

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

R.F.K. USES THE LINCOLN PLOY

We have seen the trick used over and over and over again, until we are so annoyed with misrepresentation that we can't let it pass any longer, unimportant though the detail may be.

We mean the persistent practice of folks raising some form of fuss about the Vietnam war, claiming the "precedent" of Abraham Lincoln and his famous speech in criticism of the Mexican War.

BOBBY KENNEDY is the latest to do so. His recent speech that caused a bit of fuss led off with 2 pages of apologia on the virtues of dissent even in time of war and again cited Lincoln's alleged example, rapping the Polk administration in the "war of 1848."

But there wasn't any war in 1848.

It was over.

The Mexicans had been beaten on every field. Our troops were occupying Mexico City. A new election started the year 1848 with a new Mexican "peace president" and peace negotiations began at once.

We were already completely and totally victorious in that war before Lincoln rose to criticize in a speech that couldn't possibly affect American forces in the field or the character of the Mexican resistance and could only have been aimed at demanding a fair and reasonable peace treaty for the defeated Mexican nation.

The fact of history is that Lincoln held his tongue throughout the period of actual fighting and waited until our arms were not affected before he made his criticism.

And that's the precedent that has been repeated and falsely cited as justifying remarks being made today in the midst of battle at a time when they have been welcomed as encouragement by the enemy in the field.

If anyone were really, honestly, concerned to follow Lincoln's example they would, in fact, keep their mouths shut in these circumstances. He did.

Yet they have either the nerve, or the unscrupulous trickery, or the historical stupidity to actually claim "Lincoln's action" as an excuse for their own.

It's irritating, but we admit, beside the point.

There is not any question at all about the right to find fault in war as in peace. You can verbally attack the United States even though it does encourage the enemy in the midst of bitter fighting.

And, then, in turn you can also be attacked for your position on the matter—by the same principle, and right, and guaranteed freedom.

Your responsibility then is to defend your position—not holler "foul"—or cite a phony "example" in Lincoln.

We haven't heard anybody deny the fact that Ho Chi Minh has been encouraged by the seeming confusion, uncertainty, and fears thus expressed in the United States, to the point that he has publicly given thanks for them, and has cited them as evidence that the Vietcong should keep on fighting and refusing to negotiate.

No. They just want to howl—"But we have a right to speak up."

Sure, you do. That's beside the point. The question is not if you have such a right, but are you doing the right thing when you make use of it to give aid and encouragement to the enemy and to prolong the war in which Americans are fighting and dying at the behest of their country as required of them by those legally elected to make such decisions?

And you surely don't have a right to snuggle up to Lincoln—he plainly did not think such conduct was right.

Vast Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Cheyenne, Wyo., Eagle seems typical of many which I have read recently. It states that it believes "the vast majority of Americans understand and support the President in his policy of 'prudent firmness under careful control' while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace."

The paper recognizes that "President Johnson has left, is leaving no stone unturned in his efforts to move the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. And he has made it abundantly clear, over and over, that the United States will not be pushed out of Vietnam by force of arms."

The article to which I refer clarifies some issues which concern us so urgently at this time, and with the permission of my colleagues I offer the editorial for the RECORD:

GOALS UNDERScoreD

By now, everyone in this Nation, and most of the leaders throughout the world, should understand our goals and purposes in Vietnam, our reasons for being there, and our determination to stay until aggression from the north has stopped.

President Johnson has left, is leaving no stone unturned in his efforts to move the Vietnam conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. And he has made it abundantly clear, over and over, that the United States will not be pushed out of Vietnam by force of arms.

In his state of the Union message, delivered during the 37-day bombing lull, the President said:

"We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

He pointed out "our decision to stand firm has been matched by our desire for peace."

And he stated:

"Until peace comes, or if it does not come, our course is clear. We will act as we must to help protect the independence of the vallant people of South Vietnam. We will strive to limit conflict, for we wish neither increased destruction nor increased danger."

"But we will give our fighting men what they must have; every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost and whatever the challenge."

Wednesday, the President again underscored U.S. goals in southeast Asia, pledging a continued military course of "prudent firmness under careful control" while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace.

"We will build freedom while we fight," he said, "and we will seek peace every day by every honorable means. But we will persevere along the high, hard road of freedom."

He said that, already, "the tide of the battle has turned" against the Communists. And he reminded North Vietnam his offer of unconditional peace talks still stands.

He assured critics here at home that "there is not, and there will not be, a mindless escalation."

"We have threatened no one—and we will not," he said. "We seek the end of no regime—and will not."

"Our purpose is solely to defend against aggression. To any armed attack, we will reply."

"Men ask who has a right to rule in Vietnam. Our answer there is what is has been here for 200 years; the people must have this right—the South Vietnamese people—and no one else. Washington will not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice. Hanoi shall not impose upon the people of South Vietnam a government not of their choice."

Still with us, of course, are those who would have us plunge forward in a "mindless escalation" of the war.

Some urge unlimited bombing, regardless of what effect it might have upon world opinion, and apparently without concern over the question of whether it might bring China or Russia into the war.

On the other hand, some would have us turn our backs on our commitments—pull out of southeast Asia and leave South Vietnam, and perhaps other countries, at the mercy of the Communists. The utter folly of this course should be obvious to all.

Fortunately, the man with the responsibility is the President of the United States. The decisions are his, and he has the advice and assistance of the best experts available.

We believe the vast majority of Americans understand and support the President in his policy of "prudent firmness under careful control" while pursuing a diplomatic search for an honorable peace.

Business Citizenship Competition by the American Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, beginning today the American Security Council, nationally and internationally renowned for its sober analyses and projects regarding the cold war, is conducting a unique contest open to all Americans with respect to the role of business of the cold war. Awards amounting to \$100,000 are being offered for the best papers and articles on this vital subject.

There are many of us who have felt that the United States had not exploited to the full its economic power in turning the scales against the Red totalitarian network in this incessant cold war. Also, the actual and potential losses of constructive American investments abroad, as for example in Cuba and Venezuela respectively, have not been soberly assessed by our dynamic entrepreneurs.

It is questionable, too, that private enterprise with its tremendous genius for technological revolution has been fully appreciated as a formidable weapon for freedom. In addition, the generally neutralist attitude of American business in the cold war is another angle calling for intensive analysis. These and many other basic points are ideas deserving of careful study, which this unique contest provides the opportunity for.

For the benefit of all Americans, I insert the release on "\$100,000 for Best

A1124

Ideas on the Role of Business in the Cold War" in the RECORD. I also insert the rules and entry form, so that this vital information can be made available to all Americans concerned with the power of free enterprise in the cause of expanded freedom:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR BEST IDEAS ON THE ROLE OF BUSINESS IN THE COLD WAR

CHICAGO.—A \$100,000 business citizenship competition to encourage fresh thinking on the responsibilities of business in the cold war was announced today by John M. Fisher, president of the American Security Council (ASC).

The competition will be conducted by the ASC under a public service grant from the Schick Safety Razor Co.

Calling the cold war a "psychological hot war," Fisher said that the purpose of the contest was to find effective ways to use the talents and resources of business in the worldwide battle for the minds of men.

He said that Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., chairman of the board of the Schick Safety Razor Co. made this grant because American business has the greatest array of sales, advertising, and public relations talents in the world but these talents have not been effectively mobilized to merchandise freedom.

"As the advertising genius who merchandised the Paper-Mate pen and the Schick stainless steel blade, Mr. Frawley is particularly aware of this business gap," Fisher said. "Someone had to take a first step in filling this gap, so Schick is granting \$100,000 in awards to encourage the competition."

The top five individual awards are \$25,000, \$10,000, \$7,000, \$5,000, and \$2,500. Grants equal to these awards will be given by Schick to cooperating organizations, colleges and universities named by the award winners. There will also be 1,000 medals given as special awards.

Entries are to be in the form of essays with the winning papers to be published as the appendix of "The Business Gap in the Cold War," the second in the ASC's current series of studies on "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory."

The contest will be judged by a committee headed by Robert W. Galvin, chairman of the board of Motorola, Inc.

Quoting the National Governors Conference report on cold war education, Fisher said: "The American right to engage in private enterprise, like the right of citizenship itself, is balanced by a responsibility to defend and strengthen the system which makes free enterprise possible."

He called upon all Americans to make their thoughts count for freedom by advising the business community how it can best meet these citizenship responsibilities.

Deadline for submissions to the competition is December 31, 1966. All Americans are eligible to enter except employees of the Schick Safety Razor Co. and the ASC.

Further information and entry forms may be obtained by writing to: Business Citizenship Competition, c/o American Security Council, 123 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

The American Security Council is a bipartisan not-for-profit association with over 3,500 member institutions throughout the United States. Its membership includes business firms of all types, newspapers, foundations, universities and other institutions. It is the means through which its members work together and cooperate with the government and with other organizations in the interest of national security.

RULES AND ENTRY FORM—\$100,000 BUSINESS CITIZENSHIP COMPETITION

A PSYCHOLOGICAL HOT WAR

Some call the current conflict a cold war. It is also a psychological hot war, waged by

communism to shape and influence the actions of free men. The Communist takeover of Cuba is a good example of this kind of war. Most Cubans and Americans were fooled by the false picture of Castro the liberator—a composite of Simon Bolivar and George Washington. Not until Cubans had lost their freedom was he revealed as a tool of communism.

We understand, react to, and resist attacks by bullets and bombs, but if we are to survive the psychological and political warfare of communism, new and effective means must be found to counter communism's challenge to freedom.

Our challenge is to find the most effective way of recruiting and using the talents and resources of business in the global battle for men's minds.

BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE CONFLICT

Private enterprise and all Americans dependent upon it for their livelihood suffer every time the free world gives ground to communism. With each Communist gain, be it in Cuba, the Far East, or Latin America, the danger to the remaining free world increases.

Countering communism is the responsibility of all segments of society—not of government alone.

No one knows this better than President Johnson, who recently said, "The great majority of our citizens, I believe, want to understand the form and fashion of the challenge posed for us by communism." To meet that need, the President said there is "not only a proper role, but a real need for leadership of business * * * in providing Americans with * * * sound information on which they can rely and from which they can make their own decisions as to the rightness or wrongness of the paths we pursue in the search for a peace which preserves our freedoms."

And in a formal report on cold war education, the Governors of our 50 States reminded businesses that "the American right to engage in free enterprise, like the right of citizenship itself, is balanced by a responsibility to defend and strengthen the system which makes free enterprise possible."

USE OF IDEAS

The winning papers will be published as the appendix of "The Business Gap in the Cold War," the second in the American Security Council's series of studies on "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory." The 128 colleges and universities and 102 major organizations which have cooperated in this series of studies will be joined by new cooperating institutions. All cooperating institutions will be eligible for grants to be given in the winners' names.

THE AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL

The American Security Council is operated for the improvement of business and public understanding of the cold war and how to meet the Communist challenge.

Leaders of American business created the council to provide a nonpolitical, nonprofit vehicle through which they could lay aside competitive business and political considerations to work together and with all segments of society in their common business interest of securing themselves and the country against the clear Communist threat.

In the 10 years since its creation, the American Security Council has:

1. Become the largest business-operated organization in the field of national security.
2. Brought together the largest group of opinionmaking organizations (103) and educational institutions (128) ever to cooperate in developing national strategy recommendations. The resulting strategic studies have been nationally acclaimed.
3. Built a major research center, which includes the largest private library on national security and communism in this country. This center has handled over 150,000 research assignments from members, Government

agencies, congressional committees, and newspapers.

4. Published the weekly American Security Council Washington Report, which is widely reprinted or quoted by newspapers, used as a prime news source by international wire services, quoted in editorials across the country, used as a basis for class consideration of current events in a number of institutions of higher education, and served as the basis for many speeches on the floor of both the House and the Senate.

5. Produced the American Security Council Washington Report of the Air, the bipartisan world affairs radio program coedited by Dr. Walter H. Judd, Republican, and Senator THOMAS J. DONN, Democrat. This program is broadcast by more stations than any other daily radio program in the United States.

