinions can be expressed in depth and quickly annealed for a resolute course of action.

Where national unity is of importance, the essential ingredients to its achievement are found in magazines.

There is one quality common to magazines which, to me, is very special: they vigorously express honest and forthright differences of opinion.

Magazines, especially many that may be small in circulation but huge in influence, seem to represent just about all the points of view there are. So long as the reader is selective, he can find high, low, or middle ground on virtually every important domestic and international question likely to concern him. Equally important, he can get timely discussion of all three views. From magazines, readers can learn not just what to think, but what to think about. There is a vast difference.

New magazines are constantly appearing on the market, 33 in the past year. Most of them represent new ideas; new thinking; a fresh approach. Rarely are they aimed at that audience en masse. They do not seek the lowest common denominator of a group interest, though one aim is surely financial success. But that success is expected through effective, articulate, even dramatic presentation of an idea and the idea dominates the mere technical skills of promotion, display, and exploitation.

Magazines affect and motivate people of influence. Top business executives—and their counterparts in the leaders and homemakers among women—are in a position to pick and choose. In fact, they must do so. They are not people with idle time, content to accept any mental stimuli, however slight, rather than none at all. They are people

March 9, 1966

A1325

ber of applicants. By the end of 1965-66, ORT will enroll over 50,000 students.

4. ORT must meet tremendous pressures in France, where a torrential immigration—the largest Jewish population shift since World War II—has posed grave problems for the new refugees. Israel, too, has great and increasing need for ORT-trained workers.

5. The standard ORT school is a vocational high school, with a 3- to 4-year curriculum in which an academic high school education is given along with technical training in the most advanced industrial trades. ORT also conducts special programs for those lacking the time or the requisite prior education to attend a 4-year day school. These programs include apprenticeship and preapprenticeship courses, refresher and adaptation courses, courses teaching rudimentary skills that will enable the student to get a beginning industrial job, and courses to increase the skills and income of those already employed in a trade.

6. ORT gives training in more than 70 modern industrial skills. The trades taught vary according to the needs of the particular area's economy. Thus, ORT students get the greatest opportunity for employment.

7. ORT helps to build underdeveloped economies and to man the industries of free countries striving to keep pace with technological advances. Acknowledging this help, the U.N. and some 22 countries (including the United States), most of which have ORT schools within their borders, have given ORT sizable and repeated grants.

8. Women's American ORT, the American women's branch of the World ORT Union, is the largest World ORT Union affiliate, and the second largest single source of financial support to ORT. It now has 66,000 members in nearly 500 chapters located in all major American cities.

9. The ORT program is financed by the World ORT Union and affiliates; by the Joint Distribution Committee, a member agency of the United Jewish Appeal, and by governments, foundations, etc., throughout the world. Women's American ORT supports the program through its membership dues.

### Pittsburgh Area Puts Its Brand on Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps in just 5 brief years has been an outstanding success. Never before in history have a nation's young people proved themselves so worthy on such a grand scale as they have in the Peace Corps, carrying on selfless, humanitarian work in remote sections of the world.

An article in the February 27 issue of the Pittsburgh Press recounts the achievements of some of the Peace Corpsmen who have returned to the United States and to the Pittsburgh area. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIG ADVENTURE 5 YEARS OLD

(By Sam Spatter)

Five years ago this Tuesday, thousands of young Americans, many from this area, rekindled the American adventure spirit they

felt the Nation had lost when the West was won.

On March 1, 1961, the Peace Corps was born.

The thousands who answered the call were idealistic, adventurous Americans who felt they could be part of the "New Frontier."

FOLLOWED J.F.K.

Behind their youthful, energetic President—John F. Kennedy—they were ready to bring American culture, know-how and freedom to the undeveloped and emerging nations of the world.

One of the first to join was Rodgers Stewart, son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard B. Stewart of 513 Emerson Street, East Liberty. Rodgers, now a student at Duquesne University, was Pennsylvania's first Peace Corps volunteer to complete his service abroad. He worked in Tanzania (Dar-es-Salaam) as a surveyor.

Robert Williams, urban extension worker with the Hazelwood-Glenwood Citizens Renewal Council, was another early joiner. He enlisted in Washington where he was a student at Georgetown University School of Foreign Service.

After training, Bob and his coworkers went to the Dominican Republic.

LESS REDTAPE

There he worked in the community organization field—a prelude to his current work. Sometimes Bob wishes he were back because there seemed to be fewer agencies to work through before getting things done.

"All we needed was the Central Government's approval and we got our wish. But in Hazelwood, it seems we have countless agencies to go through to get action on any of our requests," he said.

Don and Suzanne Bryant of Frankfort Springs, near Hookstown, found their 2 years in the corps an opportunity to help others while helping themselves.

SERVED IN PERU

Don, 29, a former cabinetmaker from Wheeling, is now a counselor at the Youth Forestry Camp at Raccoon State Park. His wife, Suzanne, 28, is a former nurse from Wooster, Ohio.

They joined the Peace Corps in September 1963, and worked in Peru until last year.

The young couple ran a model farm for the Maryknoll Fathers, showing Indians how to raise stock and breed cattle besides planting crops. Mrs. Bryant put her medical knowledge to good use by training a native to administer first aid. This was the only medical service available in the community.

Just returned from Africa is Ann DeSimone, 24, of 600 Ravencrest Road, Ohio Township.

TWO YEARS IN NIGERIA

Miss DeSimone, 24, spent 2 years in Nigeria teaching art and English. She signed up after receiving her degree in art education from Penn State in 1963.

Miss DeSimone said she found persons from other nations engaged in work similar to that of the Peace Corps.

"Many British youth are in Africa, working at much lower salaries than we receive (\$75 a month) to help the natives. And there are people from other nations under contract to the Government, doing the work many of our Peace Corps people are doing," she said.

Miss DeSimone returned home several weeks ago, although she left the Peace Corps in August 1965. Before arriving in the United States she toured Europe and the Middle East.

WHAT THEY'RE DOING

Some 17,000 volunteers have served or are serving in the Peace Corps.

A study of the first 5,000 returnees showed that 39 percent have continued their education; 15 percent work for some branch of

Government; 15 percent teach in the United States or abroad; 8 percent work with a social service agency; 11 percent are in business or industry; 12 percent are unemployed.

In Pittsburgh, the colleges, business schools, and nursing schools have sent 162 people into the Corps as of February 1.

Pitt leads with 69, followed by Duquesne with 39, and Carnegie Tech with 29. Others are Chatham, 13; Mount Mercy, 5; Montefiore Hospital and Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 2 each; and Point Park, Robert Morris, and Presbyterian-University Hospital, 1 each.

What is the future of the Peace Corps?

Bob Williams feels that some of its appeal has been taken over by other movements, such as civil rights, Job Corps, VISTA, and other action-oriented groups.

"We had a feeling we were part of our Nation's foreign policy and that we actually stood in the forefront of it," he said.

Only one item is holding the Bryant family from going back, Mrs. Bryant said.

"We want to start our own family," she explained.

### They Fight Battles, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 8, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune points out that most of the reporting on the war in Vietnam concentrates on skirmishes and very limited military engagements, but that full scale battles are also fought there.

This editorial is an important reminder and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

THEY FIGHT BATTLES, TOO

Much of the reporting of the Vietnamese war has tended to emphasize the little skirmish, the role of the individual soldier or the platoon. Many of the headlines have been preempted by air raids over North Vietnam. Opponents of the American role in southeast Asia talk as if that role consisted of killing women and children while showering napalm on peaceful villages. But they fight battles in Vietnam, too.

This was illustrated by the account of the success achieved by the Marines and the South Vietnamese troops against a North Vietnamese regiment near Quang Nai. Apparently, half the regiment were casualties and the rest, in the words of a Marine officer, "just survivors." And General Westmoreland confirmed the picture of real battles and real victories when, almost casually, he referred to four regular Vietcong battalions destroyed in the last few days.

This is an impressive toll. It has been customary to state Vietcong losses in terms of "body count"—a grisly method which was necessitated in part by the guerrilla nature of much of the fighting—enemy units dissolving into the jungle to reform—and in part by public skepticism over communiques that might tell of routed enemies but were far from precise about what the rout actually meant.

But in plain fact, it is possible to win victories, even over guerrillas, and fairly crushing ones at that. No matter how loose a military organization may be, no matter to what extent it normally lives off the country, once it gets past the snipe-and-run

stage, it must have bases, it must have assembly areas, it must have some kind of command and supply organization. The Vietcong are mustered into units, and those units can be smashed, uprooted from their usual sources of supply, cut off from the higher command. When that happens, although there may be many survivors, they are not effective—until they can regroup, be brought up to strength and given new leadership. And if they are hustled enough, such a reorganization may not be possible.

It is this kind of defeat that the Vietcong seems to have been suffering, at an accelerating rate, in the past few months. And it is this kind of defeat that can enable the vital political and social role of pacification to be undertaken with a chance of success. Victories can be won in Vietnam—and they are being won now, a few Senators to the contrary notwithstanding.

## War on Poverty No Federal Handout

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration's war on poverty is not a Federal handout, but a helping hand. It is not a massive Federal dole, but a tremendous challenge.

It is a program designed to help the poor learn how to help themselves. The main thrust of its emphasis is upon education.

One of the biggest tasks confronting those of us who support the war on poverty is getting the story of its growing successes to the American people. The news media of this country can play a vitally important role in this effort. I am pleased to note an increasing number of great American newspapers devoting more space to the war on poverty. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article entitled "Attack on Poverty Centered on Education," which appeared in the January 12, 1966, edition of the New York Times. I include it in the RECORD.

ATTACK ON POVERTY CENTERED ON EDUCATION—\$2 BILLION SET ASIDE BY UNITED STATES TO HELP THE POOR LEARN BETTER

(By Nan Robertson)

WASHINGTON.—"Why is America suddenly so concerned—to the extent of more than \$2 billion—about improving the education of children of the poor? This money cannot fatten a father's paycheck. It will not put bread on tonight's table."

Thus begins "Education: An Answer to Poverty," a Government booklet that will go out soon to thousands of communities and schools, offering ideas old and new on the hows and whys of teaching the poor.

It suggests what many Americans are beginning to feel keenly and statistics support:

That to be ignorant is to be poor.

That hard-core poverty, like established wealth, is inherited—90 percent of the poor are born to impoverished parents.

That the best way to break the "chain of dependence" on the dole that has linked and debased generations of poor Americans is to educate them.

More than \$2 billion is available this year under such laws as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to help poor children learn better. Still more public money is being offered to communities for adult education.

When Lyndon Johnson chose the foundation for his Great Society he said, "We begin with learning." This is the vital ingredient in the attack on poverty directed by Sargent Shriver. At no time in our history, under no President, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has there been such an emphasis on education to enable the poor to help themselves escape from their lot.

Education is woven into most of the 11 poverty programs and subprograms funded and administered by Mr. Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity and 5 others run by such Government departments as Labor, Education, and Agriculture with OEO money.

It is easy to see why this is so when one considers the problem—and possible solutions—of ever-swelling welfare rolls across the country. Each month almost everywhere in America, more people go on the dole than go off. Last year, New York City's Welfare Department closed 100,000 cases that had become self-sustaining, but 100,000 others came in, their places.

### SUCCESS IN CHICAGO

There have been few exceptions to this discouraging pattern. One such—the most striking—is Chicago.

Chicago's welfare rolls have shrunk 9 percent since 1962. New York's expanded 48 percent in the same period. Officials in Chicago say the percentage of people on public assistance there has gone down mostly because all eligible welfare recipients were assigned to literacy and vocational courses run by the board of education.

Raymond Hilliard, commissioner of public welfare for Cook County, is convinced because of this record that education is the best answer to helping the poor help themselves. New York has no such educational requirement for its welfare recipients.

The educational attack on poverty under Mr. Shriver begins below kindergarten and goes all the way through the learning and earning years. About the only programs without a built-in educational feature are those for the old and infirm.

The most successful and the biggest crash Federal program was last summer's Project Headstart, which reached below school age to 560,000 poor children at 1,400 centers in 2,500 communities. The point was to reach them as early as possible, before they were swallowed up into a traditional school system for which they were pitifully unprepared—a system in which increasing inadequacy and frustration would lead to dropping out.

Children who had never seen a book or a doctor, who could not identify colors or grasp the idea of short and long, were instructed in small groups, given medical care and nutritious food. Tens of thousands of Headstart parents became involved in school activities for the first time in their lives, as teachers' aids or participants in parent-teacher association meetings.

Tragically, the crucial followthrough for these children into the school year often did not materialize. The reasons were a lack of funds, facilities, staffs, or local school boards with the drive and imagination to carry on.

Headstart is part of the community action program, the Big Bertha of the attack on poverty. CAP receives 45 percent of the \$1.5 billion allotted to Mr. Shriver's agency this year. The initiative and the administration come from local private and public bodies banded together to find new ways to help the poor. The money comes direct

from Washington after the community provides feasible plans giving promise of progress toward the elimination of poverty.

In fiscal 1965, the Office of Economic Opportunity gave \$118,879,000 to 239 communities for community action programs that got underway immediately. Half the money went toward education programs.

That sum did not include funds released for consumer education, birth control information, or planning for projects that would turn out to be primarily educational.

All but 30 of the 239 communities had educational programs in their master plans.

### TEST COMES LATER

A teenage and smaller equivalent of Headstart, with a similarly catchy title, is Project Upward Bound. This plucked more than 2,000 poor, bright youths who were simply not responding to traditional high school teaching out of their environments and onto 18 college campuses this summer. These potential dropouts were subjected to strenuous academic instruction.

Many of them, according to Upward Bound officials, "caught fire." Some were able to pass college entrance examinations they had failed before. Others returned for a year or more of high school, where their new zeal to learn and get into college may be severely tested.

Remedial education, literacy courses, the emphasis on reading and mathematics to get and keep better jobs and be participating citizens, are part of most of the adult programs in the fight against poverty.

It is true of the Job Corps, in which 17,400 girls and boys from 16 to 21 years old are now enrolled. Out of school and out of work, they have been summoned from their homes to live in more than 80 conservation camps and urban centers.

About 40 percent are Negro, 50 percent are white farm youth, and the rest Mexican-Americans, Indians, or Puerto Ricans.

More than half their time is spent in education, but not the kind that has made them alienated and hostile—and dropouts.

### REASON FOR DROPPING OUT

Dr. David Gottlieb, a young Job Corps psychologist, writer on teenage behavior, and himself a high school dropout gone right, says the "primary reason a poor kid drops out is that he sees no relation between what's going on in the classroom and his own expectations for the future."

A corpsman explained: "I didn't like math before and I don't now, but the important thing is you have to know it to get through the world. That's what I didn't know before and that's why I didn't work at it. If you don't have education, you can't get nowhere."

That is what President Johnson and Sargent Shriver believe, and that is the heart of this poverty program.

## Addison-Wesley, Leader in Educational Revolution

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding business firms in Massachusetts is the Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., of Reading which has been an imaginative leader in the field of publishing textbooks. Since its founding in 1942 as a distributor of physics books, the

A1324

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 9, 1966

Judson, of Princeton's Geology Department; Prof. Charles McCracken, of Newark State College, program coordinator; and Robert F. Engs, assistant to the director.

Classes are of the seminar type where students are invited to express their own thoughts and wonder, analyze their own problems, and seek self-expression and objectivity. They include English, science, art, social studies, and photography. Nor is the social atmosphere forgotten: besides the exposure to the beauties of the college campus, the boys have an opportunity to live in comradeship in special dormitories, to exchange ideas freely with the faculty in informal gatherings, and to avail themselves of the services of a staff psychologist. The session begins with a buffet dinner for students and parents on registration day and concludes with the presentation of a certificate of completion at a stag roast beef dinner. There is also a parents day midway during the program. It is significant that in the classes of about 40 16-year-olds there have been no drop-outs.

No less important is the second phase of the program as boys are returned to homes and classes. During this time the staff, high school teachers, and counselors continue to work with students through their year of college decision. The university held a reunion 8 weeks after the last session during which time the boys of the previous year recounted their summer experiences in activities ranging from the National Science Foundation Institute at Bucknell University, Outward Bound School on Hurricane Island, Maine, and the U.S. Naval Reserve summer training program. As one teacher put it:

The boys seemed to feel that they have accomplished quite a bit. Those of us who had worked with them had a paternal feeling and would want to keep in touch and continue to help if possible.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH  
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of ALBERT THOMAS, the House and the people of the United States have lost an old and dear friend. His death leaves a void in the affairs of this Nation and in the hearts of his countrymen that can never be filled.

Although I did not share the long association with Mr. THOMAS that many of my colleagues enjoyed, I felt a deep sense of deprivation and sorrow when I learned of his death. On several occasions I sought his wise counsel and sage advice. He was a warm and sincere person, and I valued his friendship.

We shall long remember ALBERT THOMAS for what he was—a knowledgeable and dedicated legislator, an out-

standing citizen and, above all else to us, a kind and understanding friend.

He was a man of great courage and endurance. Under stress and pain, he carried on unflinchingly until the Maker called him to his eternal rest.

We in the Congress shall miss him greatly for he was indeed one of our true leaders.

I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to his widow and daughters.

Pursuit of Peace UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in our pursuit of peace "new emphasis must be placed on nonmilitary means at our command," the Newark Evening News says in a recent editorial.

This outstanding evening newspaper in my district believes this administration has acted right in checking, by controlled military means, the enemy's aggression while "continuing to develop the ability of friendly peoples to advance politically, economically and socially."

Since this editorial deals with a subject of vital concern to us all, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 3, 1966]

PURSUIT OF PEACE

The preponderant vote in House and Senate authorizing an additional \$4.8 billion for military needs in Vietnam was a vote to support the Nation's fighting men—nothing more, nothing less.

Control of parliamentary procedure enabled the Johnson administration to restrict voting to this one issue, and thereby leave Senators MORSE and GRUENING isolated if not silenced. Dissent in the House was commensurately small, with only four votes standing against the tide.

Reservations nonetheless remain—no over whether the men in Vietnam rate every possible support, but over the course the war may now take. In the end even Senator FULBRIGHT had to concede a military appropriations measure was not the means to amend the Nation's foreign policy.

Whether or not Mr. FULBRIGHT's unrealistic proposals gather support, they reflect a growing desire—shared by President Johnson and Secretary Rusk—for a peaceful solution to Vietnam. To date the means tried have been fruitless. Whether Mr. FULBRIGHT's suggestions would fare any better is doubtful.

Would, for example, an enemy who has rejected the neutralization of South Vietnam, as proposed by Secretary Rusk, be inclined to welcome the neutralization of all southeast Asia, as proposed by Senator FULBRIGHT?

Would the ring of bases around Red China suggested by the Senator convince Peiping of the futility of trying to advance communism by subversion, terror and so-called wars of national liberation? Or would such bases merely stand as symbols of 19th century militarism while the territory all around them fell to Communist encroachment?

Hope for a reliably negotiated peace lies in the direction of checking, by controlled military means, the adversary's ability to subvert by force and, at the same time, continuing to develop the ability of friendly peoples to advance politically, economically and socially.

The overwhelming military authorization vote was a clear expression of support for our troops, not necessarily a mandate to enlarge the war. The emphasis must remain on the pursuit of peace by the many non-military means at our command.

ORT in Brief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, today is ORT Day, the annual commemoration of the good works being performed by the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training throughout the world. In Massachusetts, Gov. John A. Volpe has issued a proclamation regarding the work of ORT and a celebration will be held today in New England Life Hall in Boston.

ORT is the recognized agency for the Jewish people in the field of vocational training. It now operates 600 training units in 22 countries around the world serving more than 50,000 students.

There is no doubt that the training of men and women in useful vocations is one of the important keys to individual independence, self-reliance and self-help. Privately financed, privately run, ORT is an outstanding example of what our voluntary agencies can do to assist in the development and training of people all over the world. I think we should extend our thanks to ORT today for a job well done and our hope that they will continue their excellent work in the years ahead.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a brief description and summary of the work of the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training.

ORT IN BRIEF

1. ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training) is a program for rebuilding lives through vocational education. The recognized vocational training agency for the Jewish people, ORT's central creed is that man is bested aided by being helped to become independent, self-supporting, and self-respecting.

2. ORT is the world's largest nongovernmental vocational training agency. Its students include the poverty-stricken inhabitants of underdeveloped countries, refugees and immigrants seeking a new life, and youngsters trying to build secure futures.

3. ORT operates in 22 countries on 5 continents. In 1964, ORT students enrolled in over 600 training units. In Europe, some 13,394; in Israel, 20,821; in North Africa, 3,751; in Iran, 2,223. Other ORT schools are in New York, South America, South Africa, and India. The number of ORT students has doubled in the past 5 years, and ORT has been working unceasingly to grow still further to admit the steadily increasing num-



March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1323

studying, weighing—sometimes cautiously or set, penetrating eyes—always watching, critically, often dimmed and moistened by inexpressible fellow feeling.

The strength of this head is emphasized by remarkable ears. This man listens, and listens—never satisfied that all has been said, all counsel expressed, all possibilities and consequences voiced. Beyond all else his face will never shed the painful cost of that remorseless choice which involves the lives of countrymen.

I have chosen to follow the portrait style which prevailed 24 centuries ago when Plato said, "Let the philosophers be kings and the kings philosophers." To his pupil, Aristotle, politics was that which "comprehends the ends of all other sciences and is therefore the true good of mankind."

In the President's face lies mirrored something of the anguish of a time and place in history. Familiar with man's inhumanity to man and a community's reluctance to permit fundamental change, this man moved a nation across a new political frontier toward more complete freedom for all men.

Mr. President, you were not an easy man to sculpt. Nor, I know, was it easy for you to even briefly sit for so static a venture. I will long recall your impatient question, "How long will this take, I have so much I must do?"

Mr. President, I will always treasure this opportunity to express my admiration and respect for one to whom public service is the highest order of human endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, the inscription on the tablet affixed to the base of a bronze sculpture of President Johnson reads:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Freedom at home was never more widely shared nor aggression abroad more wisely resisted than under his leadership of the Nation.

Freedom House, 1966.

## Illinois Audubon Society

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Audubon Society is an alert and public-spirited organization, many of whose members and whose president Mr. Raymond Mostek, live in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois. They have recently written to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and were kind enough to send a copy of the letter to me. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

Please enter our organization as opposed to bills that would seek to invade the San Geronimo wilderness with a commercial intrusion, such as a ski center, as now vociferously suggested by some advocates of wilderness destruction in the California area.

Our organization, like many another, worked long and hard to educate the people of the Middle West to the values of a true wilderness philosophy. We feel strongly that the small areas now in wilderness and primitive state should remain that way for posterity to enjoy.

Many of our members enjoy the wilderness firsthand. Others enjoy them through films and color slides shown by their friends

and professional photographers. We sponsor wildlife films to help educate city-bred people to the values of wilderness.

We are appalled that a few months after the wilderness bill was made into law, some commercial groups now seek to destroy it by piecemeal amendments and changes. California, with its huge population growing hourly, desperately needs these wild areas. San Geronimo was a key rallying point during discussions on the floor of the House during debate over the national wilderness bill. The attempt to exempt it at that time was soundly beaten. It should be again.

We believe that San Geronimo is the Alamo of the Wilderness Act. We do not intend to let it fall to commercial interest. Instead, it will be a rallying point for those who wish to preserve some of the great values of our primitive areas.

## No Mean Accomplishment

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the failures connected with the Job Corps, part of the Johnson administration's war on poverty. Like anything new and untried, the war on poverty has suffered from birth pains. It has had its problems in getting off the ground. The Job Corps has not been spared from criticism, some of it just and much of it unjust and overly exaggerated.

In the January 19, 1966, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, there appeared an editorial entitled "No Mean Accomplishment." It deals with the Job Corps. It is a good example of the objective journalism for which the Monitor has long been known. It does not attempt to whitewash problems connected with this program, but it honestly reports on the growing successes being compiled by the Job Corps, which has only been in operation a few short months. I commend "No Mean Accomplishment" to my colleagues, and under unanimous consent make it part of the RECORD at this point.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,  
Jan. 19, 1966]

## NO MEAN ACCOMPLISHMENT

The Job Corps has become one of the more controversial of President Johnson's anti-poverty programs. In 1 year's time approximately 75 centers were set up around the Nation. Into these came the victims of economic and spiritual poverty—the products of broken homes, slum living, and discrimination.

Given the speed with which the program was put together, the necessity to experiment in the absence of blueprints for such an undertaking, and the unpromising material with which the administrators had to work, we can readily understand the reaction of E. Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, when asked about the violence which took place at several of the camps. He said he was "concerned but not surprised or dismayed."

Recently at the Charleston, W. Va., Job Corps Center for Women, there were reports

of prostitution, drunkenness, fights, thefts, and so on. As often happens, reports were apparently exaggerated. But given the location of the Charleston center in a hotel in a relatively poor downtown area, it is hardly surprising that some of the girls repeated the patterns which condemned them to failure in their home environment.

A recently announced Job Corps center in Maine's Poland Spring resort is a most encouraging development. Much more than in the case of the Charleston and other urban centers, it should provide the opportunity for young women to establish new, successful patterns of living.

The entire anti-poverty program will come under close congressional scrutiny during 1966. Senate Republican Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has already served notice that he will expose incompetence and mismanagement in the Job Corps.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond, admitting the "failures and shortcomings, frustrations, and acts of incompetence," nevertheless went on to state: "But nothing could be more inaccurate than the impression that the war on poverty is mostly chaff. The grain is beginning to grow."

The Government, the private concerns which administer the various Job Corps centers, and the educational institutions which serve in an advisory capacity need to take seriously the criticism leveled at the Job Corps. At the same time, the critics need to recognize that the corps is training slum-bred youths to adjust to normal social surroundings, to gain self-confidence, and to get and hold respectable jobs. This is no mean accomplishment.

## Princeton Cooperative School Program

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I take pride and pleasure in calling the attention of the House to the Princeton cooperative school program, now in its third year at Princeton University.

There is a line in Dante's "Divine Comedy" which says, "Great flame follows a tiny spark." I feel this is particularly applicable to the Princeton program because the program takes boys who have shown their teachers a spark of something but who do not show it consistently and tries to fan that spark to a steady glow.