6. Consistently maintained an impartial and nonpolitical program to identify and disseminate facts concerning the threat of communism to American democracy and to initiate sound and effective responses in support of private enterprise and individual freedoms.

OFFICIAL RULES

1. The business citizenship competition is open to all persons in the United States, its territories and possessions, except employees of the Schick Safety Razor Co., the American Security Council, and their families, and residents of areas where contests are prohibited or taxed by State or local laws or regulations.

2. The contest entry must be in the form of an essay not less than 10 nor more than 20 single-spaced 8½-inch by 11-inch neatly typewritten pages. The essay must include a statement or definition of business' cold war citizenship responsibilities and tell how a business firm like Schick can use its talents and resources effectively in the global battle for men's minds.

Recommendations for corporate action should be specific to the extent of identifying communications media and corporate resource and personnel commitments necessary for their completion. The recommendations may cover a full range of actions or be limited to one detailed program or activity.

3. The competition is open to any individual or group of individuals. Each submission must be in the name of one individual and accompanied by the official entry form. The names of others participating in the submission should be listed in the space provided on the entry form.

4. Entries must be postmarked no later than December 31, 1966, and received no later than January 10, 1967. They must be mailed to: Business Citizenship Competition, c/o the American Security Council, 123 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. Authors of award-winning submissions will be notified by mail on or before June 30, 1967.

5. Judging will be by a panel drawn from the National Strategy Committee and officers of the American Security Council. Decisions of the judges are final. All submissions become the property of the Schick Safety Razor Co. and the American Security Council and may be used by either or both in whatever way they deem appropriate.

6. Each participant in the competition may designate an educational institution or not-for-profit organization which is cooperating in the American Security Council's study on "The Business in the Cold War," to receive a contribution in his name equal to his cash award if he is one of the five top winners.

Cooperators will be welcomed from the ranks of bona fide colleges and universities, public or private, and from among the many nonprofit organizations whose interests include some element of national security.

To enroll as a cooperator in the current study, qualified institutions and organizations are invited to complete and send in the

March 3, 1966

(d) Steel fire screen bulkheads should be provided with incombustible insulation to provide adequate fire barriers.

(e) All exposed paneling in passageway bulkheads that provide escape routes from passenger and crew staterooms should be of incombustible material.

(f) All stairwells should be trunked in with incombustible paneling and fitted with fire screen doors to enclose the area.

(g) All ventilation ducts that pass through fire zone bulkheads should be provided with automatic fused fire dampers.

(h) The sprinkler system should cover all interior combustible spaces accessible to passengers and crew including spaces where combustible material might be stored.

(i) A loudspeaker communication system should be provided to all passenger and crew areas.

(j) All emergency means of escape available, such as stateroom windows and portholes, should be kept in good operable condition.

(k) Vital communications systems such as general alarm circuits, loudspeaker system, etc., should be installed clear of high fire hazard areas and/or insulated against early damage.

(l) Pressure should be maintained on the fire main system at all times.

(m) On all overnight voyages on vessels equipped with berthing areas a fire and boat drill, including muster of passengers, should be held at starting or shortly thereafter.

(n) Consideration be given to the adequacy of communication among officers, crew, and passengers concerning matters pertaining to safety of life at sea.

5. That the Commandant, through the U.S. representatives to IMCO, seek to revise the construction standards of new passenger vessels prescribed in the 1960 SOLAS to require the maximum use of incombustible material, as opposed to reliance on sprinklers and detecting systems in conjunction with partially combustible construction.

6. That the Commandant give consideration to implementing letters of commendation to those vessels and personnel who performed in the rescue operation in the highest tradition of the sea. This will be the subject of separate correspondence from the Board.

LOUIS M. THAYER,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Chairman.

J. B. McCARTY,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Member.

WILLIAM KESLER, Jr.,
Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Member
and Recorder.

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mr. TEAGUE of Texas' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REFORMS HAILED

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

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's plan to intensify political, social, and economic reforms, with particular stress on rural reconstruction in South Vietnam, is hailed in a recent article appearing in the magazine of Wall Street.

The writer, John Scott, quite candidly points out that there is good reason for the President's insistence that major emphasis now be placed on this effort.

The informative and frank article concludes with the opinion:

President Johnson is moving cautiously but firmly to apply more and more military pressure in Vietnam. Now he is moving to bring the reconstruction effort up to the level of the war effort. This is a balanced and sane approach to the problem which rejects the counsels of extremism at either end of the spectrum.

Knowing that many will want to read this frank and informative article from start to finish, I suggest that it be published in the RECORD:

THE ANSWER TO VICTORY IN VIETNAM

(By John Scott)

The most important result of the Honolulu Conference between President Johnson and the leaders of South Vietnam was the strong joint commitment to intensify political, social, and economic reforms, with particular stress on "rural reconstruction."

There was good reason for the President's insistence that major emphasis now be placed on this effort. The failure so far of United States and South Vietnamese officials to achieve any significant improvement in the lot of the peasants in most of the Government-held areas is the Achilles heel of the anti-Communist effort in Vietnam.

A year ago, when the South Vietnamese military effort appeared to be on the verge of collapse, the major emphasis had to be placed

on increasing U.S. military strength. The first priority naturally was to avert military disaster. Economic, medical, and educational programs had to take second place.

SO FAR

Now American armed strength has been increased from 25,000 a year ago to more than 200,000 and more troops are going in all the time. North Vietnam has been brought under limited U.S. aerial attacks to show the Hanoi regime that it will not enjoy a privileged sanctuary while engaging in the effort to overthrow the Government in the south. In the words of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, "we have stopped losing the war."

While we are a long way from "winning" the war—and the Communists spurn all bids to talk peace—we are in a position to devote vastly more time, men and money to the reconstruction programs necessary for any lasting success.

WHY HO CHI MINH HAS THE EDGE

The necessity to bring about a rather dramatic improvement in the social, economic, and political situation of the rural areas under control of the Saigon government is particularly acute because the background of the struggle in Vietnam since 1946.

President Ho Chi Minh of Communist North Vietnam has a far greater influence on the peasants in South Vietnam than many Americans realize. He was the "George Washington" who led them to independence in 1954 after a long and bitter struggle against the French. He still is revered by many millions of peasants in the south who haven't the vaguest idea what "communism" is and don't particularly care.

On their list of priorities, food and clothing, housing, and a bare education, are the top items. Ideological considerations are away down the list.

From their standpoint, there is little difference between the Saigon government and the Vietcong. When "Uncle Ho" tells them everything will be better if they support the Vietcong in its effort to run the Americans out and destroy the Saigon government, they are inclined to believe him.

THE COMMONSENSE ANSWER

The United States and the Saigon government can overcome this problem only by improving living conditions in Government-held areas and areas reclaimed by the Government dramatically enough to demonstrate the advantages of life in non-Communist territory. A successful program along this line not only will erode peasant support for the Vietcong but broaden support for the Saigon government and give it a stability it has not been able to achieve since the overthrow and murder of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

The task is not going to be easy. While the Saigon government has dominion over the majority of people in South Vietnam, because it holds the big cities, it is in control of only one-fourth of the territory.

The Vietcong and their North Vietnamese colleagues hold about one-fourth of the area.

The remaining one-half of the land in South Vietnam is a sort of "no-man's land," penetrated by military forces of both sides but held by neither.

It is in this vast "no-man's land" that the Saigon government, with U.S. military support, must hack out its gains and consolidate them by swift application of reconstruction measures which will enlist the wholehearted support of the local inhabitants.

CONSIDERATIONS THAT MOVED PRESIDENT JOHNSON

It is clear then why President Johnson felt it time to raise the reconstruction campaign to a level of equal importance with the military effort. The joint communique

issued in Honolulu spelled out "three particular points" in the reconstruction program as being "essential for rapid progress":

"1. Continued emphasis by both Vietnamese and allied forces on the effort to build democracy in the rural areas—an effort as important as the military battle itself.

"2. Continued emphasis on the design of rural reconstruction work to meet the people's need for larger output, more efficient production, improved credit, handicrafts and light industry, and rural electrification.

"3. Concentration of resources—both Vietnamese and American—in selected priority areas which are properly related to military plans so that the work of rural reconstruction can be protected against disruption by the enemy."

President Johnson returned from Honolulu determined to see the reconstruction program pushed effectively and his peace efforts continued along with the military campaign. He believes, according to his aids, that:

Hanoi and Haiphong should not be bombed.

Communist China will not enter the war if the United States continues present policies.

His policies are correct and his critics, both on the left and right, offer no practical alternatives.

NOT YIELDING TO PRESSURES AND WHY

The President has been under considerable pressure from some military men and some Congressmen to bomb the industrial installations in the area of the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi and the port city of Haiphong. However, he shows no sign of giving in to this pressure.

He may well feel that destruction of these cities would not end Communist resistance, that it might bring Red China into the conflict.

He also must recognize that the large civilian casualties would weaken the U.S. stand in the eyes of many of the nations now inclined to sympathize with Washington.

THE FRENCH HELD THE BIG CITIES, BUT LOST THE WAR

The French, who failed to hold Indochina with 500,000 men, frequently have pointed out that they held Hanoi, Haiphong, Saigon, and every other major city in North and South Vietnam and Ho's men still licked them.

IN SUM

Thus—while the French position in 1954 and that of the Americans today are not analogous, there are enough points of reference to make it doubtful that Ho and the Vietcong can be defeated by bombing the big cities in the north.

President Johnson is moving cautiously but firmly to apply more and more military pressure in Vietnam. Now he is moving to bring the reconstruction effort up to the level of the war effort. This is a balanced and sane approach to the problem which rejects the counsels of extremism at either end of the spectrum.

If the strong words on social, economic, and political reform in the Honolulu declaration are followed by strong action along those lines in Vietnam, the road ahead may become considerably brighter.

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the President told the Congress in his message this week on domestic health and education that "a poor diet is a root cause of disease." I wholeheartedly agree.

I am also firmly of the opinion that the roots of a healthy nation are in the youth of America. President Johnson said that it is hard to teach a hungry child. I wholeheartedly agree.

We need to insure that the American youth be healthy, that he be vibrant, that he have the vitality he will need in the complex and challenging years ahead. We need to insure, as best we can, that he get the proper nourishment that his growing body and mind needs.

Yet, President Johnson's new budget calls for drastic reductions in the existing school lunch and special milk programs. He has submitted a proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which would be a new effort directed at feeding the needy. There is no doubt in my mind that we must continue to help feed hungry children who lack a proper diet.

However, it does not seem wise or even logical to do away with a program which has worked well since 1954. In the special school milk program, we get more return for less expenditure than in any Federal subsidy program with which I am familiar.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill today which will continue this program which is now used in over 92,000 schools throughout the country.

The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 would be directed only toward the needy child. Who is to declare who the needy children are? In my judgment, all children need milk and it is fallacious to maintain that only the needy child would benefit from a milk supplement.

The school milk program has worked efficiently for a long time and at relatively small cost to the Government. I would like to see it continued.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at a press conference recently several colleagues on the other side of the aisle expressed concern about the status of the Small Business Administration, alleging that the agency had been neglecting the problems of small business. These allegations are inaccurate and I am most pleased to state the facts and set the record straight.

Under President Johnson's guidance and leadership the major programs of the agency are operating at record levels.

In terms of the agency's lending programs, which is a true measure of the effectiveness of the agency, I am pleased to report the following facts:

During fiscal year 1960, for all its financing programs the agency loaned a little more than \$171 million. In this current fiscal year, the total lending level will be about \$718 million. Next year, under President Johnson's budget, that total will be increased to \$725 million, more than four times what the agency accomplished in 1960.

It is also interesting to compare these figures on a program basis. Concern has been expressed about the business loan program. In 1960, the agency put out a total of \$144.3 million in regular business loans. Last year they established a new record of approximately \$339 million. This year, despite curtailment they expect to exceed that record, raising the total amount to \$354 million. Next year under President Johnson's budget, the program level for regular business loans will be \$428 million. Again, this is almost four times what they were able to accomplish in 1960.