Basic support from the program, which has as its general overall purpose the encouragement of qualified high school boys who are disadvantaged because of race or economic status or both to go on to college, came from the Rockefeller Foundation and additional funds have been received from the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, and Princeton University.

Unique features of the program are the boys' nominations on the basis of "teacher's hunches" that with special help and encouragement they may develop into all-round leaders, and that they are not taken out of their own schools but returned after an intensive 6 weeks' session. Final selection is made by the director of the program, Prof. Sheldon

A1330

related mental and physical health hazards is endless—new victory is demanded every year.

There can be no great love of country, nor firm loyalty to its institutions, in a human heart that beats above an always-empty stomach.

There can be no genuine economic growth future in a nation overpopulated with children whose bodies are thinned, eyes glazed, minds dulled by malnutrition. And even though there are—at least in the judgment of those not their parents—too many of them, these children are in our world, now, and the world must, as Pope Paul pleaded, find them a place at the table. Population control cannot be retroactive.

We can and we shall use our food, or productive resources, and our know-how to help the farm families and the agribusiness structures in those developing nations where production is now losing the race with need.

But our food can only support—not substitute for—their own efforts.

A successful war against hunger and want has its roots in research and education. Unless our food supports research and education aimed at making the agricultures of developing Nations grow and support their total economic development, history will rule it wasted.

The Indian boy who eats American wheat today still must eat 10 years from now—and provide food, at that time, for his own children.

Over a span of a hundred years, agricultural research has asked many questions, answered many, and in the process has raised more questions demanding more answers, because that is the inevitable—and usually desirable—result of the research cycle. Now these questions must be asked, and answered, in increasing volume around the world if it is to adequately feed itself—asked and answered not only by the scholars and scientists of agriculture, but of the entire research and education structure of our society.

During the past quarter hour I have described the Department of Agriculture as an agency of many missions.

We are a production instrument, an economic innovator and stabilizer, a custodian of publicly owned natural resources and a cooperative planner in those privately owned.

We are a teacher, a communications media, a regulatory system, a welfare unit, a rural development promoter, an arm of foreign policy implementation.

But we are not an island. We are a part of the main. And in relationship to every area of science and education we are dependent—and seek to be dependable.

That's exactly why we asked Dr. Seitz and the National Academy of Science to help us bring outstanding representatives of the science community to the same place at the same time.

And that's why, as I enter and leave the Administration Building of the Department of Agriculture each day, I see exhibits in the patio not only of research covering food and fiber, but exhibits of the Corps of Engineers related to buildings that will some day be constructed on the moon, and exhibits of the Bureau of Ships related to making submarines of glass.

Within USDA itself the competition for men and women and dollars in the various units of research is rugged, and fixing priorities in assignments and objectives isn't easy. Reconciliation, cooperation, coordination—meshing the parts to end up with a meaningful whole—demand much of each of us at the Department's policymaking level.

This intradepartment situation is applicable to the entire range of Government-sponsored research and development. It is mandatory, in the public interest, that we constantly develop new bases for coordination of research and the pooling of knowledge among Federal agencies and, hopefully,

among other Government and private agencies as well.

If this symposium achieves nothing more than a demonstration of the Department of Agriculture's appreciation for the strength that lies in the creation of broadened understanding, and the promotion of concerted endeavor, we shall consider it most worthwhile.

We are anxious to earn, and to hold, full partnership in the basic and applied research community so that we may contribute to it—receive from it—with the purpose of moving more quickly toward the goal all of us share; improving opportunities for all people, everywhere, to achieve maximum quality in every facet of their lives.

### Success Caps 6 Months Operations of Youth Job Information Center

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary aims of the Johnson administration's war on poverty is helping to bring together jobs and unemployed young people.

The Bridgeport, Conn., Telegram in its February 21 edition contained an interesting story about the success so far of the Youth Employment Information Center, designed primarily to help young people find jobs or continue their education. I commend it to my colleagues.

#### SUCCESS CAPS 6 MONTHS OPERATIONS OF YOUTH JOB INFORMATION CENTER

The Youth Employment Information Center of 1378 Stratford Avenue, which is designed primarily to help young people find jobs or continue their education, has been successful in its first 6 months of operation, according to an appraisal issued by the center.

#### OPENED LAST JULY

The center, operated by the Chessmen Foundation, Inc., began its work July 1, 1965, financed by a \$29,680 Federal grant for this fiscal year. The grant was obtained under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Center expenses for the first 6 months were \$12,939, including \$10,547 for personnel, \$5 for travel, \$655 for rent, \$231 for supplies, \$1,284 for equipment and \$215 for other expenses, according to the center's appraisal.

Paul Mendes, center administrator, said the center's six full-time, salaried staff members earned a total of only \$10,547 during the first 6 months of operation "because this is part of the war on poverty and we felt the salaries should be low."

#### REFERS CLIENTS

The center does not find jobs for people or provide them with further education, but refers its clients to organizations that might be able to provide these services.

Of the 548 persons assisted by the center during its first 6 months of operation, 114 were referred to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 179 to the Connecticut State Employment Service and other similar services, 45 to testing centers, five to counseling agencies, 36 to organizations which provide scholarship and educational information. Other cases are pending.

The center tries to aid those seeking assistance by:

Obtaining information on application for job retraining and apprentice programs.

Discovering the availability of scholarship grants and loans.

Securing free tutoring service information.

Learning of youth fellowship and recreational programs.

Determining where orientation and guidance in domestic and educational affairs is available.

Contacting and advising dropouts on the advantage of continued schooling.

Securing current information on employment opportunities on Government studies, surveys, and other beneficial information.

A knowledge of pertinent laws pertaining to housing, employment, to promote better living standards among the underprivileged.

Most of those seeking assistance at the center are Negro and most are residents of the East End. Mr. Mendes said, however, that center services are available to all residents of the Bridgeport area.

He said persons in need of assistance learn of the center through word of mouth, from similar agencies in the area, and through direct contact with center staff members who are in the field daily.

Speaking of the center's early successes, an appraisal released by the center said:

"Since the inception of the Youth Employment Information Center as an informational service for the benefit of the community at large and its youth in particular, much has been accomplished and much is still to be gained.

#### "GOALS SECURED

"The goals that the \* \* \* center has set for itself have been secured for the most part. Although in some areas we have not accomplished as much as we would like, we feel that the importance of the project such as ours has been realized and finally accepted.

"Our task is a large one, but we have accepted it as being our obligation to the Bridgeport community.

"Our goals are many—helping young people, as completely as possible, to become trained self-supporting taxpaying citizens of our community and to live with their fellowman, to develop educational programs aimed at specific skills required for currently available jobs, and develop job opportunities, where there are needs for a variety of non-professional and technical skills."

#### A JOINT PROJECT

Recently, the center and the Bridgeport Board of Education joined in a work-study program. Youths involved in the program participate for 3 hours a day, 5 days a week. The program offers expanded counseling services and more direct supervision.

The program is called Bridgeport rehabilitation involving disadvantaged gaining employment stability (BRIDGES), Chessman Foundation, Inc. The committee working with the program includes Robert Ashkins, John Bruzas, E. P. Bullard IV, the Reverend Louis A. Deproffio, George Deeb, Joseph Dolan, Dr. Paul Lane, Saul Schine, Mrs. Philip Smith, Charles Tisdale, Mrs. Sylvia Trachtenberg, Fred Robinson, Mr. Mendes, and Aubyn Lewis.

Center staff members, beside Mr. Mendes, include Aubyn Lewis, youth adviser; Fred Robinson, work-study coordinator; Richard Johnson, coordinator-interviewer; Mrs. Marie Lee, coordinator-interviewer; and Darcy Sanz, clerk.

### Some Rather Startling Figures

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, citing A1 Smith's recommendation that we look at the record, Joseph Alsop has put together

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1329

**Address of Secretary of Agriculture  
Orville Freeman, at Symposium on Research  
in Agriculture, at Warrenton,  
Va.**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. CLAIR CALLAN**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman during a symposium on research in agriculture, at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., Thursday, February 24, 1966:

When a scientist named Justus von Liebig was just 14 years old, he blew the roof off a drugstore in Heppenheim, Germany.

This explosion, the result of the boy's secret experiments with fulminate of mercury, discouraged the druggist from keeping him on as an apprentice. But being fired didn't destroy young von Liebig's interest in chemistry and plantlife. He continued his studies, his experiments.

They led him to the discovery of phosphate and potash in the ashes of burned plants, and ammonia in their vapors. He put all three into barren ground, and made it a wonder of fertility.

"There will be a time," he said, "when the fields will be fed with substances produced by chemical industries, and containing the substances indispensable for plants."

History has treated few prophets more kindly.

Justus von Liebig was born in 1803, and when he died at the age of 70, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was only 11 years old—but already deeply involved in basic and applied research.

I know of no legend which claims USDA researchers began by blowing the roof off a grocery store, a dairy barn, a grain bin, or packing plant.

They have, however, triggered many of the explosions which mark revolutionary changes in the physical environment, the food and fiber production and utilization patterns, and the social and economic aspects of American life.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss with leaders of the science community the role of research in the missions of the Department of Agriculture—but first:

Let me express my very deep gratitude to Dr. Seitz and the National Academy of Science for joining the Department in sponsoring this symposium on research in agriculture, and thank all of you for your participation.

The Department of Agriculture and its research services are honored by your presence, inspired by your interest, enriched by your cooperation.

I am not, as you know, a scientist—unless it can be held that practical politics and government administration hold a place on the fringe, if not actually in the field, of science.

I can measure the B.t.u.'s of a public issue without a thermometer, but I cannot regulate the flame of a bunsen burner with any degree of skill.

I can analyze the generation of turmoil in a political party convention far better than that resulting from combinations of chemicals in a test tube.

I can read between the lines of a Gallup poll, but not between specimens under a microscope.

And I react more quickly to the theory of votability than to the theory of relativity.

So allow me, then, to paraphrase Voltaire:

I may not fully understand how you do what you do, but I shall always be grateful for the fact you do it—and do it well.

For without research the politician, the public official, would function constantly in a vacuum—because it is research that both asks and answers the questions related to public policy and program determinations.

Does it need doing? Can it be done? If it can be accomplished in a variety of ways, which method should have priority? How can it be kept in balance with other policies and programs? What type of administrative structure will be required? How is it related to the various States, to other agencies of Federal Government, to private industries and institutions? What will happen as a result of the action or actions taken?

I have found these questions and the search for answers applicable across the vast range of the Department of Agriculture's operations—whether it be in finding, as USDA did, a faster and more economical method of producing penicillin, or—

Encouraging an environmental adjustment that will solve, in major degree, the population pressures of cities and the underutilization of both natural and people resources along the countryside;

Encouraging, and maintaining, abundant production of food and fiber while moving toward the economic goals of parity of income opportunity for farm families and fair prices for consumers;

Protecting food purity and quality, developing new products and new and better distribution, marketing, and processing systems;

Cooperating in the public welfare field with direct distribution of foods to needy families, participation in school milk and lunch programs, and food stamps;

Protecting, developing, and expanding the multiple-use of natural resources on public and private lands, and helping the food-deficit nations of the free world take the lead in the war of liberation from hunger and malnutrition through the improvement of their own agricultural production plants.

I would hesitate, without strong and versatile research arms, to attempt to carry out these and other missions that the people, the Congress, and the President have assigned—and will continue assigning—to the Department of Agriculture.

As I pointed out earlier, the Department of Agriculture was engaged in research long before any of us was born—and for 99 years before I became its Secretary. Consequently, I can point to its research performance with pride without being self-serving.

The first major support provided to research by government was in the field of agriculture. And as recently as 1940, when the Federal Government began broadening its research and development support to a total of \$74 million, agriculture research received two-fifths of the outlay.

A quarter of a century later, in fiscal 1965, Federal support for agricultural research alone exceeded the entire 1940 expenditure—amounting to \$231 million. But instead of two-fifths of the total research and development budget, Agriculture has 1.5 percent of it. By that time Defense was being awarded \$7 billion; NASA, \$4.9 billion; the Atomic Energy Commission, \$1.5 billion; and HEW, \$813 million.

I do not cite those figures to call attention to the fact Agriculture's share of research and development appropriations has declined in relationship to the total Federal expenditure—but rather to emphasize that, as a pioneer in the field, Agriculture perhaps deserves some credit for creating a favorable climate for expanded governmental interest and investment in research. In

other words, agricultural research—since 1862—had been demonstrating to the people and the Congress they were getting something for their research money.

Our Government has not only used the Department of Agriculture as a trailblazer in research, but in tying research to education through the land-grant colleges, and then carrying knowledge to the rural community through extension services, thus providing, in fact, a working model for the transition of science into technology.

Out of this combination of basic and applied research, of education and extension, has come in substantial measure the greatest food and fiber production plant the world has ever known—great in the skills and judgments of its operators—great in the volume and quality of its output—great in its potential for perpetuating the era of abundance.

American agricultural development is, indeed, one of the miracles of this century.

It was when we freed more and more people from the task of producing food that we made our human resources increasingly available for an ever-widening range of activity in industry, commerce, education, science, and culture.

It was when we began making an adequate supply of food an ever-decreasing drain on family incomes that Americans could increase their investments in living well beyond buying their daily bread.