The comparisons carry through for every SBA loan activity. Loans to State and local development companies in 1960 totaled \$4.6 million. This year their volume will be almost nine times that amount—\$40 million. Next year under President Johnson's budget for SBA, they will increase that amount by 25 percent to \$50 million.

In 1960, approximately \$18.4 million was loaned to small business investment companies. This year, the amount will be about \$75 million and next year you can expect a similar amount.

The amount of funds allocated for disaster lending depends, of course, on the need. In 1960, the amount was slightly in excess of \$4 million. This year it will be \$220 million. While a comparison of these amounts is not particularly useful as such, the disaster loan program being carried out in the agency today does throw some light on the present quality of leadership and efficiency of the agency. Put very simply, since Hurricane Betsy struck Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana in September of last year, this agency in response to that and other needs, made more disaster loans than were made in the entire history of the agency. This was accomplished at a time when the agency's 68 field offices were operating the business loan program at record levels. In the Betsy disaster area alone, they will make approximately 3,000 loans.

In 1965, they added a new program of loans to impoverished businessmen which was incorporated in the Economic Opportunity Act. That year they loaned \$2 million. This year they will increase to approximately \$25 million and next year, under the new budget the amount will double to \$50 million.

If the size of SBA is any indication of importance, then we find that under President Johnson's budget, at a time when budgets are very tight, the agency will increase significantly to almost 5,000 employees. This can be compared with a little more than 2,000 in 1960. This growth does not suggest plans to downgrade or destroy the agency.

sumer—who buys what he must—regardless of price.

The cost of living index as currently contrived by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is faulty and misleading. It fails to include the high cost of family interest and increased contributions to retirement and health programs. Statistically, it leaves the individual family with disposable income which does not exist.

There are other ways to control credit expansion which seem completely overlooked by the Federal Reserve. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal insurance corporations have the authority to increase the liquidity of banks and savings and loans simply by ordering an increase in the reserves. Without raising interest rates one penny, the lending institutions would be stirred into the purchase of Government securities to bolster liquidity. This would contribute to the stability of public borrowing and reduce the rate at which the Government itself could borrow—reducing in this way the cost of servicing the public debt. Perhaps this would call for a higher degree of patriotism than we have a right to expect from our bankers. However, a reserve increase policy should be completely suitable to responsible lenders who should see the long-term advantage to national fiscal policies.

An increase in bank reserves would dry up excess credit and continue to make it available for priority purposes at no greater costs.

The Federal Reserve policies on collateral lending restrict credit to 30 percent on securities listed on the major exchanges. However, no such restriction applies on over-the-counter issues in which lending institutions can loan without reservation and participate in unregulated speculation.

Frankly, a full and continuous congressional hearing is long overdue on economic and fiscal policies. The war on inflation demands our daily vigilance.

America has been built upon enterprise, prudence, and a national distaste of usury.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD'S INTEREST INCREASE MAY HAVE TURNED PHANTOM INFLATION INTO AN ECONOMIC MONSTER

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to wholeheartedly endorse the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board to stem a "phantom inflation" may have actually produced an inflation where one did not exist. In the area of home building the increase in the discount rate which was followed by the rise in FHA mortgage interest charges have succeeded only in raising the cost of housing; and when the cost

of housing goes up, the cost of building materials must go up, and so on around the circle until prices on virtually every service and product rise.

I sincerely hope that the Federal Reserve Board will not make the same mistake again, but I have an uneasy feeling that the Board is planning to adopt an even higher increase in the discount rate and bank savings account rates in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, but I will use a practice adopted by many trial attorneys called arguing in the alternative. Under this practice, the lawyer contends that his client did not punch the plaintiff in the nose, but if his client did punch the plaintiff, then it was only because the plaintiff struck him first. By arguing in the alternative, I will state that there is no inflation in this country, but if there is an inflation, it was caused by the Federal Reserve Board's hastily concocted interest rate increase.

The United States, as we well know, is sailing along in its period of peacetime prosperity. For some unknown reason, the Federal Reserve Board through its economists, self-appointed prophets, and ouija board operations have determined that we are not in an era of prosperity, but rather are in the midst of an inflation and the only remedy they foresee to cancel this period of prosperity is to raise interest rates.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss interest rates and tightening of money with the Governor of the Italian Central Bank System, Gov. Guido Carli. In the past several years Italy was faced with what everyone, I am sure, will consider a bona fide inflationary period. The Italian Central Bank, following established Federal Reserve Board policy, sought to solve the inflation by tightening money. I want every Member of this Congress to know that Italy solved its problem of inflation by tightening money. No longer is there inflation in Italy. The country—as a result of the tight money policy—is now in the throes of one of its worst depressions and Governor Carli personally admitted to me that—

We might have gone a little too far in our tight money policies.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board, by tightening credit, has taken the tiger out of the tank and injected it into the monetary system. It has jerked the tail of the monetary tiger and gained an instant response. But what happens when the Federal Reserve Board faces the task of stimulating the economy? No longer can they jerk the tiger's tail. They must now push that same tiger and, like the tiger, it is not easy to push a recessionary monetary state bank to a time of prosperity.

For several months the Small Business Administration has been under fire for its cutback lending policies, and I fail to see an end to SBA's problems unless the Federal Reserve Board withdraws its rate increase. At the present time the Small Business Administration cannot make loans with an interest rate of more than 5½ percent. In addition, it must make millions of dollars worth of 3-per-

cent disaster loans and many other millions of dollars worth of loans that bear 4- or 5-percent interest rates. In order to make these loans, the agency must reimburse the Treasury for the money lent at an interest rate which is equal to the current Government money market. At the present time it costs the Government nearly 5 percent to obtain funds. If SBA is required to pay Treasury nearly 5 percent for its money and then turn around and relend the money to disaster victims and small business owners at rates as low as 3 percent, then it does not appear that the agency can go on indefinitely making loans. This same situation applies to every governmental agency or program which is engaged in the lending business. The only way to solve this situation is to reduce interest rates in general and thereby lower the cost which the Government has to pay to obtain funds. In short, the less money the Government has to pay in interest on its funds, the more money that SBA and other Government lending agencies will have available. I urge every small businessman to write and to protest to the Federal Reserve Board for increasing the discount rate and together let us lay the responsibility where it belongs—at the feet of the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Speaker, I shall not go into the motives that were in the Federal Reserve Board's mind when it raised interest rates but only hope that these gentlemen can justify this increase to themselves when it turns a period of prolonged prosperity into a period of depression.

UN

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the voices of dissent have been heard throughout the land. Many of these have impugned our Armed Forces in Vietnam—inferring that they are oppressors or tools of imperialism.

While these voices have not been many in number, they have been broadcast loudly throughout the country. The story of their so-called dissent has been distributed to the press of the world and has undoubtedly given great hope to our enemy. I do not question that they have also encouraged him to fight on with renewed vigor despite the efforts of our Government to bring about a just settlement of the conflict.

Some might come to the conclusion that the morale of our fighting forces in Vietnam would be destroyed by these dissenting messages from their home base. Never in past wars has the American fighting man lacked in support from the home citizenry. While we can but agree that the right of the dissenter to be heard is fair, we also believe that it is about time that the voice of the assenter has an equal opportunity to reach the ears of the people. I know of no segment of our populace who can better speak for the American people than the rank and file of the servicemen who are serving overseas.

Computed annual interest rate on the public debt, marketable issues, 1939-Dec. 1965

End of fiscal year or month:	Total
1939	2.525
1940	2.492
1941	2.413
1942	2.225
1943	1.822
1944	1.725
1945	1.718
1946	1.773
1947	1.871
1948	1.942
1949	2.001
1950	1.953
1951	1.981
1952	2.051
1953	2.207
1954	2.043
1955	2.079
1956	2.427
1957	2.707
1958	2.546
1959	2.891
1960	3.449
1961	3.063
1962	3.285
1963	3.425
1964	3.659
1965, June	3.800
December	3.890

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1964, and Treasury Bulletin, November 1965.

Mr. Speaker, let me translate these percentage increases in interest rates into more meaningful terms. Since 1952 the people of this great Nation have paid some \$60 billion in excess interest costs. This figure is based on the level of interest rates existing in 1952. This amounts to almost 10 percent of the gross national product in 1965 and more than half—more than 50 percent—of the estimated Federal administrative budget for fiscal 1965. I need not dwell on the many vital programs these funds could be invested in if they did not have to be paid out in higher interest rates.

When the Martin regime took over in 1951, the Nation's taxpayers were paying \$6 billion in interest on the national debt. Today, 15 years later, this figure has skyrocketed to \$13 billion. In each of the past 3 years, Mr. Martin has raised the discount rate on the wholesale cost of money to the banks.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no hope that Mr. Martin will exercise voluntary restraint. If we allow him, Mr. Martin will lead us to total monetary disaster. And the great long silence of the Congress leads Mr. Martin to believe that he is free to follow this reckless course.

Therefore, I am convinced that the Congress in this session must set the record straight. In the next few days, I plan to meet with our "unofficial steering committee to maintain the 4¼-percent interest rate." As you know, this committee is composed of 87 Democratic Members of the House. I plan to ask the committee to consider the introduction of a resolution which would include these points among others:

First. That the Federal Reserve Board rescind its order of December 6 and return the discount rate to 4 percent.

Second. That the House of Representatives go on record in support of the 4¼-percent maximum on long-term Government securities.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret to anyone in this Chamber that I am strongly in favor of a complete overhaul of the Federal Reserve System so that it is more responsive to the people and to the elected representatives of the people. I have introduced legislation to accomplish this I hope Congress will see fit to act on this legislation soon.

However, today I address myself to the need for an immediate and emergency resolution setting forth the sense of the Congress on the financial issues which cannot wait. All of us know we are facing the absolute necessity of providing funds for massive military expenditures in southeast Asia. This is a fact that cannot escape us. Therefore, I feel it is imperative that we take action now that will assure that we can finance and carry on this war without bankrupting the Nation through skyrocketing interest rates.

We should strongly consider steps which will allow the country to finance the Vietnam expenditures on a formula comparable to that used in World War II, when interest rates on long-term Government securities never did rise above 2½ percent.

Let us not deceive ourselves. We are at the crossroads. In one direction we can let the big banks and their willing ally the Federal Reserve Board stoke the fires of rising interest rates in wartime profiteering. Or we can take a more rational and sounder position which will hold interest rates down and give the Johnson administration the ability to finance the Vietnam conflict within reasonable monetary limits and without inflation.

We cannot dodge the issue. We cannot dodge our responsibility. The country is watching and waiting.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, in emphasizing the danger of continued high interest rates. I commend the gentleman for his outstanding work in bringing to the attention of the American people the folly of high interest policies and in citing the terribly high cost that it imposes on our economy and on each of our citizens.

During the past 15 years, the national debt has increased by 20 percent, but during the same period the interest cost on the debt has gone up 100 percent. Comparable increases in the field of private credit cost the American consumer many billions of dollars each year.

Because of the imminent danger of further increases and because of the need for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority in monetary matters, I introduced a bill on March 1 which would require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to obtain congressional confirmation for changes in rates of discount. Under provisions of the bill, the Board would retain the flexibility to make changes, but without congressional confirmation, they would remain in effect for only 90 days. Congress would have the power to rescind the Board's action at any time during the 90-day period.

This degree of congressional control must be asserted to assure that the national monetary policies of the Federal

Reserve Board do not conflict with the combined economic policies of the Congress and the national administration.

Again, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and all of those who have joined in this most vital effort to maintain stability in the Nation's banking and credit systems.

SPIRALING COSTS OF CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Committee on Economic Report for directing the attention of the Congress to the spiraling costs of credit brought about by recent Federal Reserve policies.