Look at what has happened:

Today one farm worker provides food and fiber for 35 other persons. A century ago he met the needs of just 5 others, and as recently as 1950 only 15.

In 1950 American families were spending about 25 percent of their take-home incomes for food. A decade later it was 20 percent. In 1965 it was an all-time low of 18.5 percent. Continued advances in production and marketing efficiencies, and in consumer earnings, are expected to bring further cuts in family food outlays—to about 17 percent of take-home pay in 1970, 15 or 16 percent in 1975.

Meanwhile, average realized net income per farm reached a record high in 1965 and our farm families are well on their way to parity of income opportunity with their urban neighbors—a development which, in turn, improves the tone of the total economy.

Important as it is internally, this production miracle is even more vital this year—and in the years ahead—as an export item while the world accelerates mobilization for an all-out war on malnutrition, hunger—even famine—in its widespread food-deficit sectors.

We have the knowledge accumulated through research and its application, we have the experience in grassroots educational programs, and we have the food—all the weapons essential for leadership in helping less developed nations help themselves achieve the ability to grow—and to buy—enough food for their families.

This is a task that has captured the hearts and the imaginations of our people. It was blueprinted by President Johnson in his inspiring—yet studied and realistic—food-for-freedom message to the Congress. And now legislation in support of the food-for-freedom program is being hammered out by the committees of Congress.

A few weeks ago I visited the fighting front—and the farm front—of South Vietnam. I saw efforts to protect freedom and to produce food, going on side by side. Agriculture is the key to freedom's victory in Vietnam. Fertilizer is just as important as bullets in the winning of that war.

We must fight in Vietnam. And we shall fight until its people have the right to determine in their own way the type of government under which they shall work and live. Yet, military wars come to an end. The battle against malnutrition, hunger and

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1331

some startling statistics on the war in Vietnam and has made some very cogent comments about them.

Mr. Alsop's article appeared in the March 9, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

## SOME RATHER STARTLING FIGURES

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Some pretty peculiar reporting from Vietnam plus a lot of flabby thinking here in Washington have combined to produce a mood of defeatism in many quarters in this city. Hence it is high time to have the look at the record that Al Smith always used to recommend.

First, a short preface is needed. At Honolulu, General Westmoreland told President Johnson that he could not expect to see the full effects of his initial troop commitment of 200,000 men until the end of March at the earliest. For logistical and other reasons, there is a long lag between an outfit's assignment to Vietnam and that outfit's maximum impact on the enemy.

If all goes well, therefore, the figures that tell what has been accomplished since the new year somewhat underrepresent what can be accomplished later. None the less, if you cumulate all the announcements of General Westmoreland's headquarters—of a Vietcong battalion put out of action here, and a few hundred of the enemy killed there, and some prisoners taken in another place—you get rather startling results.

Briefly, between the new year and the end of the first week of March, the body count of enemy dead abandoned on the field of battle totaled 7,615. In the same period, American and allied troops took 1,143 enemy prisoners of war. And more than 1,500 of the enemy also defected on the battlefield, to be added to the prisoner-of-war total.

There are several things to be said about these figures. To begin with, they reveal a truly astonishing transformation of the war. Hardly more than 18 months ago, Vietcong and North Vietnamese battlefield discipline was still so excellent that a single abandoned corpse, or just one defector or one prisoner, was a genuine cause for celebration. To those who saw the war at that time, the present results are hardly credible.

A persistent attack on the credibility of these results is indeed one of the forms that the above-mentioned peculiar reporting frequently takes. It is true, of course, that any body count made in running combat is likely to contain some duplication. A reasonable margin of error is 10 to 20 percent.

But unless you assume that all the American officers in Vietnam are engaged in a vast conspiracy of mendacity, that is the outside margin. Any such error is certainly compensated, however, and compensated many times over, by the tally of the enemy who are killed but not counted. The old battlefield discipline still holds to the extent that the Vietcong and North Vietnamese always carry away their dead when they can. Thus, the body count can hardly include more than 60 percent or so of the enemy killed in action or by air attacks.

In addition, the enemy undoubtedly loses a rockbottom minimum of two men severely wounded for every man killed. When you work the figures, therefore, you find that the total enemy losses of all kinds, from January 1 through March 7, must be numbered quite literally in the tens of thousands. After ample allowance for the inclusion of wretched press-ganged porters among the casualties, it can therefore be seen that the enemy's regular and guerrilla forces have been getting a cruelly hard going-over.

In Asia, more than anywhere else in the world, the rule holds that nothing succeeds like success and nothing fails like failure. Thus, signs of trouble in the Vietcong rear

areas ought to accompany such Vietcong reverses as those now indicated. These signs are duly appearing on schedule.

The most important sign to date is an article recently published in Tien Phong, an official journal of the People's Revolutionary Party. As the article was then broadcast on the Vietcong clandestine radio, it was in fact intended as general guidance for all cadres. It strongly confirmed earlier interrogation results, which have been denigrated by the same persons who denigrate our troops' successes in battle.

Detailed analysis of the Communist gobbledegook would require another long report. It is enough to say that the article warns of greater difficulties, confusion (meaning defeatism) among the cadres and forgetfulness of the precious experience of the time when the Vietcong was winning. It also reveals very bad trouble in the Vietcong villages, and real Vietcong alarm over the great refugee movement of "people with their paddy," which, of course, impairs the Vietcong food base.

In sum, we are by no means winning the war as yet. In order to counter the effects of the massive, additional invasion from North Vietnam, General Westmoreland will certainly need many more men. But the proof is clear that Westmoreland's strategy is already working better than anyone could have hoped. And if we are not winning, the Vietcong is at least beginning to be apprehensive about losing.

## Additional District and Circuit Judges

## SPEECH

OF

## HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, today I would like to note with my approval the imminent passage of a much needed and long awaited bill, S. 1666.

As a direct result of this bill the law's delay will be alleviated to a great extent, especially in my home State of California. At the present time, my State is divided into two judicial districts, northern and southern. Upon enactment of this bill two new districts will be created, an eastern district and a central district. The two districts presently in existence have been called upon to service the Nation's fastest growing State. It has been estimated that the population of California will increase by almost 50 percent between the 1960 census and 1970, from 15,717,204 to 22,075,000. It would be belaboring the obvious to say any more than that these two new districts are heartily welcomed by the people of my State.

All of us are familiar, at least to some extent, with the burgeoning caseload with which judges throughout this country are faced, and justice cannot be served where delay, or the threat of delay, can cause unfair settlement of honest claims.

We have only to consider the ordinary tort action to see in which manner delay can work injustice. A man is seriously injured in an accident and he is the sole supporter of his family. He cannot afford to wait a month for a settlement, much less a year or more. Consequently, in order to provide for his family, in at least some degree, he will settle with the defendant in the action for a sum far below that which he would be able to obtain from a jury trial.

The law's delay can also work for the defendant and against the plaintiff. Often the debtor will rely on the long delay between the filing of a complaint and the trial to force the creditor to settle for a smaller sum than that to which he is rightfully entitled. Examples such as this are too numerous to enumerate but they all revolve about one basic need—the need for more judges and more facilities.

We have today taken a giant step forward in providing truly equal justice and in making our courts accessible to the citizens of this Nation. Our Nation is a nation founded on laws and governed by laws and if the law forums become unavailable to the average citizen, then the concept upon which this Nation was founded becomes meaningless and words, not deeds, form our substance.

In these times of national and international unrest and uncertainty it is one of our primary duties to provide this country with a judiciary that is second to none and one that stands as an ideal toward which others may strive. Quantity certainly does not assure quality, and this is especially true in the administration of justice. We may, though, assert with certainty that whenever the number of judges is unequal to the task of administering, then quality must be compromised and any talk of justice must be as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

Today we are giving substance to our ideal of justice for all. Let us not neglect this ideal again.

## United States Warned of Financial Danger

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1966

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned at reports that an effort will be made in the near future to lift the historic interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. In my judgment, the most dangerous move that could be made would be to encourage further increases in the mounting cost of money.

The present statutory ceiling has served as a stabilizer in good times and bad, through peace and war, and throughout the current period of unprecedented economic growth.

The measure of concern being expressed by leading economists in the Nation over the prospect for higher in-

terest costs deserves the attention of every Member of Congress. The following article by David R. Francis of the Christian Science Monitor expresses a cross section of that concern.

UNITED STATES WARNED OF FINANCIAL DANGER  
(By David R. Francis)

NEW YORK.—The Nation stands on the brink of a financial crisis. This is the view of a number of prominent economists.

It should be understood these men aren't speaking of a severe market crash or depression. But they do see potential dislocations in Wall Street.

Says Robert V. Roosa, former under-secretary for monetary affairs: "Interest rates are getting dangerously high. They are creating strains within the whole financial structure.

"If they go much higher, they will be dangerously disruptive."

Comments Prof. Gabriel T. Kerekes, economist for a prominent brokerage house, Goodbody & Co.: "If the Federal Reserve System really tightens up money, a wave of bankruptcies would hit this country.

"It would include a few banks."

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, is also concerned. He urges the "Fed" not to over-restrain the growth in the money supply. He wants only "moderate restriction."

#### WARNING SIGNALS

The prominent economist points to the present "severe disruption" of the bond market and the decline in the stock market as warning signals.

Some of the Nation's biggest bankers are also known to be privately worried.

Most of the concern is related to the high demand for credit in the Nation's money market. It threatens to push interest rates even higher than present skyscraper rates.

One sign of the trend: A group of New York banks this week raised the interest on special "savings certificates" to 5 percent.

Mr. Roosa sees signs of what economists call the "Roosa paradox." Speculating on higher rates, lenders hold off on making loans, and borrowers rush to borrow ahead of need. This forces up interest rates more rapidly than a normal demand-supply relationship would justify.

On top of this, he notes, there is the anticipated sale of financial assets by the Federal Government. A goal of \$4.5 billion has been set for fiscal 1967.

#### ENORMOUS DEMAND

"This is a nice principle, to get these assets back to private hands—that is, fine when the private sector isn't all choked up."

At the moment the demand of corporations and municipalities on the money market are enormous. "Already excessive," Mr. Roosa held.

In such a situation, the central bank should not attempt to supply the commercial banks with sufficient funds to keep interest rates stable, Mr. Roosa says. Such an effort would be inflationary. Instead, the Government's actions should be aimed at cutting the demand for credit.

Last year, he noted, the Fed permitted commercial banks to expand their loans and investments by a gigantic \$27 billion.

"The way we have to keep the capital markets from being overburdened is to switch to the other side of the useful two-pronged fork—the fiscal side."

In other words, Mr. Roosa urged a boost in taxes.

He continued. "If you do rely only on the Fed, you will have a continuing (upward) erosion of interest rates that will have a disturbing impact."

#### APPREHENSION NOTED

"Right now the cause of these high rates is market apprehension about the Federal Government's action. It is not any additional restraint applied by the Federal Reserve System."

Mr. Roosa suggested that after a seasonal strain on the money market is over about mid-April, Congress pass a "Vietnam tax surcharge" giving the President power to raise both corporate and individual income taxes by 5 percent to 10 percent (in total revenues, not the tax rate).

"We ought to be thinking right now about the tax change that ought to be made by the middle of the year."

As proposed by Mr. Roosa, Congress would set the amount of the boost but leave the withholding rate and effective date up to the President. The President would exercise this discretion according to the economic situation.

The authority would expire after a year. "This is a real opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to fiscal flexibility," said Mr. Roosa.

As explained by Dr. Kerekes, the danger of financial disruption lies chiefly in the liquidity position of the Nation's banks. They have some 70 percent of their funds invested in loans today, as compared with 10 percent at the end of World War II. Their supply of easily sold Treasury bills and bonds is correspondingly limited.

More bank money is invested in mortgages. These are also less liquid.

On the supply side, banks are relying heavily on certificates of deposit. These may be less easy to sell as corporations find their own cash positions squeezed.

The result could be financial stress.

"I would rather see more inflation than see these financial dislocations," says Dr. Kerekes. "Price stability is desirable, but we have made a fetish out of it."

#### TAX BOOST OPPOSED

Dr. Kerekes disapproves of a tax increase. He believes tighter money would disrupt the money market.

And he reckons the benefits of economic boom—its creation of prosperity, its dampening of the civil-rights problem by providing jobs, its capital renewal—compensate for some inflation.

"If we throw too much burden on monetary policy, we could have a modern version of the cross of gold," he said. He referred to a famous slogan by William Jennings Bryan when he fought unsuccessfully for the Presidency against William McKinley, who upheld the gold standard.

Thus, although these economists agree on the danger of financial disruption, they diverge on the best tools to avert such dislocation.

### Medicare Crisis

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the position of the Republican minority has been one of constructive criticism not blind opposition.

We have made the point again and again that our party is not so much in opposition to some of the administration legislation as much as it is appalled by the carrying out of it.

We have repeatedly stated that it is a terrible waste of the taxpayer's money to pile new program on top of new program before the old ones have been able to get off to a satisfactory start.

A good example of this was the launching of the Job Corps part of the poverty war before the Vocational Education Act had a chance to get underway.

An excellent example of the lack of preparation and planning for a new program is the health insurance portion of the social security amendments. It was a well-known fact after the elections of 1964 that there would be a Medicare bill. The provisions of that bill passed last year do not take effect until July 1 of this year.