I cannot join those who reason that an inflationary price spiral can be curbed by raising the price of money borrowed for enterprise or family life. Our pricing experience since the unwarranted rise in the discount rate last December has not reduced a single price. On the contrary, it has added considerably to every item of purchase. For the average American who must rely upon credit, the new house is drastically more expensive—and so is the automobile and the refrigerator. The added interest rate paid to those who lend money is like a new excise tax on every item of purchase—ordered to be paid by an agency of the Federal Government to private lending agencies. This exercise of the power of the Federal Reserve constitutes the worst form of "administered pricing," pricing upward for the lending industry.

During the past 60 days, the cost of living index continued more sharply in its upward trend. It is not coincidence that the acceleration of trend during the past 60 days over the previous 60-day period appears to be just about equal to the increase in the cost of credit—decreed by Federal Reserve policies.

The method of calculating the cost of living index fails to include the cost of credit as a family commodity—and yet in my district the cost of credit per family ranges from 10 percent of family income to as much as 35 percent of family income. The action of the Federal Reserve on December 6 raising the discount rate from 4 to 4.5 percent had the effect of precipitating at least a 12½ percent rise in the interest rate at all consumer level—thereby driving low-income, high-borrowing families closer to the poverty levels.

Business and industry can simply tack on added interest rates as an additional business expense, added to the higher price. Through the multiplying effect of price increases at the production, wholesale, distribution, and retail levels, the economic domino pressure eventually crashes down on the family con-

March 3, 1966

4663

Despite the terrors of guerrilla warfare, the penalties of tropical disease, the lack of adequate supplies, the bombing of his rest zones, the failure of total support from home—our servicemen have carried on in the tradition of heroism that has marked our fighting men in every conflict since we first took up arms in the Revolutionary War.

The American serviceman's morale has also remained high through the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam. He knew full well that this cessation would permit the enemy to bring larger forces to oppose him and that greater casualties would be forthcoming. In the renewal of that bombing, he has seen the failure of the cessation plan and the realization that the road ahead is one that could cost him his life.

Winston Churchill said:

No one can guarantee success in war, but only deserve it.

Most certainly by our actions in the Vietnam situation, we are deserving of success. Our motives are clear and honest. At one time, we put trust in the words of the Communist nations and thus placed entire nations of people into bondage. The Berlin wall remains to this very day as a symbol of the imprisonment of millions.

I have not chosen the dove nor the hawk as my symbol in the great debate that exists in the Congress. I have instead remained firm in the support of that bird which has ever symbolized a just freedom for all—the American eagle.

I do not disagree with the principle of debate. I do say, however, that the national interests of our Nation should be ever paramount during such discussions.

I pledge my entire support to our Armed Forces in Vietnam and that, of course, includes the decisions of its Commander in Chief.

Just today, I attended the signing of the new GI bill. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has always treated such matters in a nonpartisan manner. I worked very closely with its most able chairman, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, in the preparation and passage of this bill. As I stood in the White House and watched the President sign this measure, I could but feel that this was a further demonstration to our men in Vietnam that the overwhelming majority of this Congress supported them.

Before the Christmas holidays, the Akron Beacon Journal, with its usual concern for the welfare of our servicemen, asked the parents of those serving on foreign shores to send in their names and addresses so that the readers of that paper might be able to send them Christmas cards. I do know that the Akron populace responded en masse to this opportunity. My son, Frank, who is serving with the Navy in Asian waters has told me that he received a large volume of mail. I am certain that the other men also received many well wishes from the Akron Beacon Journal's readers.

I also wrote a letter to each one of these young men, from my district, who were serving overseas. I wish to assure them that I am appreciative of their actions and that the people of the United States of America, with but few exceptions, are standing firmly in their support.

I did not ask nor did I anticipate a reply but I was most pleased to receive a large volume of mail from them.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in my remarks, I stated that no one could better speak for the assentors than our servicemen overseas. I shall read a number of the letters that I have received from the men who are serving on foreign soil. I would have you note that without exception they not only know what they are fighting for but have no dissent with it.

Their letters have brought pride to my heart and tears to my eyes. I do not include the letter that I have received from my own son, Frank, who is serving amongst them, but I assure you that he agrees with every one of their statements.

I hope that every Member, not only of this House but of the other body, as well, read their words. We can have no greater authority than this, for our future actions.

They ask for our support and prayers. Can we deny them to them?

Some of the letters follow:

U.S.S. "SACRAMENTO,"
December 26, 1965.

WILLIAM H. AYRES,
14th District, Ohio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I wish to thank you very much for the letter that I have just received from you. It meant a lot to me and to all my shipmates.

Some of the men have received "anti-U.S. intervention in Vietnam" letters from people back home. They sound as if they don't know what is really happening. For this reason, your letter meant a lot to all of us.

I myself wish that all people everywhere could live together in friendship with no fear of each other. We, I know, are trying to make such a world by fighting communism here in the Vietnam area.

Sir, when you asked if there was anything that you could do for me, I thought of only one thing. I was wondering if you, yourself, would tell everyone in the United States the whole truth on why we are over here fighting; tell them we are here to help save the whole world from communism. I do not think that half the people of the United States really know that this is why we are here.

From the news we get, it seems that they are fighting among themselves over something that they do not really understand.

Thank you again for the letter. I want to wish you a very Merry Christmas and wish you many more in the years to come.

Your friend,

BOB WALKER.

OUI NHON, VIETNAM,
January 3, 1966.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I want to thank you for sending me that wonderful letter and taking out the time to write to me.

Everything is going along for me here in Vietnam fairly well. Sometimes it is a little rough, but it is an honor for me to be chosen from Ohio to serve in the Army.

The only thing that I could ask of you is to say some prayers so that we can win the war over here.

I am a little late in wishing you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

SP4C THOMAS J. SZUDLO,
151st Transportation Company.

DECEMBER 24, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I would like to start this out by saying how much I appreciate your kind thoughts at Christmas.

Every man in America has to fulfill his obligation to his country.

Men like your son and myself fulfill this by doing our part.

The Armed Forces today are ready to meet any task the enemy or country calls for. We will continue to stay ready to defend until peace unites all countries and America calls us home for good.

Merry Christmas and the best of New Years to you and yours.

Sincerely,

CPL. CARL E. OSBURN II,
A Battery, 2/27th Artillery, 3d Armor
Division.

DECEMBER 12, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I don't know how to thank you enough for your letter.

It proves to me that there are people who will take time out from their daily schedules to care about us.

It was a truly kind gesture which I sincerely appreciate.

I have something for you. It speaks, I believe, for every man in uniform today and I would appreciate your reading it and passing it on to the other House Members if you believe it to be good enough.

Once again, thank you very sincerely for your letter and I hope you and yours have a very Merry Christmas and happy New Year.

Pfc. MICHAEL K. JOHNSON,
Company A, 2d Battalion, 37th Armor.

DECEMBER 12, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Just a few lines to thank you for your letter to one of our men. Being a GI during these troubled times, letters such as yours does much for one's morale. Many people in the United States don't realize the situation we are faced with. Although we are stationed in Europe, many miles away from our counterparts in Vietnam, we realize the hardships and trouble they suffer. I'm sure we speak for the many men in uniform when we say thank you for your kind support.

It's hard for us to understand the reasoning behind these peace loving Americans who walked around supporting the very people who are killing their sons and neighbors. What must it take to bring these individuals around to their senses? Did our grandfathers and fathers go through the same when they were called up to defend their country?

Don't these people realize that basically what the young men of today are fighting is just the sons and grandsons of the past oppressors. Sure their color and features are different but their ideas are no different than those of the Kaiser, der Fuhrer, II Duce and the Rising Sun. The young men of today are fighting more than an enemy, they are fighting for ideals and beliefs that have been taught to them from youth, yet their own teachers are now saying they are wrong, that they should give up and return home. What kind of home would they return to if they did this? What kind of home would they have now if their fathers and grandfathers had just given up? To-

March 3, 1966

day it's the Constitution—what's it going to be tomorrow—"The Communist manifesto?"

Each day here in Europe units lose from three to five men daily who have volunteered for service in a forgotten war. Are these youths warmongers or just men who believe in America's future? Some day these same young men hope to raise families and I'm sure they would much prefer to raise them as they remembered it: TV, local dances, stopping at the local hamburger shack for a snack. This brings a question to mind. What if the one hundred and some odd Red divisions rolled across the border that we are protecting into the heart of Europe. What would be America's reaction, that we were warmongers? Is there a difference? The hammer and sickle has many faces and colors (as was proven in Korea). We say there will never be another Pearl Harbor; will there be?

Sir, this letter all came about because you were considerate enough to express your appreciation in the form of a Christmas greeting to one of our men. Along with this soldier we, the men of this company, would like to extend sincerest gratitude and appreciation to you, along with our wishes for a very merry Christmas and a fruitful New Year. Our thanks, sincere thanks, to the men in Vietnam, to you, and the many Americans who have not forgotten their heritage.

Sincerely yours,

THE MEN OF A COMPANY,
2D BATTALION, 37TH ARMOR.

FIGHTING SQUADRON 24,
U.S.S. HANCOCK,
December 29, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for sending me a Christmas greeting. I was really surprised. I just don't know what to say. I almost feel honored to have gotten a letter from you. It sure made me feel good to know that you found time out of all your work to send me a letter.

I know my Christmas wasn't the best a man could hope for in the way of being home and all, but as far as proudness goes, I don't think I could have been any more proud than I was Christmas Day. It really felt good to know that I was a part of a team working to conserve freedom and peace for all. I think that my being here is the best Christmas present I could give. I only hope and pray that this war is over soon, so that we all here and in Vietnam can come home to our loved ones safe and sound.

I am on the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Hancock somewhere close to Vietnam. It is hot and we have been working 12- to 18-hour days, 7 days a week. We have been here 2 weeks and we still have 4 to go.

It's not really bad. I guess it's just being out here in the middle of nowhere for days on end that bug you. But I guess it's better than what those poor guys are going through in Vietnam itself. Compared to them, I guess we have it pretty soft. I only pray that we do not lose many more men.

I will close here. Thanks again for everything and I pray that your son will come back safe and sound. As for things here, they are fine and if ever I need your help, I'll be sure to let you know. Thanks. May God bless and guide you in everything you do.

Sincerely yours,

Clyde C. Green, Jr.

KON TUM,
January 8, 1966.

DEAR MR. WILLIAM H. AYRES: I would like to thank you for sending me a very nice letter wishing me season's greetings. It means a lot to a soldier to know that he isn't forgotten when he is away from his family and loved ones.

It is wonderful to know what we servicemen in Vietnam are doing for our country. But we wonder if we have the backing of our fellow citizens who are sitting in their homes, relaxed and happy with their holiday, where they are free. We hear on the radio and read in the Stars and Stripes what a few of our fellow citizens think of what we are doing here.

It is the prerogative of every citizen to protect his rights, but when we receive word of demonstrations against our being here, and of donations to the north, we begin to wonder whose country we are really trying to protect. But there are few people who don't realize or appreciate what the American serviceman is trying to do over here to try and keep our country free.

I always remember what the late President Kennedy (God rest his soul) said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

I hope your son will come back home with his family and loved ones, safe and sound. I hope, too, that your family had a very nice and cheerful holiday. Well, I have taken up enough of your time, so I will close.

God be with you.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN E. FISHEL.

JANUARY 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Thank you very much for your Christmas card. It came to me with over 25 other cards from people whom I do not know.

After reading about the demonstrations in the United States, I was very surprised and happy to receive all the cards that I did.

My faith in the American people has always been great, and this has made me feel even better to hear from so many fellow Americans.

Thank you again.

Sgt. JOHN E. AYERS,
19th Ord Det (ED).

HEADQUARTERS BATTALION, 3D MARINE DIVISION, 1ST PLATOON MILITARY POLICE COMPANY,

December 23, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I want to thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to write me. I really appreciate your thoughtfulness. I must say I certainly was surprised to hear from you, but it was a pleasant surprise for me.

I am proud to personally be able to serve my country in this way. There are so many over here fighting to keep freedom in our land and also to help those who want to have the same privileges that we do. These are people who give their lives each day to keep this freedom that we have been guaranteed by our Constitution.

We of the United States have so much to be thankful for during this Christmas season.

Once again I want to thank you for your letter and I want to wish you and your family a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Cpl. WILLIAM F. SNYDER,
A member of the Armed Forces in Vietnam.

DEAR SIR: I received your wonderful letter today and I must say I was really surprised to hear from you. First of all, I wish to thank you for your great concern over me, as well as the many others from Ohio who are here. I know you are a very busy man and your time is limited, as well as mine, so I wish to take this spare moment I have to thank a very great man and a great leader of our Nation, as well as Ohio. Thank you.

I feel it's a pleasure serving the United States here in Vietnam so that other there might live in peace and enjoy their holiday seasons and worship our Lord as often as possible wherever they may be. I am proud serving my country and I will do all I can in the years to come for world peace.

I just hope and pray that my wife, Nancy and baby, yet to arrive, will always be safe and free from danger, as well as everyone else. I love my country, State, and family and will do anything for our freedom. Thank you once again. God bless you.

Sincerely,

A2c. LARRY L. CARTER,
6250 Air Police Squadron.

U.S.S. "ARNOLD J. ISBELL."

DEAR MR. AYRES: I would, at this time, like to thank you for the season's greetings, which you so thoughtfully extended to myself and, I presume, to many other servicemen here in Vietnam.

Although I miss not being home for Christmas, I consider myself lucky to be having a turkey dinner on Christmas Day. It is something I'm sure many of the mariners won't get. It doesn't seem like Christmas here at all because of the absence of cold and snow. The only thing I really miss about Christmas is the people.

Once again thank you, best wishes for a merry Christmas for you and your family; and may the people of Ohio continue to support you in your effort to maintain freedom in our country and peace throughout the world.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND MICHAEL ECKARD, SA

DECEMBER 27, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I would like to thank you for your wishes, and also for taking time to do so. I know that you are a very busy person and I thought it was wonderful to hear from you. I have never received such a nice letter, especially from someone who really understands what we go through and the reason why.

We have a wonderful country and it's worth giving up 2 years of my life. That's a small price when so many men have given their lives. I'm here in Germany now. This is my first time away from home. I've seen enough of this country and how the people live to really make me realize how lucky I am to be an American. We have a wonderful country.

I hope very much that your son returns home safely from Vietnam. If I ever need any help, I will let you know. I would like to wish you a very happy New Year. Thank you again for your kind thoughts.

Sincerely,

Pvt. LAWRENCE D. GOMMELL,
Headquarters, Battery, 4th Armored Division.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Thank you very much for your wonderful letter. I've shared it with others that they may appreciate it, also.

I can't tell you how proud we've all been at the wonderful cards and letters we've gotten.

I'm forwarding your letter, with some of the others to my wife and family so they may also share these warm greetings at this festive season.

What is heartwarming are some of the letters of children. If only all adults could share their wisdom and knowledge.

Thank you again. Wishing the merriest of Christmas seasons to you and yours and a very fine New Year.

Very sincerely yours,

Sgt. RICHARD E. BAIR,
Mass--2, MWNG--1, 1st Maw, III MAF.

COMPANY C, 1st SFG (ABN).

DEAR MR. AYRES: Just a note to express my deep appreciation for your thoughtfulness at this time of the year.

I am a member of the 1st Special Forces Group (ABN) and very proud to be wearing the coveted Green Beret. I have received over 100 cards and letters from loyal Ohio citizens expressing their encouragement

March 3, 1966

and support. I've never once doubted the integrity our people are capable of demonstrating when the chips are down.

I have watched your career since your initial election and I am very proud to state that I have never missed voting for you. I met you once back in 1953 when I was a student of Akron University, and have always been grateful for the assistance you rendered to my father by speeding up the arrival of his new wife from Italy. I've always wanted to correspond with you, but have hesitated due to my military status. I believe it is "healthy" and beneficial to keep in touch with our elected officials. I hope some day I will be able to meet you again—I would consider it an honor.

I am proud of my career soldier status and enjoy the honor of helping to defend the American way of life.

Sincerely,

JIM ASENTE,
 Major Infantry.

VIETNAM,
 December 15, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: I am Sp5c. Norman F. Goble. I received a very nice letter from you yesterday. I didn't think I was even known. But I see now at least my State is behind me, and I am very proud to be serving my country. My only thoughts now are returning home to my family in one piece. And I pray the good Lord for that.

And Congressman, I wish you and your family a very merry Xmas and a happy New Year and for the years to come, very prosperous years.

Thank you very much for your concern about me. I just hope my being here will help end this endless war.

And God bless you Congressman—you and your relations—for the years to come.

Yours truly,

NORMAN F. GOBLE,

JANUARY 7, 1966.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity to thank you for the letter that I received from you over the holidays. I hope that you forgive me for taking so long to send this note of thanks.

I cannot explain how glad I was to find out that you had taken time out of your busy schedule to send a cheering note to me over the holidays. It was especially good to find that the majority of the U.S. citizens are behind the American serviceman, as I received several other notes and cards. Thanks again for the wonderful letter.

A1c. KENNETH W. BOLEY,
 6910 Scty. Wing.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your most appreciative letter. I realize that you are a very busy man, so I won't keep you from your work any longer.

All I wanted to say is thanks for thinking of me during the Christmas holidays. As you said, you were in the service at one time and you know how lonely a man can get during this time of year, so again I thank you.

I will remember you at the polls and in my prayers.

Sp4c. DAVID P. BECHER,
 Headquarters WSASAPAC.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I would like to thank you for your letter to me sending season's greetings.

Although my thoughts are of my family at this time, I still think of the people who have sent their greetings to me and other servicemen wishing us well in everything we do. I would like to say that they are not forgotten in our hearts and knowing they are behind us enables us to do an even better job.

Although you are my Congressman, you are people, and I would like to send my sincere thanks for your formal letter and greeting. You are helping me enough by knowing you are behind me.

Thank you,

Your serviceman.

Cpl. MICHAEL M. ROWE,

1st Battalion, 7th Marines, B Co. No. 13.

P.S.—May I wish you and your family a very "Merry Christmas and New Year's holiday." May you have many, many more. May God bless and keep you.

SAN FRANCISCO,
 December 25, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
 14th District, Ohio, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound appreciation and gratitude to you for your Christmas message of December 20, 1965. Such an acknowledgement of one's efforts has a tremendous reinforcing effect, especially at Christmas time.

I noted that the envelope was postmarked in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, which is where I was born and raised, so the letter seems to carry a special significance to me. With your permission, I am sending your letter on to my wife and children in Dayton, Ohio.

May I also extend belated season's greetings to you and yours, with the fervent wish that some day we may all enjoy the holidays in peace and prosperity.

Sincerely,

PAUL T. KEMMERLING, Jr.

DECEMBER 22, 1965.

HON. MR. AYRES: I would like to take this time to thank you for the fine letter you sent me. It was welcomed with my deepest appreciation.

I am proud to be an American soldier for I know it is part of my duty to help maintain freedom for my country and all of my people.

May God bless you for your efforts to see that the American servicemen are being treated fairly.

To you, Mr. AYRES, I wish you a happy Christmas and also wish for your continued fine work in the coming year.

Sincerely,

Pfc. THOMAS E. CRANGLE,
 529th M.P. Company.

DEAR HONORABLE AND MRS. AYRES: This is in regards to your letter I received on the 24th of December.

I would like to thank you and your family for the real nice letter and special thoughts and message you sent to me.

I am hoping and praying that your son arrives home safely from the Vietnam area. I know how much he was missed at your table on Christmas.

With persons like yourself and Mrs. Ayres and the wonderful country we have, it isn't much of a hardship for myself to be away. It is well worth it when you personally know what the outcome could mean if there wasn't anyone to defend and fight for what we love and believe in.

I would like to wish you and your family a wonderful and joyous New Year.

Again, thank you sincerely for your welcome letter. May God bring your son home safely. Best wishes, health, and happiness.

Sincerely,

Sgt. ROBERT F. MCCracken,
 Co. B, 76th Engineer Battalion
 (Construction).

DECEMBER 26, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I appreciated your sending me a letter of season's greetings. In a way over here, it sure isn't like Christmas, but we are trying to get the Christmas spirit.

Oh, yes, we all went down to see the Bob Hope show. It was really great. They had a lot of talent there and it was good to see real American girls. It built up morale a lot around here.

Oh, yes, before I forget, I am a little too late to wish you a merry Christmas, so I am wishing you a happy New Year. Well, I guess that's all for now.

See you in April.

Your friend,

Pfc. LAWRENCE B. SKIBISKI,
 Co. C 2/503 Infantry 173 Airborne.

DEAR SIR: I could never express in words, the warm feeling I got from your letter. Thank you for taking time out of your busy life to send a letter. You are truly a good man.

I would like to wish you the very best of the holiday season. We are all proud to serve when we have people such as you backing us up. We are proud of our Government and the United States.

Thanks for being so kind.

Your friend,

Pfc. JACK C. McCLINE,
 69th M.P. Detachment, USAGOK.

DECEMBER 27, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: I appreciate your holiday greetings.

I, myself, never had any doubts concerning the American people backing us here in Vietnam. In fact, I feel the whole issue is blown up and quite ridiculous.

Sincerely,

Sp4 ROBERT E. PREUSSE, Jr.,
 Company B, Spt. Bn., 1st Brigade,
 101st Airborne Division.

DECEMBER 27, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: Received your letter today, and would like to thank you for writing.

It is very encouraging and gratifying to hear from the people back home to let us know they are with us in thought and prayers.

This is my third overseas assignment and I, for one, am honored to have an active part in our fight for peace.

I really enjoy overseas duty and hope to go to Germany when I am reassigned in 1967. But it is too soon to think about that yet.

Thank you again for your letter.

Yours truly,

S. Sgt. TOM MOYER,
 883d Medical Group, CMR Box 339.

U.S.S. "BELMONT" AGTR-4,
 December 25, 1965.

MR. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
 Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Thank you very much for your holiday greetings. It may sound funny, but I am very proud to have received such a letter from you.

Yes, indeed, sir, my feelings are very much mixed up in many instances. This is my first Christmas away from home, and as you know, it is not the Christmas I formerly knew.

I consider myself a very lucky fellow, Mr. AYRES. As you told me, your son is serving in the Vietnam area. And doing such is a responsibility to which every serviceman of the United States is a part in one way or another. And I know you are very proud of him for his contribution as such.

And thank you for your willingness to help me, sir. But I think with the help of God and the situations and surroundings that I will encounter while in the Navy, I will be able to cope with any problem that might come up.

Again sir, thank you for your interest in myself and my situation.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD VICTOR HOAGLAND, SN.

March 3, 1966

1ST DIVISION, U.S.S. *Duncan* DDR 874,
December 28, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: I received your letter today and must say, I was really surprised. It's not every day I get a letter from a Congressman.

I received seven other letters from people I didn't know personally and I must say, yours and their letters made my Christmas complete. Yours personally made me feel really proud of myself for being in the U.S. Navy.

I get out December 8, 1966, and will definitely be home for next Christmas. This was the third Christmas in a row I missed.

How is your son coming along? Fine, I hope. How long has he been in now?

We just came from Vietnam. We are now at Chow-Chong, and are leaving for the Philippines on January 1. We will be there a few days and we will be pulling out again. I can't tell you where. It's against regulations.

So, how was your Christmas and New Year's? Fine, I hope. I do wish I could have the pleasure of meeting you personally.

Well, BILL, or should I say Congressman AYRES? As I said before, I never got a letter from a Congressman before. Again, I thank you for your letter. May God be with you and your family in whatever you do.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK DANIEL DELAGO.

P.S.—When I get out, I will vote for you.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: Your Christmas greeting was appreciated very much and even more so to a soldier in war-torn Vietnam.