These has been better than a year and a half to organize to carry out the provisions of the bill and yet the Johnson administration is wholly unprepared to do this.

A good description of the lack of planning and preparation is found in the "Inside Report" column by Roland Evans and Robert Novak, published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1966. I commend this article, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues.

#### INSIDE REPORT: MEDICARE CRISIS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The Medicare program, passed last year amid much self-congratulation by Democratic politicians, is posing the Johnson administration with a full-sized election-year crisis beginning July 1.

That's when the program of medical benefits for the aged begins. This new Federal health care will markedly increase the demand among persons who previously couldn't afford it. But they will come face to face with drastic shortages in every field of medicine.

Even before Medicare, big-city hospitals are jammed close to capacity, and the national occupancy rate is close to 90 percent. Naturally, then, there won't be nearly enough beds to handle the demand from 19 million old people who become eligible for hospital care under the pride and joy of the Democratic Party's welfare program.

But that's only the beginning of the crisis. The Medicare law provides many different types of medical service for persons 65 or older. Every one of these services—including doctors' services—suffers from serious shortages.

Administration officials carefully explain that the new law does not guarantee hospital, diagnostic, out-patient, nursing-home or home nursing care. It simply guarantees partial payment of the bill by Uncle Sam.

But that explanation may not sit well with people who suddenly become eligible for treatment they could never afford before, and then find the treatment isn't allowable because of lack of space, doctors, nurses or technicians.

Much more likely, they will blame the Federal Government—and that means the Johnson administration. Some politicians, in fact, see this as a major "sleeper" issue in the congressional elections.

Regardless of how they voted on Medicare, Republicans can blame the Johnson administration for not being ready to handle the huge influx of aging citizens eligible for the new benefits.

In Oklahoma, for example, a recent conference of medical experts met in Oklahoma City to take an inventory of what will be needed to meet the new demands of Medicare.



March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1339

pate in an election. Yet this is the very formula that the minority party spokesmen and critics of the poverty program here in this House of Representatives are proposing for the poor people of America.

Mr. Speaker, the Daily News editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 7, 1966]

## THE APATHETIC POOR

Four hundred thousand poor people in Los Angeles were eligible to vote for representatives on the policy board that will direct the city's vast antipoverty program. In the wake of the bloody Watts riots it was expected that interest among the poor would run high.

Actually, it turned out that only 1 percent—one person in a hundred—cared enough to vote.

The case is not isolated. Similar tests in other cities have disclosed monumental apathy among the indigent toward participating in their own economic betterment.

The fact throws interesting light on all the political breast beating that has gone on over giving the poor a voice in the anti-poverty program. For the most part, the poor couldn't care less.

There are, of course, many other symptoms of the same ailment. One is the high dropout rate among youths who could stay in school if they wished. Another is the filth that invariably piles up inside and outside the dwellings of the hard-core poor. In each instance the apathy works to the obvious detriment of the apathetic. But the dropouts still drop out, and the filth keeps piling up all the same.

None of this is cause for cynicism as to the redeemability of the disadvantaged. They must be rehabilitated, unless society is willing to go on bearing steadily more crushing financial burdens for their care.

But it does raise sharp questions as to how much of the poverty program is on target, and how much of it is simply slush money calculated to win votes.

The fundamental job is to teach the poor to care enough to help themselves. Part of it can be done through intelligent educational programs like Operation Headstart, where society begins very early to offset the deadening effects of environment, and with adult instruction carried out in the communities.

Part of it can be done through job training programs—and gratifying progress is being made not only in the area of public works, but among private employers vigorously and systematically opening up training and employment opportunities.

But the antipoverty program's success depends first of all upon the skill and wisdom and imagination and integrity with which it is carried out. And that calls, we should think, for policy boards manned by persons whose experience and talents equip them to exercise the judgments involved in the selection of projects and the allocation of vast amounts of tax funds. Every community has its dedicated groups and leaders in the welfare field, and these should, of course, be represented. But it would be dangerous, we think, to leave vital judgments up to those who manifestly do not know why they should care.

## The GEB Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OFHON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an ar-

ticle which appeared in the March 1 edition of the Advance, a publication of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, which has its national office in my congressional district at 15 Union Square, New York City. The statement of the Amalgamated's General Executive Board relates to the situation in Vietnam. The article speaks for itself. I hope all of my colleagues in the House will take the time to read it:

## THE GEB STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The principal issue facing the United States today is the war in Vietnam. For many Americans, at war far from home, it has become a matter of life or death. The burden of expense it imposes on the Nation as a whole is enormous; already it has cost us more than the entire Marshall plan. Furthermore, the course of the war affects all our other foreign policy problems, and may interfere with our ability to solve pressing domestic problems as well.

The immediate prospects in the war are unknown. Increasing our involvement has not brought us closer to a solution. We have reached an impasse to which there is no end in sight.

An issue of such critical and overwhelming importance to each and every one of us calls for objective and thorough consideration by all elements of society. In the U.S. Senate, which has a constitutional obligation to oversee foreign policy, the current hearings conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee under the chairmanship of Senator FULBRIGHT, are making an indispensable contribution to our understanding of the issues.

The report issued by the group of Senators led by Senator MANSFIELD also dramatized the risks and complexities facing us. We know that there is need for more, not less debate. Those who support present policy and those who oppose it, should feel free to express their points of view without fear of retribution. No military threat exists that is so catastrophic as to warrant abusing our basic right to discuss and even to disagree. As a matter of fact, some of the problems now facing us might have been alleviated had there been greater dissemination of information and more candid discussion of the facts earlier in the war.

The information we are now getting through the Mansfield report and the Fulbright hearings and the interpretations submitted by such authorities as General Gavin and former Ambassador Kennan are significant building blocks in the formation of an enlightened public opinion.

In our democratic society, an enlightened public opinion is a vital ingredient in the making of public policy, particularly when the consequences are so grave. Occasionally, no doubt, the complexities and risks involved as public opinion develops may displease those in authority.

For certain leaders, particularly those who are responsible for military decisions, the temptation probably exists to cut through the processes of democracy and make policy arbitrarily and unilaterally. It is a dangerous temptation which must be resisted at all costs. Decisions based exclusively on military considerations have been fallible too often in our past and could be fallible now. Sound policy must be based on the broadest considerations, involving all aspects of public policy—and it must be made only following ample opportunity for democratic discussion by all interested parties in our society. This has been the keystone of our growth and strength in the past and must continue to be in the future.

Our original purpose in Vietnam—to give advice to a friendly nation seeking to build its own security—appeared to be in the tradition of our post-war programs. But our involvement grew, and today we find ourselves heavily involved militarily on behalf of a government not enjoying full popular sup-

port, in an area where the possibility of military victory is remote, and with little support by even our most committed allies.

There is no comparison in Vietnam with our post-war position in Europe, where we joined with other nations in containing Communist advances by bolstering the economic and political stability of non-Communist democracies. There is no comparison in Vietnam with our efforts in other areas, where the free world, under the banner of the U.N., has set limited goals on which to make a stand.

In Vietnam, the political and military factors have eroded our original hopes for swift victory. Although the options before us are limited, certainly the one we would oppose the most vigorously is further escalation of our military effort. Escalation has failed to prove its usefulness. On the contrary, almost every step forward taken by the United States has been more than matched by the opposition. Further escalation could eventually be met by the massed armies of China, an eventuality which could endanger the survival of mankind. Whether we hope for military victory for our troops, political security for Vietnam or diplomatic support in the world community, none of these goals would be served by further escalation.

Our recent efforts to find a solution to the impasse of war through negotiation deserve our support. We urge the administration to continue and expand its efforts to achieve a negotiated peace, using the U.N. or the good offices of third parties or any other method available to end the fighting and settle the problems around the conference table.

The Amalgamated, and the labor movement generally, has a major stake in Vietnam. Our goals are sharply affected by the political and economic state of the Nation, and it is the sons of workers who are being drafted first for military duty.

We consider it a civic duty to participate in the national debate and to express ourselves responsibly on this problem. No single group may have a monopoly of wisdom on Vietnam, but no responsible group should be ignored or silenced as the Nation gropes for a solution to this somber issue.

## Minimum Wage for Farmers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the start of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, our mail has been quite substantial from industries asking they be included or excluded from the extension of coverage of the proposed minimum wage law.

It is impossible, it seems, to make all groups happy and satisfied. For some, it is a problem of inclusion or exclusion. For others, it is a matter of the level of the minimum wage and when that level will be established. For others, the problem is one of overtime.

In the field of agriculture, we have received mail from farm organizations that express the hope there will be no minimum set. I feel sure the matter will be fully debated and an opportunity for complete expression of viewpoint of every Member of the Congress.

A somewhat different viewpoint was received recently which pointed out the merit of broadening the wage and hour

A1310

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 9, 1966

laws of farmers as a means for farmers to retain scarce farm labor, or in other words, to keep the remaining farmers on the farms. Without subscribing to the support of this position until there is a determination in the Education and Labor Committee of all the groups that may be included or excluded and what levels may be established for the years ahead, I thought the letter recently received might be of interest and perhaps some guidance to the committee and of interest to Members who may not have received this kind of letter.

The letter we received was on the stationery of the National Egg Producers Organization and was signed by Forest Nave, Jr., chairman, of Lexington, Mo., in our congressional district. The letter follows:

Representative WILLIAM J. RANDALL,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Outside of the Vietnam issue, the broadening of the coverage of the wage and hour law is the most important legislation facing this Congress.

We are hearing a lot about eliminating poverty in rural areas and redevelopment of rural America. Frankly, there is very little wrong with rural America that a decent income level wouldn't cure.

Our country towns have been bled white by loss of millions of their people who have flocked to the big cities in search of greener pastures. This exodus has added to such urban problems as housing, traffic, air pollution, etc., and much of it could have been prevented if we had been realistic and included all workers, including farmworkers, under the minimum wage and hour law at the very start.

We have known for a long time that the population explosion and world food supply are on collision course and the experts are now predicting famine in the next decade.

Too many millions of farmers in the last 50 years have gone off to the cities and we now have a predominantly overage farm population; dwindling livestock numbers and runaway meat prices are proof of this. Only recently we have discovered that milk production is declining.

We strongly urge inclusion of all farmworkers in the wage and hour law, and at the same minimum wage as other workers, so that farmers can compete on even terms for scarce labor to produce more meat and milk for Americans and more grain and soybeans for a hungry world.

Let's keep the remaining farmers on the farms producing food instead of going to the cities to produce more smog, slums, and traffic jams. Immediate inclusion of all farmworkers is a must. I remain.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST NAVE, JR.

**Congressman Horton's Tribute to the  
Late Honorable Albert Thomas, of  
Texas**

SPEECH  
OF  
**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the final departure of ALBERT THOMAS, of the Texas Eighth District, is a serious loss, not only to those of us who knew, ad-

mired, and respected him for his talents as a Congressman, but also to the many thousands who valued his political accomplishments, even from afar.

Throughout his lifetime ALBERT THOMAS was a citizen of Texas, and he burned with a desire to serve the needs of the people and strengthen the traditions of his State. And—in keeping with this desire—he had the capacity to comprehend the needs of the times and to serve his constituents with unflinching energy and unswerving devotion.

ALBERT THOMAS was born in 1898 in Nacogdoches, Tex., where he attended the public schools before entering Rice Institute. Obtaining a commission in the Army, he left college to serve in World War I. Following the armistice he returned to college, graduating from Texas Law School in 1926.

As a young lawyer he was sufficiently impressive to win election as district attorney, which office he held for two terms. In 1930 he was appointed assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas, and in 1936 he was elected to Congress.

In Washington ALBERT THOMAS found that lawmaking was as much to his liking as law enforcement. In short time he revealed his knowledge and abilities in several phases of the law, serving on committees as different in nature as Appropriations, Un-American Activities, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He was for a time chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, and was for many years chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He also served as chairman of a special appropriations subcommittee with jurisdiction over supplemental appropriations.

President Johnson, who knew ALBERT THOMAS for many years, has praised him for his unflinching "devotion to the people he served," and surely there was never praise more well deserved than this. For undoubtedly, as the President observed, ALBERT THOMAS "worked hard" and "served well," far beyond the mere call of duty.

Yes, we who admired the political ability of this remarkable Congressman will miss him dearly in the days ahead. And those of us—myself included—who knew and loved him as a person, will be doubly mournful. It was indeed an honor to know and to work with ALBERT THOMAS, and to have experienced the satisfaction of dealing with an outstanding public servant wholly dedicated to the interests of his flag, his country, his district, and his fellowman.

**A Resolution by the Lithuanian American  
Council of Greater New York**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. EDNA F. KELLY**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting to my colleagues a

resolution which was adopted on February 13, 1966, at Webster Hall in New York City by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York, other interested Lithuanian-born, American citizens and permanent residents.

As we read this resolution, I know we all share the hope of the people of Lithuania that their motherland will one day again be free.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN  
RALLY ON FEBRUARY 13, 1966

We Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 13, 1966, at Webster Hall, New York City, to commemorate the 43th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania.