Mine was posted on the bulletin board and even drew a favorable comment from the base commander.

Thank you.

T. S. HOCKNEY,

Airman, First Class, U.S. Air Force.

DECEMBER 30, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I am a serviceman in Vietnam. I have been here for 6 months. I am 30 years old and I live in North Canton, Ohio. I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the letter which I received from you bearing season's greetings. Thank you and all my fellow Americans who are in support of us over here.

I am sure you will continue to do the fine job you have done through the years.

Good luck.

Sincerely,

Sp4c. LARRY EVANS,

Company C, 1st Battalion (ABN), 327th Infantry, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division.

DECEMBER 23, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
*Fourteenth District of Ohio,
Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AYRES: I am in receipt of your letter dated December 20, 1965, and am most proud and honored to receive a letter from one who understands the position of our American servicemen.

We of the U.S. Armed Forces in Europe, are privileged to serve in peaceful surroundings but still special thoughts and prayers go to individuals, as your son, who are doing more than their part for the defense of the free world.

I wish you and your family a merry Christmas, a happy holiday season, and the best of everything throughout the coming year.

Again, thank you so much for the most appreciated letter.

Sincerely yours,

Sp4c. JIMMY R. MOORE,
51st Transportation Company.

U.S.S. *Austin* LPD-4.

DEAR SIR: I would like to thank you for the wonderful letter that you sent. It makes me very proud to be in the service of our great

country and have people who really know what we go through here and throughout the world backing us up. It really makes me feel good and proud to serve. I feel this way despite those people my age and older who make monkeys out of themselves in front of the world about something they know nothing about except from the papers.

I hope you and your fine family had a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Thank you again for the letter.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. PALMATIER, FN.

DECEMBER 24, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: Many thanks for your letter. I can honestly say that it was the most surprising of all the letters I have received. Most people feel that the only time they would ever get a letter from their Congressman is if they write first. But I think I have the distinction of receiving one from my Representative first.

I only hope that you will excuse any mistakes which you may find, but I had a rather hectic day as my first day working alone as desk sergeant. Also, it is Christmas Eve and I am sitting here thinking of Akron and everyone back home.

I hope you had a very Merry Christmas and wish to again thank you for the time you took to write.

God bless you and keep you.

Sp4c. PAUL D. MCGLOTHLIN,
Company C 504 MP Battalion (A).

DECEMBER 24, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: It was very thoughtful for one so busy as yourself to take time to write to me. I voted for you, sir, the first time I ever voted, and your kind gesture has assured you of that vote again if you need it in another election. I am pleased with my choice. I am the only man on my ship who received a personal letter from his Congressman.

I am very interested in the field of government as my vocation. I plan to return to college after my hitch in the Navy, and major in political science, with a position in the government as my goal. I have been watching with considerable interest the States (such as Oregon) that are planning educational subsidies for Vietnam veterans. I will be greatly interested in such a program in Ohio, or even on a national level.

I am sure you, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, are just as interested as I in these programs.

I first saw you when you spoke at our DeMolay chapter and I must say that I really respect your meet-the-people personal approach to politics. It is refreshing in this age of hard-sell politics.

Keep up your good work.

Your loyal supporter,

DONALD F. HALE II,
U.S.S. "Preston" (DD 795) OI Division.

VIETNAM,

December 17, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter today and I surely appreciated the time you took from your work to write me.

I was very glad to hear from you and I thank you in more ways than one.

May you have a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

I am proud that I'm here in the defense of my country, with the knowledge that by so doing, we will always remain free.

May God bless and keep you and your family through the coming year.

Yours truly,

Pfc. RICHARD L. WALTERS,
59th QM (FM) Company.

DECEMBER 16, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I just want to drop you a short note in appreciation of your letter. I

was certainly surprised to receive it and am grateful for your interest in us here.

I am stationed at Camp Holloway, Pleiku, Vietnam, and have been here for 6 months already. Since I put in for a 6-month extension of my tour, I have another year to go. There is one advantage to the great amount of work here; that being, in addition to learning more about electronics, time goes by much faster. My job is aviation electronics equipment repair, which I consider a very interesting job. I plan on going into the electronics field when I get out of the service. As yet I'm not certain what field in electronics I would like the best. Maybe you could give me a suggestion.

Once again, I want to thank you for your letter and I also wish you and your family a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Respectfully yours,

ALVIN KELM.

2034d Signal Detachment.

KUNSAN AIRBASE, KOREA.

December 18, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: It is with pleasure and pride that I pay my compliments to you and those in back of you. My mail has shown the same foresight as you, yourself, have expressed. To know that people just like myself (even though civilians who really will never understand war, etc.) keep the home fires burning is a heartening thing.

Having a son in the service keeps you informed of the events. I've no official complaint to date—just a little homesick like the rest, though I have a good outlook—only about 83 days before rotation of new assignment.

Yours truly,

TED H. MORRIS.

DECEMBER 28, 1965.

DEAR MR. AYRES: I just want to drop you a line to show my deep appreciation for the Christmas greetings you sent me.

I hope your boy is safe and happy if he didn't get home. I'd also like to thank the Beacon Journal for the time and trouble they went to, to make all these greetings possible for the servicemen away from home. I don't think enough thanks can be given to them.

Once again, thank you, and have a happy new year.

Yours truly,

EDWARD H. HUNTER,
*U.S. Navy, R-4 Division,
U.S.S. "Amphion" AR-13.*

DECEMBER 16, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
*Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

Sir: Thank you very much for your recent letter and for your kind wishes at this time of the year, and I, in turn, would like to extend the season's best wishes to you and your family. I sincerely hope that your son will also have as nice a holiday as is possible under these circumstances.

My mother has often told me how very much you have assisted her as she tried to help disabled Air Force veterans and I would also like to thank you for this help. Don't be surprised if she enlists your help in the future since she is quite a determined woman but also quite a wonderful one.

May you and your family have a very happy Christmas and thank you again for your remembrance.

Sincerely,

W. D. MACMONAGLE,
*Major, U.S. Air Force, Detachment 4,
619th Tactical Control Squadron.*

DEAR MR. AYRES: I know you are a very busy man, so I'll make this as short as possible. I wish to thank you for taking the time to wish me a merry Christmas. I am

very proud to be a member of the Armed Forces, serving here in Vietnam. I never realized how fortunate we Americans really are and I am sure all the other men feel the same way.

You asked if there is anything you could do that I should let you know. I would appreciate it greatly if you could send me material on the GI bill.

I know you are a busy man so I'll close my letter.

Thank you again.

Sp4c. GEORGE JUNDZILO.

AT SEA CS Div.,
U.S.S. "HANCOCK" CVA 19,
December 23, 1965.

MY DEAR MR. AYRES: Having been familiar with you through the early part of your political career in the Akron area, I can say that I am very deeply honored to receive your greetings.

It is true you can not know my feelings at the present. But what you have overlooked is the fact that your lot is a heavier load to bear than mine, as I am here and can see what is to happen. But you are home and must wait for news of the unknown. For this reason I extend my sincerest regrets.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and all who are concerned for the benefits which have been extended to the men in combat. The benefits of which I speak are: income tax exemption, which I might add, for a touch of humor, we call legal tax evasion, and the free mailing service. Neither of these are of no great capital gain, it's true, but they tell us that there are people on top of the ladder, looking out for us, and this does a lot for morale.

As I close, once again thank you for the kind and timely greetings. May your holiday be happy and may the New Year treat you well.

Very respectfully,

J. W. BARE,
Signalman, 2.

P.S.—Forgive my poor handwriting, as at this moment we are launching aircraft and this causes much motion of the ship.

I have also received letters of a similar nature from the following oversea servicemen. Only space prevents me from including them in this speech. They echo the words that you have heard from their brothers in service:

Sp4c. Gilbert J. Horonetz, A Battery 2d MSL Battalion 61st Artillery.

James T. Walls, FTM3, Fox Division, U.S.S. America CVA-66.

Jasper L. Shreve, Jr., of 325 Wunderlick Avenue, Barberton, Ohio, now in Korea.

A1c. R. A. Johnson, 2167 Communications Squadron, Box 835.

Pfc. Larry L. Light, 557th Medical Company.

Cpl. Rick C. Hummel, Marine Barracks, 15th V.D., Rodman, Canal Zone, Panama.

Frank J. Banut, III, ETRSN, 696-94-05 OE Division, U.S.S. Independence CVA-62.

A/1c C. D. Craddock, 6250th Supply Squadron.

S. Sgt. D. L. Bradley, 4252d Strategic Wing (SAB), Kadena Air Base, Okinawa.

A2c. David L. Gipson.

Cpl. John G. Stuart, Headquarters, 464th Mar (Armory), 4th Marines, 3d Marine Division, FMF.

Philip C. Schnu, NMFA, U.S. Navy, U.S.S. America CVA-66.

Pfc. Daniel C. Starcher, 993d Quartermaster Detachment.

Pfc. Francis S. Bork, SIG SPT TM No. 2, care of HEB, 1st MSL BN, 67th ADA.

Lt. Gary F. DeBurtitz, Company C, 519th MI Battalion.

A2c. Bob Takacs, U.S. Air Force, 439 Supply Squadron.

Sp4c. Earl T. Hanson, Headquarter Troop 2d Reconnaissance Squadron 3d ACR.

Dennis Rysole, 3d Division, U.S.S. Great Siskin AE 17.

Michael L. Schmitt (SN), 2d Division, U.S.S. Telfair (APA 210).

A1c. Michael A. Martin, Detachment 2200, 7232 MMC, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the men who are prepared to die for our principles. They have given us an example by which we might well conduct ourselves during this time of war.

Before closing, I wish to commend Publisher Ben Maidenburg of the Akron Beacon Journal for creating the vehicle by which the citizens of the 14th Ohio District might communicate their support of their soldier citizens who are serving abroad. The Akron Beacon Journal is also printing a very fine newsletter that they are sending bi-monthly to all of these men. They have done this so that these men might have the news of their home community.

Mr. Speaker, the words that I have spoken here are insignificant compared to the words that you have heard from the patriots serving overseas. Let us make certain that they have not spoken in vain.

SCHOOL MILK AND LUNCH PROGRAMS IN MINNESOTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have protested long and loud in recent weeks the President's request that we reduce the school lunch and special milk programs to much smaller proportions than they now enjoy. Hundreds of thousands of children would be adversely affected by this cut, as my colleagues in Congress have been quick to point out. Letters have literally poured into congressional offices, pleading for the continued support of two programs that have won popular approval at every level. We have letters from concerned parents who have never written their Congressman before. We have letters and telegrams from school district supervisors, principals, business managers, teachers, and concerned citizens. Almost without exception, they want to know why this program is being cut to help pay for a war on poverty that fills local newspapers with stories of scandal, mismanagement, and waste. They want to know why a program whose benefits are obvious, whose benefits are apparent and attainable by every citizen, should be cut to make way for a whole series of experimental programs over which they have almost no control.

In Minnesota, the school lunch and milk programs are so successful that they have had rapid growth rates in recent years. In 1965 alone, participation in the school lunch program increased by 6.1 percent, and school milk participation increased by 11.95 percent. Very few Federal programs—very few indeed—can boast this kind of popular acceptance.

Figures supplied to me by the Minnesota Farmers Union and the Department of Agriculture show the following:

About 455,000 school lunches are served daily in all Minnesota schools and about 800,000 half pints of milk consumed.

In 1965, schoolchildren consumed 77.3 million half pints of milk under the special milk program and 61.1 million half pints served with the noon school lunches.

The school milk program provides for Federal reimbursement of up to 4 cents per half pint of milk served.

Out of Minnesota's 2,850 schools, 2,644 elementary and secondary schools participate in the special milk program, and 1,673 participate in the school lunch program.

Of the 2,211 public schools participating in the school milk program, 1,013 schools supply the milk free of charge; 626 schools charge 1 cent per half pint to the student; 465 schools charge 2 cents per half pint to the student; and 107 schools charge 3 cents or more per half pint.

The 197 other outlets—camps, settlement houses and so on—dispense milk under the special milk program.

Application of a needs test or "means" test would mean that almost all students would have to pay the full cost of the milk, varying from 3 to 5 cents per half pint, which would be 3 or 4 cents more than they now pay.

Presently, only a very small number of students obtain the school lunches free because of low family income. About 4 percent of the schoolchildren participating in the lunch program are given the meals free, but most of these receive the meals in return for assisting with the kitchen or lunch-line work.

As can be seen from the figures, Mr. Speaker, nearly half of the children in participating schools are presently receiving school milk absolutely free. If they are suddenly required to bring from 3 to 5 cents for every half pint of milk they drink, even if only exclusive of lunch milk, their parents are in many cases going to tell them to wait until lunch to have milk, and are not going to give them the 15 or 25 cents per week they need to get their extra half pint per day. This to me represents a great loss. Who knows what percentage of the 64.1 million half pints will not be consumed in 1967? Who knows what this will mean to the nutrition of the children involved? Who knows what effect this will have on the dairy farmers? All these unknown quantities must be carefully weighed against the risk we take if we curtail these valuable programs as the President has suggested.

Mr. Speaker, one-half of a pint of milk contains one-fourth of every child's minimum daily requirement of vitamin D and one-eighth the minimum daily requirement of vitamin A. No one is willing to dispute, I am sure, that these vitamins are essential to growth and general health. Children who have come to depend in part for their daily requirements in these vitamins through the school milk program will inadvertently be cut off from this source; it is more than likely that in many cases these vitamins will not be replaced at other points in the child's diet.

March 3, 1966

Department of Agriculture officials admit that there will be a decrease in milk consumption if the proposed cuts are allowed to take place, and their conservative estimate is a 20-percent reduction. To me, that reduction is more than sufficient justification for the continuation of these programs. When the school milk and lunch programs were initially devised, it was the opinion of Congress that it was immoral for the Government to hoard surplus commodities at great expense when those commodities could be doing untold good for the schoolchildren of the Nation. That precept still holds true. If dairy product consumption goes down as a result of a budgetary cut to these programs, the CCC will have to become more involved in dairy supports, and the taxpayer will be paying to store dairy surpluses at the same time he is paying extra for his child's milk in school. This makes little sense morally or economically.

I AM A TIRED AMERICAN

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I believe most of us will agree that this past winter has been a winter of discontent for many Americans. Perhaps it is best epitomized by an editorial entitled "I Am a Tired American." It was written by Alan McIntosh, publisher of the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn., and has been reprinted in numerous newspapers throughout the Nation. Perhaps it may some day come to be regarded on a par with William Allen White's famous "What's the Matter With Kansas?" which appeared 70 years ago.

So that my colleagues may share McIntosh's editorial, I include it with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I AM A TIRED AMERICAN

(By Alan McIntosh)

I am a tired American.
I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American—weary of having American Embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American—choked up to here on this business of trying to intimidate our Government by placard, picket line, and sit-ins by the hordes of dirty unwashed who rush to man the barricades against the forces of law, order, and decency.

I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby-faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the new wave of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American—nauseated by the lazy do-nothings who wouldn't take a job if you drove them to and from work in a Rolls Royce.

I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched Americans in an obscenity race, who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture.

I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with the civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses; from coast to coast—movies denouncing the United States, movies made in Communist China.

I am a tired American—who is angered by the self-righteous breastbeater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States, but who never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

I am a tired American—who resents the pimply-faced beatniks who try to represent Americans as the "bad guys on the black horses."

I am a tired American—who is weary of some Negro leaders who, for shock purposes, scream four-letter words in church meetings.

I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

I am a tired American—who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes, yet send their own children to private schools.

I am a tired American—who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed. They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American—who gets more than a little bit weary of the clique in our State Department which chooses to regard a policy of timidity as prudent—the same group which subscribes to a "no-win" policy in Vietnam.

I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the "have nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am an American—who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the "Star Spangled Banner" and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpet when Old Glory reaches the top of the flag pole.

I am a tired American—who wants to start snapping at those phony "high priests" who want us to bow down and worship their false idols and who seek to destroy the belief that America is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

I am a tired American—who thanks a merciful Lord that he was lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God, with truly mercy and justice for all.

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

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

[Mrs. MINK'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

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

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

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

THE ROLE OF BUSINESS IN THE COLD WAR

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years ago—on May 8, 1963, to be exact—a very significant exchange was taking place in room H-227 of the U.S. Capitol.

Four distinguished representatives of the American business community were meeting that afternoon with the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The topic under discussion was the U.S. ideological offensive in the cold war.

More specifically, the subcommittee was trying to ascertain what American business was doing, and what more it could do abroad, to advance the cause of freedom and world peace: the twin goals of U.S. foreign policy.

The transcript of that meeting appears in part II of the hearings on "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive," issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It constitutes a significant part of a study which is being conducted by the Subcommittee on International Organizations since 1962: a study of the fourth—the ideological and psychological—dimension of our foreign policy.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have been responsible for the initiation of this study and for its conduct. And I have taken particular pride in one of its achievements: the focusing of public attention—and the attention of policy-making officials in the executive branch of our Government—on the important role which private American initiative continues to play in the global struggle which has engaged the energies and the resources of our Nation for the past two decades.

The role of our private sector was mentioned prominently in report No. 2 on "Ideological Operations and Foreign Pol-

When business people learn and live this truth, business will have come to maturity.

This sounds idealistic. Statements of belief and faith always are. But it is action that is significant and action is difficult. Values must be made real by individuals acting on them, and even then, results are all too apt to be ambiguous. Throughout the corporation, management must find ways to articulate and support these values, as well as the company's objectives.

MORE THAN TECHNOLOGY

Therefore it takes more than technical competence for the successful, responsible conduct of business today. The developing concepts of administration as I have outlined them require an understanding of art, the social sciences, history, religion and literature. In the words of Montaigne:

"We need men and women who know what courage is, and temperance, and justice; what the difference is between ambition and cupidity, slavery and submission, license and liberty; by what signs genuine and solid contentment may be known; to what extent we should fear death, pain, and shame; what springs move us, and the occasion of so many stirrings within us."

In short, the nub is education. We must deeply ponder Judge Stein's opinion in the Supreme Court of New Jersey:

"Nothing that helps or promotes the growth and service of the American universities can possibly be anything short of direct benefit to every corporation in the land."

We of Xerox, for example, believe that the vitality of democracy depends on free and open discussion of the troubling issues, and that this is the only means to continuing education in the movement of events around us.

This is why we support higher education as fully as we can.

It is why we try to increase public understanding of controversial issues, through such television programs as those about the United Nations, or presentations of significance in man's search for freedom and purpose, such as the TV shows about "The Louvre," or "Let My People Go," which told of the Jews' establishment of a homeland in Israel.

But the first purpose of the businessman is the profitable conduct of his enterprise. This is the sole source of his power for good. There can be no controversy on this point.

Yet our experience demonstrates that innovative policies involving social responsibility bring very interesting reactions to the business as a business. Our sponsorship, without advertising, of the U.N. television series, brought an avalanche of favorable as well as unfavorable comment, and has been hailed as a revolutionary action. We knew it would provoke much comment. That is why we decided to do it.

An Elmo Roper survey has shown that thus far we gained much, much more goodwill than we lost.

Another example relates to the proposal by one of our shareholders that our corporate contributions for charity and education be restricted to those which could be proved to be directly beneficial to the company. The proposition, put to a vote at our annual meeting, was overwhelmingly defeated.

The effect upon business of this kind of action is extremely difficult to measure. The only thing we know with certainty is that Xerox has become identified, in the minds of people who know something about it, with progress, with education, and with the spirit of responsibility and that's enough for us.

THE MORAL CHOICE

Pioneering on a frontier inevitably causes deep reactions pro and con. It could not be otherwise. It is the result of the problem of moral choice which faces corporate heads who, like all other citizens, have the

duty of every individual to work for good government and a health of society. It is a tightrope over a deep chasm that the manager walks with only his insight for a balance pole. The risks are great and missteps are inevitable, although we dare to hope inconsequential and temporary, if he is wise.

The businessman must now above all other times act bravely with convictions and courage to inspire him. And to insure the best of his service, society must allow, indeed, ask him to do so. As John Stuart Mill said:

"A state which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

By the same standard, dignity, even greatness can come to those men, and only to those men, who accept fully the challenge of responsibility inherent in their work, whatever the risks. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt:

"Credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena * * * who strives valiantly, who errs and comes up short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms and the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumphs of high achievement; and who at the worst, if he fails, at least falls while daring greatly; so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither defeat nor victory."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 7, 1966

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will announce the program for next week and the balance of this week.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished gentleman from California, we have completed the legislative program for this week.

We have no program for next week to announce at this time beyond Monday.

The program for Monday is the Consent Calendar, and three bills on suspensions:

H.R. 10721, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1966.

H.R. 12762, authorization for funds for the U.S. Coast Guard.

H.R. 11509, amending reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection. UN

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Mr. MADDEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an address by Vice President HUMPHREY.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, at the annual dinner given by the American Legion for Members of Congress last evening, Vice President HUMPHREY gave a review of his recent trip to southeast Asia. It was one of the Vice President's great messages for which he is famous. It was received with almost unanimous approval by the gathering of over 3,000 legionnaires and their guests.

The following are the highlights of his observations and facts concerning Vietnam problems:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE ANNUAL AMERICAN LEGION LEGISLATIVE DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 2, 1966

It is good to be back again with my friends of the Congress and the American Legion. I am particularly pleased to be in the company tonight of my good friend Representative OLIN TEAGUE. I can think of no one in the Congress, who more deserves the award you have bestowed on him.

There is no doubt what is on all our minds tonight. It is the war in Vietnam.

As you know, I returned a few days ago from 2 weeks in southeast Asia and the Pacific. Tonight I would like to give you some of the impressions I bring home from my mission.

First of all, may I say that the conflict we face in Vietnam is not an isolated conflict. It does not exist in a vacuum.

South Vietnam is the testing ground for two struggles taking place in Asia: The struggle of nations to maintain their independence while threatened by Communist subversion and aggression, and the struggle to bring about a social and economic revolution for the people of that part of the world.

In Vietnam, the tide in both those struggles has begun to turn in our favor. But make no mistake about it, we must be prepared to face a long and costly effort.

The military situation has improved over even a few months ago. South Vietnamese, American, and allied forces are holding their own with the Vietcong. They are today taking offensive initiatives in Vietcong sanctuaries which were previously immune to attack. Sections of road and railroad, previously unusable, are being used again. The Vietcong defection rate has increased in the past few months. Defectors report low morale, food shortages, and, above all, fear of bombing among Vietcong forces.

Allied firepower and mobility are increasing.

Tactical air support is excellent.

Our communication and supply situations have improved.

March 3, 1966

4649

occupation and, cynics to the contrary, self-fulfillment involves much more than the size of the paycheck. To the extent he truly can find himself in his work, man will be happy in it. To the extent that he finds outlets for expressing many facets of his makeup, he will feel enriched.

In a recent publication, "Managers for Tomorrow," Rohrer, Hibler & Replogle, psychological consultants, put it this way:

"Growth, finally, is the involvement of personal goals and the sense of venture in pursuing them. This is the meaning of the dedicated man. His personal goals, his company goals, and his job goals have coincidence to a great extent; and his personal power is directed single mindedly toward being himself on his job."

The corporate leader who does not try to conduct his company so as to instill pride in his people is doomed, these days.

The considerations I have discussed—power, farseeing pragmatism, varied motives and self-expression—are a few among many that have affected the nature of large corporations as they are run today in America.

COMBINED FROM NEED

People organize institutions to deal with the recurring problems of a civilized life. The institution of business grew out of the basic needs of all people, from primitive societies to the present day, to make and distribute tools, weapons, clothing, or automobiles and television sets.

In much the same fashion, institutions arise in response to social needs.