Protesting vigorously against the forcible incorporation and continued occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia;

Reaffirming the unswerving determination of the Lithuanian people to regain independence and freedom;

Expressing our gratitude to the Government of the United States for its steadfast policy of nonrecognition of the situation created in Lithuania by Soviet aggression;

Thanking the U.S. House of Representatives for Resolution No. 416 of May 19, 1965, climaxing the hearings on conditions in the Baltic States;

Recalling the United Nations Declaration of December 14, 1960, which proclaims that "all peoples have the right of self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development";

Resolve, (1) to appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to promote the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

(2) to demand that Soviet Russia withdraw its military police, and administrative personnel from Lithuania;

(3) to request that the United Nations Committee of 24, dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications," immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

(4) to ask that the Free Europe Radio extend its broadcasts to Lithuania;

(5) to urge the American Lithuanians to support the policy of the U.S. Government opposing Communist expansion everywhere and aiming at the restoration of the right of self-determination to the captive peoples.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF  
GREATER NEW YORK,  
STEPHEN BREDAS, Jr., President,  
MARLJA ZUKAUSKAS, Secretary.

**Free World Owes United States Immense  
Debt**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. GEORGE HANSEN**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the position of the United States as a bulwark against the spread of communism has been ridiculed, maligned, slandered, and downgraded. Some of the "doves" in our midst see no threat of Communist expansion. Some of our "hawks" say none of our efforts are appreciated.

March 9, 1966

A1338

Honolulu is destined to play in our national and international life will be more fully appreciated by its Members, and through them the people of America. Now is the time to look to the "Paradise of the Pacific" for pleasure, for business, or international culture, technical, and political exchange.

### Free Import of Ship Model

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my very dear and gifted friend and my former neighbor, Rev. Cyril Mark Wismar, now pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, and former pastor of the Trinity Lutheran Church of my hometown of Clinton, Mass., I am filing today a companion bill to one introduced by my able, distinguished colleague, and friend, the gentleman from Ohio Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL. This bill is designed to permit the importation into the United States duty free of a certain ship model which Pastor Wismar is very anxious to use in his beautiful church.

I believe that the bill is a very meritorious one and I am very happy to urge its adoption by the House Committee on Ways and Means and the House. As Reverend Wismar points out, ships and ships models have long been associated with the churches of Northern Europe, and I am persuaded that our Government and this Congress should be willing to assist in the free importation of this particular model which has been procured through the personal generosity of Reverend Wismar.

The New York Times of Sunday, December 5, 1965, treated of this matter and under unanimous consent I insert this news account be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

IMPORTED ITEMS: DEFINITIONS VARY—CUSTOMS BUREAU AND PUBLIC SEE THINGS DIFFERENTLY

CLEVELAND, December 4.—The unending tug of war between persons who import things and the Bureau of Customs men who assess the duty centered on a new sort of dispute this week.

The latest question is: Can you call a model ship a religious article?

It follows such questions of equal complexity as:

Must miniature soldiers, tanks, and ships be classified as toys, or may they be admitted as hobby material?

May a complex little model train chug under the tariff wall as a therapeutic device?

Is a plastic jack-o'-lantern necessarily a toy when it is designed to be worn as a hat?

The case of the model ship arose when the Reverend Cyril M. Wismar, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant in Maple Heights, went to Pier 26 to pick up a model ship built by Arne Peterson of Store Hedding, Denmark.

#### DOUBLE ASSURANCE

The model is of the frigate *Ober*, which brought a group of German immigrants from Hamburg in 1839 seeking religious freedom in America. The immigrants eventually founded the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church.

Mr. Wismar assured Customs that the model, which he planned to hang in his church, was a religious object and hence duty free.

The Customs officials assured Mr. Wismar that the model was a model, subject to duty totaling \$210 on its value of \$600.

Mr. Wismar is considering an appeal to the customs court.

"It isn't that we don't like to buy American," he said. "I tried 3 years ago to get a model built in Massachusetts. But it involved so much research they couldn't do it."

#### DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

Pending in the U.S. Customs Court at Philadelphia is a case in which a business catering to hobbies says that 16 million imported plastic soldiers, tanks, and ships, built to scale, are hobbyists' and collectors' items. The Government says they're toys.

The import duty on toys is 35 percent. The duty on hobby items ranges from 10 to 19 percent.

In another pending case, a miniature train was called a therapeutic device because it was intended to calm the nerves of the consignee, an adult.

The case of the plastic jack-o'-lantern has been settled. Customs finally ruled that it was neither a hat nor a toy but a "plastic article."

### Firmness in Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WM. J. RANDALL**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, our mail on Vietnam varies from expressions of concern and doubt whether the war is worth winning to the complete support and approval of the vigorous prosecution of our military efforts. The American public has just witnessed by the media of television the hearings on Vietnam held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The witnesses presented arguments both for and against our military action.

We received recently from the Tiry J. Ford Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Independence, Mo., as the adjutant put it, "a short but concise resolution which expresses the feelings of many of us in your home district." This resolution was prepared by the post judge advocate, John J. Phillips, and attested to by the post adjutant, Ben Turoff, Jr.

This is the home post of former President Harry S. Truman, and it is a high privilege and a great honor to claim membership in the American Legion in this same great post.

The American Legion, true to its long tradition, has quite straightforwardly set out in the resolution that it is always ready and willing to be counted in times of national crisis. The resolution follows:

Whereas our country is presently engaged in a vicious and brutal armed conflict with the forces of Communist enslavement, and

Whereas our President has called for the support of our policy in Vietnam by all patriotic citizens devoted to liberty and opposed to world communism, and

Whereas there are those in this country who would exercise their right to free speech for the purpose of condemning and belittling the brave efforts of those young men of our Nation who are daily suffering and dying in Vietnam, and

Whereas the American Legion has ever been ready and willing to stand up and be counted in times of national crisis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Tiry J. Ford, Post 21, American Legion, Department of Missouri, do hereby express our approval and support of the policy of our President in the vigorous prosecution of the conflict in Vietnam: Be it further

*Resolved*, That the membership of said Tiry J. Ford Post is on record as remembering with reverence our fighting men in Vietnam who have fallen, honoring and supporting those who are fighting now and pledging our continued support and encouragement to all who may yet be called there in the defense of liberty.

### The Apathetic Poor

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News has written a powerful editorial which I believe more than adequately answers the question raised here on this floor by critics of the poverty program regarding involvement of the poor in the planning and operation of such programs.

I would like to call this very important editorial to the attention of my colleagues because it describes so succinctly how hollow are the arguments of those who criticize the program.

I have always held, here on this floor, that the maximum feasible participation of the poor in the planning of these programs is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary for their success.

However, I do not agree with those of our colleagues who insist that these anti-poverty programs must be entirely managed by the poor.

I agree even less with those who insist that representatives for the administration of the anti-poverty program in local communities should be designated by local elections limited to participation only by the poor.

It is my understanding that in the Los Angeles election described in the Daily News editorial, Americans who wanted to participate had first to show either their relief check or their income tax return. If they had neither, they had to sign a sworn statement that their income did not exceed the limitations.

I can think of nothing more repugnant to the American tradition of democracy than to have a citizen show his proof of income before being allowed to partici-

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1337

De Gaulle, for example, vetoed Great Britain's entry into the Common Market in 1963; he has insisted that France develop its own small nuclear force, the force de frappe; he has withdrawn from NATO the French fleet and major French land forces; he has increased trade with Cuba; and he advocates neutralization of Vietnam.

This hasty cataloging indicates why De Gaulle has complicated the search for a common purpose and policy among the Atlantic nations. The alliance today is an alliance of sovereign states, and will probably remain so for the foreseeable future, but there is real danger that the alliance itself will be disrupted if one member country continues to insist on pursuing policies which are independent of its allies, or even contrary to their wishes. Even though it is a major power, the United States has learned that no nation can any longer afford to go it alone. For that reason, therefore, the search for greater unity—with or without France, but hopefully with her eventual full cooperation—must continue.

Let us look at another area where the Atlantic allies have been pursuing quite different policies and where greater coordination appears indicated—trade with the East. We all know, of course, of the ban on certain strategic items agreed upon following World War II; over the years that list has been considerably shortened. We know too of the "gentleman's agreement" reached among Western nations in 1934 to limit credit guarantees for normal business transactions to no more than 5 years.

In recent years Western Europe has been much more aggressive in resuming trade with the East than has the United States. In addition, the countries of Western Europe, led by France and Germany, now frequently extend credit to Communist countries for periods of up to 15 years. Since 1948 U.S. trade to the East has doubled, whereas the Western European countries have expanded exports fourfold. It is worthy of note also that U.S. exports to the East are still unimportant compared to our worldwide trade, whereas for countries like Turkey and the Netherlands this trade is much more significant.

If closer coordination of policy could be achieved it almost surely would result in a considerable liberalization of U.S. policy. A special study mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was a member, recommended to Congress a year ago that this whole question be reviewed and that expansion of nonstrategic trade be encouraged. President Johnson has only recently made recommendations to the same effect. Even with the President's support, however, the going will be tough. There are many in Congress who are strongly opposed to any significant increase in trade with the Communist world, or in any easing of our credit policy.

There is, of course, considerable urgency about some of these problems. Because of France's boycott of the Common Market, ended just a few weeks ago, there has not yet been a meeting of the minds by those six member countries. Without that preliminary agreement the so-called Kennedy round can make little progress. It is obviously impossible for the United States to utilize the powers granted under the Trade Agreements Act of 1962 until Europe puts its house in better order. And we need not remind ourselves that powers granted under that act will lapse in June of next year.

So, too, we need to give immediate attention to the broad problem of monetary reform. There is, I am glad to say, growing recognition that something must be done in this area. The sooner we wrestle directly with the various specific suggestions which have been made, the sooner a solution is likely to be found.

One additional problem which has not been mentioned is the necessity for exploring

the interrelationship of the Atlantic nations with respect to science and technology. In this connection, we might explore the possibility of joint scientific and space ventures, as suggested by the President at the time of Chancellor Erhard's visit to this country last December.

In the face of this growing list of pending business one can sense a certain restlessness on both sides of the Atlantic, and indeed in Congress, too. There is uneasiness about what change bodes for the future, and a reluctance to contemplate the unfamiliar. Then, too, there is the fear that fear is all that has held us together. There is feeling that without the threat of an imminent invasion, or the danger of flagrant subversion in Europe, centrifugal forces may take hold.

This current hesitation is in sharp contrast to the high hopes of 1962. That was the year, you will recall, when we appeared on the threshold of a new era of economic expansion. In the United States we passed the Trade Expansion Act, Great Britain appeared about to enter the Common Market, and the trend toward greater unity appeared both imminent and inevitable.

That was the year, too, when we heard much talk about a "grand design," Atlantic Federation, and so on. It was in 1962 that Secretary of Defense McNamara gave a lesson in strategy to our European allies, in a speech in which he deplored independent nuclear efforts in Europe as redundant, divisive, and dangerous. Speaking more tactfully, President Kennedy on July 4, 1962, stressed the interdependence of nations, and outlined his idea of a future equal partnership between Europe and the United States.

In the years since 1962 those high hopes for one reason or another were shattered. Divisions among allies increased, and in many areas Europeans assumed a tougher stance with respect to the leadership of the United States. Understandably these developments produced confusion in this country. We were disappointed and disillusioned, we were frustrated and even angry—and in our disappointment we overreacted. If anything, we became more dogmatic about our ideas. We attached our hopes to new chariots and sped off.

Take, for example, the multilateral force. This idea was first put forward as a limited but negotiable step in the sharing of major responsibility with our allies. Gradually, however, the MLF proposal became almost a panacea for all sorts of problems. The MLF would promote military and political unity in Europe; it would help sell our strategic doctrine to the Europeans; it would enable Great Britain and France to rid themselves gracefully of their burdensome nuclear forces. In our enthusiasm we pushed the project with increasing energy, apparently oblivious to an evident lack of enthusiasm in most of Europe.

Recent experiences will teach us, I hope, to avoid going through another such cycle of high expectations, impatient activity, sharp disappointment, and overreaction. Such an approach will do little to solve the vital unfinished business of Europe. Indeed, as the preponderant power in the alliance, the United States should exercise special care in preventing the development of unnecessary frictions and potential crisis situations.

In your work here today I would ask that you keep the broad objectives of the community uppermost in mind: that we are all part of one community dependent each upon the other for our freedom and prosperity. Centuries ago the psalmist sang this song: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." The bold vistas of a truly united community of nations are indeed pleasant to contemplate. To achieve our goals, however, demands more than contemplation.

We should take care not to downgrade what we have already accomplished. Our

alliance was necessary and it has been productive; it has brought us safely through a dark period. What we need now is to ask, are we ready to undertake new tasks to achieve new objectives? Are not the values, the ideals, and the culture of the West worth this further effort?

The answer to this can only be affirmative.

Let us Americans take the lead again now as we did in 1949. Let us not be timid, even when we argue over which is the wisest course of action. This time let us lead our friends with patience and understanding, in a spirit of cooperation among sovereign and equal nations. In our common search for greater unity let us recognize and understand the desires of each of the Atlantic nations to participate in decisions which affect them—and to participate in the decisionmaking process before final commitments and actions are taken.

As our Secretary of State has said:

"So let us proceed with quiet determination, avoiding both the drag of inertia and outmoded concepts, and the seduction of sloganeering and apparent shortcuts, seizing the opportunities for more cohesive action with vigorous and open minds. In so doing we will demonstrate anew the vitality of the North Atlantic Alliance in meeting the needs of our time."

### "Paradise of the Pacific" Has Great Potential

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the city of Honolulu has recently been the center of national and international attention, and the Joint Declaration of Honolulu announced by President Johnson and Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam will no doubt go down in world history as one of the great documents of this era.

Because of the growing importance of the Asian nations as they relate to our international relations, and because of the strategic geographic location of Hawaii's capital city, it will continue to serve as the situs for many more important events to come.

Businessmen, too, have recognized the great potential of Honolulu and have converged upon a booming economy. As a consequence, Honolulu attained a rank among the 11 leading cities of the United States in the value of building permits issued from January through November last year. Dunn & Bradstreet lists the building volume for the city and county of Honolulu for the 11-month period involved as \$191.6 million, a huge 44-percent increase over the same period in 1964.

Honolulu, which ranks as the Nation's 43d largest city, overtook San Francisco—12th largest—last October. San Francisco's volume for the same period was \$181.6 million.

This all experts agree is truly a phenomenal record for a city located in the youngest State of the Union. I bring this matter to the attention of Congress in the hope that the important role which

5156

imports by adding 100,000 tons to the quota in February, and more recently lifting the quota ceiling altogether for the first quarter of 1966.

Touted as an effort to reduce a cost raise by some cane sugar refiners in the Northeastern States, the only effect of these hasty actions has been to depress the price of raw sugar throughout the Nation.

For the grower who must sell his crop to a raw cane sugar mill, this flooding of the market is no small disaster. His price and his income are directly related to the price the miller gets for the raw sugar. When those prices drop, it is the cane grower who feels the squeeze first.

Since the Florida ports are the nearest U.S. ports to the Latin American sugar-producing areas, largest in the world, Florida will be the first to suffer.

The Department of Agriculture assures us that it did not intend to reduce the market price on raw sugar, but rather to prevent price hikes in refined sugar. A closer look before leaping would have shown them the results they could expect from this buckshot-scattering method.

But they chose not to look any closer, and went right ahead and lifted the quota. The result, of course, was to lower the price of raw sugar without affecting the price of refined sugar by one penny.

All this has happened at a time when the costs of growing sugar were increasing, and when the price the grower could expect to receive was just approaching the target levels set as fair prices by the Sugar Act.

All that has been accomplished is to worsen the lot of the domestic sugar producers. Certainly this is no way to encourage the development and growth of a domestic sugar industry.

In a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, I have urged him to abandon these badly aimed shotgun tactics and use other means to accomplish his purposes without needlessly sacrificing our sugar-cane growers.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House this afternoon to protest action by the Secretary of Agriculture that threatens to seriously injure the sugarbeet industry not only in my State, but in some 25 States throughout the country. The Secretary has gradually relaxed import restrictions on raw sugar to the point at which there are now no limitations whatsoever on importation for foreign suppliers. This, of course, has had the effect of depressing prices paid to domestic growers. The price has been driven down to \$6.85 per hundred pounds for raw sugar, a loss of 3 cents per hundred pounds since mid-February, and some 12 cents below the statutory target price determined by Congress to be fair to consumers and producers.

The action taken by the Secretary was ostensibly for the purpose of putting a brake on rising prices for refined sugar sold to consumers. But what the Secretary failed to point out is that prices are not uniform throughout the country and that the Chicago-West market has been depressed for some time. The price of

sugar in the Chicago-West area has been substantially lower than the price in the northeastern part of the country. It should be pointed out that the northeastern market is served almost completely by cane sugar produced outside of the United States. The Chicago-West market, on the other hand, is vital to our American producers as it is a prime user of domestic sugar.

If it was necessary for the Department of Agriculture to depress sugar prices in the Northeast, it should have directed its attack at that particular part of the country. Its action, however, was of such a character as to threaten price stability for growers throughout the entire Nation. With the importation of more sugar from foreign producers, the effect on our own people may very well be disastrous.

In a time when costs to domestic producers are increasing, it hardly seems wise for the Department of Agriculture to take action that will depress the price that our domestic growers can receive for their products. The Department's action is going to push the domestic grower further back against the wall and, if pursued, will have disastrous consequences for the American sugar-beet industry. I deplore this action, and urge that the Secretary reconsider it in the interest of a healthy domestic sugar industry.

#### ADVERSE EFFECT OF DEEP DIVISION WITHIN DEMOCRATIC PARTY OVER AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in a statement issued on March 2, 1966, the Republican policy committee pointed out that "the deep division within the Democratic Party over American policy in Vietnam is prolonging the war, undermining the morale of our fighting men, and encouraging the Communist aggressor." We also called upon the President "to disavow those within his party who would divide this country as they have divided the Democratic Party."

That this concern is real and not fancied, that the deep division within the Democratic Party does have a serious and detrimental effect on our effort in Vietnam is a matter of public record. Each day has seen a new report, a voiced concern, that this division is encouraging the enemy and dismaying our friends. For example:

It has been reported that following a White House briefing, Roving Ambassador Averell Harriman stated:

I think those who dissent \* \* \* should recognize that it does give comfort to the enemy—or not comfort, but it does give encouragement to the enemy.

In an article datelined Saigon, February 27, and entitled "Look is Different Where Action Is," Washington Post Correspondent Ward Just stated:

From Washington it may seem that the war aims of the U.S. Government have not been defined and Senators may believe the Vietcong represent the will of the Vietnamese people, but in Saigon this talk strikes officials as neither instructive nor ameliorating. It unhinges friends and fence sitters in the Ky governments and now it has unhinged American diplomats.

New York Times Columnist C. L. Sulzberger concluded that:

Both Peiping and Hanoi must have gained fresh encouragement by the joining of our know-nothings with our know-it-alls.

Richard L. Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reported:

Using Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as its spearhead, the Johnson administration has embarked on an all-out counter-offensive to sell the Vietnam war to the American people, and overcome the uneasiness, restlessness, and doubts which have appeared in the past month \* \* \*. Roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, who accompanied the Vice President on his whirlwind tour of nine nations, has come back just as firmly determined as Mr. HUMPHREY to combat what seems to be interpreted as defeatism. Messrs. HUMPHREY and Harriman take the position that it was providential they were in Asia at the time of the FULBRIGHT hearings in order to counter there the misapprehension over American resolve.

He [HUMPHREY] also said that the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action)—a left-of-center group which he formerly led, and many of whose members are dubious about the war—are just the people he will try to persuade.

In an article entitled "U.S. Debate Rattles Saigon" and datelined Saigon, correspondent Takashi Oka stated:

Washington's debate over possible Vietcong participation in a future South Vietnamese government has caused acute discomfort here.

To suggest that the Vietcong be given seats in a coalition government, either before or after election, sounds to them like an invitation to take over the country.

In an article by Stanley Karnow datelined Hong Kong, March 4, 1966, it was reported:

As the Chinese Communists see it, the divergent opinions over Vietnam within the U.S. Establishment are only tactical differences about how American aggressive aims are to be achieved. And these differences, in Peiping's view, dramatize the extreme weakness of the Johnson administration.

Moreover, the Chinese leaders seem to consider this dissension a sign that the United States will eventually be forced by its own internal contradictions to withdraw from Vietnam. Thus they appear to believe that a compromise settlement of the Vietnam war is unnecessary—at least for the present.

In a recent interview, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY stated:

The success of negotiations is not improved by public discussion of suggestions which terrify one party and whet the appetite of another. \* \* \* Had I not adequately repudiated it immediately [the Kennedy suggestion], it could have led to a serious crisis in Saigon.

And, in an article dated March 7, 1966, Marquis Childs stated:

The belief among the President's closest military advisers was that the debate would prolong the war at least a year, with the



sugarbeet growers, whose market has been depressed. I believe the target price which the Sugar Act authorizes should be reached to help growers whose costs are increasing at every turn.

As one who has long been interested in a restrained and careful policy for the disposition of Commodity Credit stocks in grain so as to allow grain producers the full benefit of market demand, in just this same vein, I respectfully request the Department to practice great restraint in its sugar quota actions in the future.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend and colleague Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I would suggest that you add my name to the list of those who will submit a statement. There is one being prepared in my office to be included with your remarks in the RECORD. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her interest in our agricultural problems. I might point out that only yesterday we called to the attention of this House the dumping of corn which has been a drastic blow to the agricultural economy in our part of the State. So this seems to be a general practice.

Again I thank the gentlewoman for leading this discussion and calling it to the attention of this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join many other colleagues here in the House today in protesting the Department of Agriculture's lifting of all restrictions on the importation of raw sugar during the first quarter of this year.

It is my feeling that sugar beet growers and refiners in Minnesota, the entire Midwest, and the West may very well suffer from abnormally depressed prices, because the USDA thought sugar prices were getting too high, particularly in the Northeast.

Almost all this foreign sugar after refining will eventually wind up in the Northeast market, where base prices are more than \$1 a hundredweight above the base prices west of Chicago.

But the alarming fact is that the USDA action taken to reduce inflated sugar prices in the Northeast has not dropped prices there by so much as a penny, but raw sugar prices have been driven to 12 cents below the target set by Congress in the Sugar Act.

Since the raw sugar price underpins the entire price structure for beet and cane growers and refiners in the United States, this precipitate action by the Government may very well hurt those presently getting the least for sugar.

Mr. Speaker, most of us from the Midwest know that domestic sugar beet growers and refiners in our area have long had a depressed market. They have been just starting to narrow the price gap between Midwest and east coast prices, but this USDA action seems likely to prevent such a happening.

I want to join my colleagues in protesting the Department's action, and to urge the Department of Agriculture to practice greater restraint in its price-influencing quota actions in the future.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful—and I am sure that this hope is shared by my colleagues—that this discussion has been helpful to all the Members of this House who have been here during this colloquy and that it also will be helpful to those who will read it in the RECORD. We hope that the presentation of these facts will increase, in this House, the understanding of the very serious threat which the Agriculture Department's recent sugar actions does pose to the sugar farmers of our Nation—the cane growers of the South as well as our beet growers in the Middle West and the West.

It has been pointed out today that the primary effect thus far of the Government's hasty actions has been to depress the raw sugar price, which is the price that underpins the entire sugar price structure in the United States. For the sugarbeet growers, a lower raw sugar price presents a serious potential danger. The beet sugar industry produces refined sugar—it does not produce raw sugar for later refining as is the practice in the cane industry. But the raw price, as we have pointed out, has a most important bearing on the refined price, which is a fundamental factor in the return the sugarbeet farmer receives for his sugarbeets. Hus this matter is of very serious concern to the sugarbeet producer.

For the sugarcane producers of Louisiana and Florida, the effect of a lowered raw sugar price is even more immediate and direct—because the Louisiana sugarcane grower, for example, sells his crop to a raw cane sugar mill, and the income of that Louisiana grower therefore is directly and immediately dependent upon the price received by the raw cane sugar mill for raw cane sugar.

Just this morning there came to my attention some most pertinent comments on this subject in the March 1, 1966, issue of the Sugar Bulletin, published in New Orleans by the American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A. The Washington column of Mr. Josiah Ferris, who represents the Sugar Cane League here and whom many of you know, discusses the very subject we have been discussing here today. Mr. Ferris writes, in part—and I quote:

Sugar appears to be caught in the new effort by administration officials to avoid inflationary wage and price movements. President Johnson has called upon business, labor, and government to seek "new ways" to prevent price increases. While the President asked for voluntary control, there is speculation that as an alternative, the Government might utilize some new mechanism to enforce wage and price conformance to prevent the inflation threat.

The February 15 issue of the bulletin carried an article in our column entitled "The Bull's Eye." The item praised the Government for its administration of the Sugar Act which resulted in a price for raw sugar exactly the same as the parity price set forth in the Sugar Act. No sooner had the article appeared in print than the Government in three successive movements completely

jerked the rug from under the raw sugar price from \$6.94 on February 23 to \$6.80 on February 25.

In their public announcements, the U.S. Department of Agriculture stated definitely that their quota manipulations were for the purpose of checking announced price rises for refined sugar. Agriculture Department officials state privately that it was not their intention to reduce the market price of raw sugar. Nevertheless, the raw market was, as always, the most sensitive of the two and consequently it fell while the price of refined has remained unchanged. USDA officials make no bones about saying that the announced price increases for refined sugar were unjustified and unwarranted and certainly are out of line with the President's request to industry to voluntarily do what it can to prevent inflation.

Mr. Ferris concludes his report to the members of the Sugar Cane League by saying:

The feud between certain Government officials and some cane sugar refiners, which started over a year ago but quieted down for a short time while the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 were being considered by Congress, has flared up anew and unfortunately, producers of raw sugar, who are innocent bystanders, are being substantially injured.

When Government sugar officials go gunning for refiners, they should use a rifle and leave the scatter gun home in the closet.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this discussion we have had here today will help to emphasize to the Secretary of Agriculture the special importance which this House attaches to the letter which I read at the beginning of the discussion and which we have dispatched to him.

There is no doubt that the Sugar Act for many years has contained the directive to the Secretary of Agriculture that one of his primary responsibilities with respect to administration of the act is to achieve and maintain the raw sugar price objective of the law. The purpose of some of the amendments enacted last year was to provide the Secretary with additional tools for achieving that objective. One of these tools was the clear and unmistakable authority to establish quarterly quotas during the first two quarters of the year. The statement in the House committee report, which has been referred to, further underscored the intent of Congress. A similar statement appeared also in the report of the Senate Finance Committee report on the sugar bill. It is my understanding that all the segments of the domestic sugar industry—the cane sugar refiners as well as the sugarcane and sugarbeet producers and processors—supported the provisions and directives designed to strengthen the Secretary's hand in achieving and maintaining the price objective of the law.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary will be aware of this as he reads our letter.

Mr. Speaker, with the request that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on this subject, I yield the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has recently dealt a serious blow to the sugarcane growers in my own State of Florida and in other Southern States. The Secretary has opened the gates to foreign sugar

March 9, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5157

Communists seizing on every word spoken in opposition to Vietnam involvement as proving the United States will not stay the course.

Finally, so that the record may be absolutely clear with respect to the March 1 Republican policy committee statement, as chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point the complete text of that statement.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT  
ON VIETNAM

The deep division within the Democratic Party over American policy in Vietnam is prolonging the war, undermining the morale of our fighting men and encouraging the Communist aggressor. It has confused the people in other nations about the American purpose and has led North Vietnam to believe that in time we may falter, that we do not have the necessary will or determination to win. As a result, the peace that this Nation and the free world seeks has been delayed, the fighting intensified, and the threat of a major war deepened.

In an effort to please the conflicting elements in the Democratic Party, the administration has had to dodge and shift. Its policy and position on Vietnam continues to be marred by indecision, sudden change and frequent reinterpretation. Under the circumstances, it is little wonder that the enemy has been encouraged, our friends dismayed, and the "national unity that can do more to bring about peace negotiations than almost any other thing" delayed.

We, therefore, call upon the President to disavow those within his party who would divide this country as they have divided the Democratic Party. Certainly, as the President has stated, "there is much more that unites us than divides us." However, as long as the party in power cannot agree on such basic issues as whether Americans should be in Vietnam at all, what our Nation is trying to achieve there and whether the right means are being used, there will continue to be uncertainties, misunderstandings and fears about the war in Vietnam. America, indeed the world, is waiting for the President to take command of his party. Until this is done, the divisive debate will continue, the confusion will grow, and a peaceful solution will elude us.

Republicans are united in their support of the fighting men in Vietnam. We also support a policy that will prevent the success of aggression and the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

In addition, we believe that the people of South Vietnam should have an opportunity to live their lives in peace under a government of their own choice, free of Communist aggression.

Certainly, these objectives cannot be realized by admitting the Communists to a share of power in a coalition government. For this is "arsenic in the medicine," the "fox in the chicken coop." It would pave the way for a Communist takeover as surely as did the coalition governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary. Moreover, it would make a cruel and indefensible mockery of the sacrifices of the fighting men in Vietnam.

THE TRUE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN  
GHANA

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, what has been revealed about the true state of

affairs in the African country of Ghana since Kwame Nkrumah was removed as head of government by the military February 24 is enough to make Americans stop and think.

It has been established that Nkrumah kept literally hundreds of his political opponents in jail, where many of them were tortured, and that he looted this once well-off land to the point where Ghana's people are hungry and in rags and tatters. Moreover, according to a March 2 dispatch to the Washington Post, Ghanaian police arrested, in a red Thunderbird, Nkrumah's "mistress," described as "a tall raven-haired woman from South Africa." They allowed to depart for Cairo "his Egyptian wife and her children."

The authoritative London Times reported March 7 that the people of Ghana demonstrated angrily after the dictator's former financial aid revealed how Nkrumah had plundered the nation's treasury to pay for his bid for Pan-African leadership and for his own personal gain. The British left Ghana with a big monetary reserve. It is all gone, along with what has since been taken in.

And just to show more of his real character, Nkrumah is now broadcasting to Ghana from nearby Guinea, according to United Press International, threatening to return and "put to death the leaders of the military regime that ousted him."

To cap this wild extravaganza, which would not be believable on the stage, Nkrumah was deposed while he was in Peiping hobnobbing with Red Chinese leaders, and en route to Moscow.

What was our Government doing while this was going on?

The administration in Washington was helping to support Nkrumah in office and permitting him to foster his ambitions for Africa-wide leadership by pouring public and U.S. money into the \$360 million Volta project. Upon this dam and production effort, \$150 million in U.S. taxpayers' money and \$50 million in private American funds are being spent.

AID and the U.S. Export-Import Bank put \$37 million into the just completed Volta dam and power facilities, apparently not realizing that the Ghanaian people were too poor to buy food or clothes, let alone electric power.

Then the administration provided—way down on the lower part of the African bulge—an aluminum plant, one-fifth completed, with a capacity of 150,000 tons a year. AID and our Export-Import Bank are spending \$109 million on this, and the Kaiser and Reynolds companies the rest.

However worthy this Volta project may be, it was employed by Nkrumah as his major prestige piece for power at home and Africa-wide.

Now that the pro-Communist leader of Guinea has by decree made Nkrumah titular leader of Guinea, why do we not withdraw recognition from Guinea or insist upon some action to abort this wierd development?

Either we did not know the character of Nkrumah and his regime and were putting our money in blindly or else we

were informed and continued to support him anyway. Either is unthinkable.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in view of what has happened in Ghana, the Congress and the State Department should reexamine and reappraise our policies in this area.

PRODUCTION OF FISH PROTEIN  
CONCENTRATE

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop through the use of experiment and demonstration plants practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate.

With the developing world wide struggle against hunger, the potential of this new process for producing a wholesome fish protein concentrate which can be used as a diet supplement throughout the world is nearly unlimited.

The task of feeding a world confronted with a population explosion of the magnitude which we now anticipate is almost beyond belief. President Johnson's recent message to Congress on food for freedom documents the problem of the world.

At the present time, more than half of the inhabitants of the world are undernourished or in actual hunger. When the world's population is geometrically increased over the coming years, the world's food problem will be increased in like proportion.

Thus, this new concept of fish protein concentrate is of the utmost importance for us all.

We should waste no time in our efforts to commercialize the production of this new source of food.

THE TAXPAYER HAS A RIGHT TO  
KNOW

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining several of my distinguished colleagues of the minority in introducing legislation to give the public and the Congress better access to information about the activities of the Federal Government.

The purpose of this bill is a simple one: to prevent the suppression of public information by Federal Agencies. I have long been a stout advocate that the public's business ought to be open to the public.

It is unfortunate that a measure of this sort has become necessary, but recent events have pointed up the fact that many agencies have lost sight of the fact that it is the American people they work for. Many have taken it upon themselves to decide what the public

March 9, 1966

should know and what they should not be able to learn.

The bill I propose would require that every Federal Agency make all of its records promptly available to the public as requested. If an agency should refuse to do so, the courts have the power to decide whether the refusal is proper or not. Of course, there must be several exceptions to this rule. All material of a security nature, foreign policy information, agency material dealing with personnel policies and records, privileged trade secrets, investigatory material compiled for law enforcement, and other specifically exempt material, would not be made public.

The existing law on this matter simply provides a curtain behind which agencies may hide. They make the decision themselves. This has proven to be an effective way for hiding skeletons and covering up practices which, if known to the taxpayer, would lead to serious questions.

Recently, for example, the Post Office Department refused to release the names of its summer employees. It had become apparent that funds which were designed to pay salaries of people in the poverty group, were actually being used to employ political friends and relatives in the Post Office, regardless of their need. When asked, the Post Office refused to furnish the list of employees.

I myself have had similar experiences. Not long ago, I needed some information of an unclassified nature, based on official correspondence between the Army Corps of Engineers and another agency. I was refused access to the information by the Engineers until they secured the consent of the other agency, despite the fact that it had been referred to in detail in conversations with the corps and was in no way privileged.

The agency, under present law, does not have to give any reason for withholding information. Instead they simply assert that they have found a good cause not to release it. They determine whether a cause is good, and no one can effectively challenge that decision.

Mr. Speaker, that situation, coupled with the rapid expansion of the role and power of the Federal Government, has become a real threat to our democratic system of government.

When the people and their representatives in the Congress no longer have access to the information on activities of their servants in the Government, the whole democratic system begins to be undermined.

The administration has consistently opposed such legislation. This is a bit suspect in itself. The question which comes immediately to my mind is. What have they to hide?

It is inconceivable that an administration dedicated to improving the public welfare and encouraging healthy participation of citizens in a responsible government, could reasonably object to assuring that the public be able to know what the government is up to.

I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will act promptly to approve

this legislation and guarantee that the American people will be able to find out how their money is being spent.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE COUNTRY ELEVATOR

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1965, the Department of Agriculture announced their feed grain sales policy for the 1965-66 marketing year. Included in that announcement was the following statement:

Sales of CCC feed grain stocks in 1965-66 are expected to be considerably smaller than in 1964-65. \* \* \* Anticipated 1965-66 requirements can be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts expected to be made available from CCC-owned stocks.

In a direct about-face, the CCC has dumped nearly 175 million bushels of corn on the feed grain market since the first of this year. In other words, during the past 9-week period of this year in which CCC sales "are expected to be considerably smaller than in 1964-65," the Government has loaded enough corn to equal almost 43 percent of the total dumped during the 1964-65 season. In just 2 days of last week, the CCC dumped 40 million bushels of corn in Minneapolis; nearly five times the amount sold in December on all markets.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past attempted to point out the disastrous consequences these dumping practices have on the family farmer who uses most of his feed grain crop to feed his own livestock. While the large corporate feeders can buy the price-depressing unloaded stocks of the CCC at prices below what it costs the average farmer to raise his crop, the independent family farmer must suffer from unfair competitive influences.

There is another aspect of the CCC dumping policy which needs to be more fully explained. Yesterday, I told the House of a call I received from the operator of a small country elevator who had lost \$12,000 because of the recent CCC practices. Today, I received a letter from the manager of the Farmers Co-op Elevator and Mill at Buffalo Lake, Minn., who was writing on behalf of 87 elevators in southwest Minnesota. With understandable consternation, the manager asks "why—the—Commodity Credit Corporation does not use the same policy for the country elevator as it does for terminal trade." The country elevators, which have been forced to buy large quantities of corn from the CCC this year due to the weather-affected poor quality corn crop, have found that the prices they had to pay for off-grade corn were about 7 cents higher than those paid at the terminal markets.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to include the text of this letter and its supporting documents at this point in my remarks. I encourage my colleagues to

keep the problems of these country elevators in mind in connection with our efforts to curb such discriminatory activities by the CCC.

FARMERS CO-OP. ELEVATOR & MILL,  
Buffalo Lake, Minn., March 7, 1966.  
Re sale of commodity corn on open market.  
Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,  
1533 House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. NELSEN: The 87 elevators in southwestern Minnesota which make up the Western Grainmen's Association have asked me to present to you the situation the Government has placed them in by selling these large amounts of corn on the open market at this time.

The areas we are talking about were very much affected by weather conditions which resulted in a high moisture, low-test weight, in other words, poor quality corn.

The majority of elevators in our organization had Government-stored corn in their elevators and in December we had the option to buy this corn back or ship it to Commodity Credit Corporation. Most of us felt that we had to buy it back and keep it for future needs for spring and summer use to take care of local demands for turkey, hog, and cattle feeders.

Let me try to explain the problems on the takeover of Government corn. By the time the country elevator gets the corn from the farmer it has been stored on the farm from 3 to 4 years and, we from the Midwest know, corn stored this long very seldom grades No. 2 corn or better. For example, corn in our area graded all the way from 5 percent to 40 percent damage. In the past, when we redeemed Government corn storage tickets from our own storage, the discounts were based at the same price the terminals were discounting. Not so this year.

Enclosed you will find copies of purchases we made from Commodity Credit Corporation through our commission firm, showing the price we had to pay for off-grade corn and also the prices the terminal markets would have paid us for the same quality corn that day. You will note there is about 7 cents per bushel difference. We would like an answer as to why Commodity Credit Corporation does not use the same policy for the country elevator as it does for terminal trade. On March 3, corn dropped 3 cents, and I understand 47 million bushels of corn were picked up by terminal trade. Now again corn is up 3 cents. This type of thing is discriminating against the country elevator.

We are the first to realize the Government has to dispose of corn, but we hope in the future it can be done in a more orderly manner.

Thank you very much for any future consideration you might give us on this situation.

Sincerely yours,

ARVID NELSON, Manager.

P.S.—I sent copies of this letter to Representatives QUIE, OLSON, and LANGEN.

FARMERS CO-OP ELEVATOR & MILL,

Buffalo Lake, Minn.

Re sale of commodity corn on open market.

Our track price f.o.b. Buffalo Lake, Minn., January 11 and 12 was \$1.225. The discount on this corn on these days should have been as follows (according to terminal standards):

	Cents
Test weight (discount) .....	0.02
Foreign material (discount) .....	.02
Damage (discount) .....	.075
Total (discount) .....	.115

But you will note that we paid \$1.175 instead of \$1.105. The ASC Office discounts at above rate; terminal discounts at above rate; but when we buy it back they set their own scale.