In short, the only stability in society, either in business or outside it, is the certainty of change and the need for existing institutions to be prepared for change or become reconciled to extinction at worst and fossilization at best.

The situation is dynamic. Businessmen have not changed; people have not changed; but our environment and its possibilities and demands have. In this ebb and flow our perspective must be enlarged. Required programs must be developed and administered, never mind by whom. We should not oppose either Government intervention or big business expansion for the sake of opposing one or the other, but we should oppose each if it threatens the quality of life.

UNFAMILIAR INVOLVEMENT

Business has not failed in discharge of the duties conventionally assigned to it—the production and distribution of goods. The problem comes when business, in organizing for these necessary and socially significant objectives, finds itself in a realm where there are consequences outside the range of the businessman's training and experience, where criteria are fuzzy indeed.

Acceptance of a corporate commitment to socially responsible action raises fearsome specters in the eyes of both businessmen and the public.

There is the problem of adequate control to insure that power will not overrun the interests of the individual, a difficulty inherent in any large organization. As size and complexity increase, it becomes more and more difficult to administer policies equitably, even those adopted precisely and exclusively for the benefit of the individual.

There is the problem of paternalism, which implies return to a feudal structure of noblesse oblige basically insulting to individual dignity and destructive of individual initiative. Fringe benefits, for example, are sometimes criticized as making a kind of industrial feudalism which binds workers to a particular corporation by threatening losses of seniority, or retirement benefits, to those who change jobs.

Further, any act of responsibility is an exercise of power, and people fear the exercise of power greater than their own, especially when coupled with confusion about goals or means or both.

There is fear that the large corporation itself is a kind of welfare state which may reach into every aspect of life, and could become a leviathan and a threat to freedom. This would be anathema to a society dedicated to pluralism as ours is, and businessmen would deplore it as much as any were it to happen.

Here is the classic moral problem confronting each of us. No man has the right to order the lives of others, even for good, but inevitably, the decisions of the businessman do just this—and yet, act he must.

SEARCH FOR CRITERIA

The revolution in thinking about business' responsibility leads to a search for workable criteria upon which the businessman can base his actions. There appear to be two kinds of criteria: the external standards embodied in formal law, and the internal standards of an ethic based on philosophy and religion.

Although the first of these may take the form of positive, or enabling legislation, most laws governing business have been negative and restrictive. Legislation, both Federal and State, has permeated business activity to an extent that would amaze many people outside it. A vast multitude of statutory restrictions sets limits to the conduct of enterprise.

The truth is that most of the laws which so hedge in the operation of today's business were enacted because of early abuses of freedom by some businessmen and the consequent need to protect various segments of the community. The net result has been to force business into a mold of responsibility—and to keep it there—without providing really workable criteria for the businessman who seeks to reconcile his duties to society and his duties to his share owners.

For example, a highly motivated man would undoubtedly pay his employees a wage consistent with the level of the economy. Not to do so, in the absence of legislation, would be "morally" wrong. Today's laws convert the moral issue to a legal one and say that not to pay at least a specified wage is legally wrong. The businessman, however, continues to have a moral problem. He must determine whether the legal minimum wage is a moral minimum wage.

Beyond these laws, the structure of the corporation itself presents a paradox which restricts the kinds of moral actions a corporation can undertake. The corporation, legally, is organized to act as a person in the conduct of its affairs. Yet unlike a person, it is composed of individuals whose rights must be respected. This second consideration restrains the corporation in many ways. Legally a corporation may, for example, donate a part of its profits to charitable organizations like United Funds. The corporation may also distribute literature to its employees advertising a blood drive. But it is not defensible on any ground for a corporation to order its employees to donate blood, or to exert pressure on them to contribute to a charity.

This points up the distinction which must be made between the kind of service it is right for an individual to offer, and the sort of service proper for an artificial person like a corporation. Progress made by community organizations depends to a large extent on the voluntary contribution of time and energy by members of corporations acting as private individuals. Participation in church activities, fund drives, elections, and service on school boards are matters which must be engaged in by individuals as individuals. Corporations can only foster an atmosphere in which participation of this sort is nurtured. Corporate responsibility must manifest itself in other ways.

LEGAL PROGRESS

Until recent years, there has been a dearth of legal expression on positive actions open

to corporations. Now the law has so developed that it permits the exercise of responsibility to the community through the commitment of corporate resources to charitable purposes. More than 40 States have passed statutes authorizing corporations to make donations to philanthropic and educational institutions. In 1953, a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey established the doctrine:

"When the wealth of the Nation was primarily in the hands of individuals, they discharged their responsibilities as citizens by donating freely for charitable purposes. With the transfer of most of the wealth to corporate hands and the imposition of heavy burdens of individual taxation, they have been unable to keep pace with increased philanthropic needs. They have, therefore, with justification, turned to corporations to assume the modern obligations of good citizenship in the same manner as humans do. Congress and State legislatures have enacted laws which encourage corporate contributions, and much has recently been written to indicate the crying need and adequate legal basis therefore."

A policy of making contributions to worthwhile efforts is the best way, it seems to me, for the corporation to contribute to the welfare of the community without infringing the rights of the individuals who compose it.

A CODE FOR BUSINESS

All of this leads to the notion that business ought to be a profession—in the sense of one which comprises a concept of service and a code for its practice.

Management has largely shifted from the owners of the means of production to a class of salaried managers ultimately responsible to an enormous, diffuse body of shareholders who do not run the business. The new justification for control of resources is knowledge and ability to use them, rather than possession. These facts facilitate understanding of the managerial function as a service, directly to the shareholders and indirectly to the general public. Although managers may own stock, most of them do not control the company through this holding; their services are purchased in the same way people purchase the services of doctors, lawyers, or teachers.

Donald K. David, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, put it this way:

"The goal of professional administration * * * is the achievement through our economic system of a full life beginning with but not ending with material plenty * * *. The direction in which we are moving compels me to say that administration will some day be recognized as the process of conducting affairs in the interest of a life worth living according to the values of our society and the capacity of each individual."

The concept of the businessman as a professional brings me back to my original historic view of business activity. It never has been and is not now outside the dictates of moral considerations. Business today is neither immoral nor amoral by nature; the consequences of its actions in pursuit of its objectives are subject to judgments as to their morality. The businessman, to be successful, to be honorable, must be a full man, developed both intellectually, spiritually, and in the special knowledge relevant to his affairs.

The idea of banditry may be hard to dispel. Distrust has been built upon very real experience. Some bandits are still with us. This does not change the need for acceptance of moral responsibility.

No matter what laws are enacted, no matter what changes transform our institutions, men will err. But through attitude, standards can be high. This goes for the man at the top; it goes for the man at the bottom and for all the ones midway.

March 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4651

Coordination among allied forces has improved.

I think you should know that our American troops are conducting themselves in the best traditions of this country, not only in the field but in their work in building rural schools and hospitals, in helping the Vietnamese people to build, plan, and have hope for the future. Their performance is good, their morale is high, and we have every reason to be proud of them.

Special mention should be made of the excellent rescue and medical care available to our troops in Vietnam. Within 3 hours most wounded receive skilled medical treatment. And fewer than 1 percent of all wounded troops hospitalized fail to survive—this compared to a rate of 8.5 percent in World War I; 4.5 percent in World War II; and 2.2 percent in Korea.

There are no "Yankee go home" signs on the walls in Saigon and other cities. Indeed, the Vietcong themselves seem to have some trouble in getting their soldiers to believe their own anti-American propaganda. Questioning of prisoners and defectors shows that very few of the Vietcong feel the United States seeks conquest or domination in Vietnam.

One prisoner who was questioned said this: "I saw an American once, working with several Vietnamese to repair a bridge. He wore no shirt. I saw that he and the Vietnamese workers understood one another very well."

Another prisoner said that he had seen Americans nearly every day in his area and added:

"I've never seen an American doing something which showed that he wanted to rule the Vietnamese."

And he was right.

We are not in Vietnam to rule the Vietnamese. We are there to repel aggression, and to prove to the aggressors that the price of their aggression comes too high.

We are in Vietnam to maintain the rights of self-determination and national independence in face of calculated subversion, terrorism, and military force.

The other side calls itself the National Liberation Front.

I agree that it is a front—a front for Hanoi and for the expansionist drive of Asian communism.

I have had direct experience with the front tactic. I faced Communists first-hand as mayor of Minneapolis. I helped clean them out of my State political party. And I helped clean them out when they tried to infiltrate the American labor movement and a number of liberal organizations.

And, in case there is any doubt in anyone's mind, let me make it clear that the people who use the front tactic are not mild-mannered social reformers. They are hard, callous men filled with a drive for power and domination over others.

The so-called National Liberation Front in Vietnam is being used by Communists. It is led by Communists, and its direction comes from the north.

And I challenge tonight the idea that the Vietcong is anything but an instrument of the Asian Communist thrust for power.

There are no doubt honest nationalists swept up in the Vietcong movement. But their tragedy is great, for they are being deluded and used—just as others have been in the past.

I said earlier that there are two struggles in Vietnam and southeast Asia: the struggle against subversion and aggression; and the struggle for a better life for the ordinary people of that part of the world.

The first struggle is going better, although there will undoubtedly be disappointments and setbacks ahead.

What about the second struggle—the struggle which can build that area's long-term health and stability?

When I left Saigon, Premier Ky told me "We have begun 12 years late. But it is not too late."

The South Vietnamese Government has now undertaken—late in the day, it is true—programs which will give the people of the countryside a feeling of participation and a stake in their government.

The South Vietnamese Government is working hard to educate Vietnamese children; to feed, clothe, and house hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese refugees; to overcome a dangerous inflation in the Vietnamese economy; to defeat corruption and administrative inertia. It is working hard toward the day when truly free elections may be held.

And we are helping in this second struggle just as we are in the first.

At the same time we seek, as strongly as ever, to bring this conflict to negotiation. Our aim in that negotiation: The establishment of a just and honorable peace—and the chance for the long-suffering, valiant people of South Vietnam to decide their own futures.

We have chosen no easy course. We have not chosen the course of withdrawal. Nor have we chosen the course of massive escalation and violence.

We have chosen the course which faces with sober responsibility the whole complex situation there.

Have we the resolve, the staying power, and the courage to see it through?

If we do not, we may face tomorrow elsewhere the aggression we face today in South Vietnam.

I found, on my journey, that almost all the independent nations of southeast Asia fear the expansionist drive of Asian communism—an ideology which seeks to exploit every possible point of weakness in that part of the world.

The approach of Asian communism is not merely economic, although it capitalizes on the poverty and despair of the Asian peasant.

Its tactic is not merely political, although its hardcore followers are dedicated believers in Marxist doctrine, and although it wraps itself in the robes of nationalism to attract those who are not yet ready for the full gospel.

Its thrust for power is not simply military, although it has never won power except by ruthless use of force—and I believe it never will.

Here in the United States, many thousands of miles away, it is easy to debate and theorize about Asian communism. But, in Asia, it is not a subject for debate. It is a harsh, dangerous reality. The peoples and governments of southeast Asia are facing this reality. And we—and an increasing number of our allies—are facing it with them.

The people of Asia want to decide their own futures. They want to be independent. But no free Asian nation is strong enough to stand alone in face of massive military force, subversion, and terrorism directed against it.

I believe that the time may come when Asian communism may lose its fervor, when it may lose some of its neuroses, when it may realize that its objectives cannot be gained by aggression.

But, until that time, I believe we have no choice but to help the nations of southeast Asia strengthen themselves for the long road ahead.

There truly is no alternative.

The continent of Asia may seem distant and remote to us here in this comfortable ballroom. But I would remind you that, in this nuclear age, no point on the globe is any longer remote from any other. In this time we would well heed the words of great Asian Thinker Confucius.

"If a man take no thought about what is distant, he will find sorrow near at hand."

And so it is that we must rededicate ourselves to the pledges made last month in the

historic declaration of Honolulu—pledges to defend against aggression; to the work of social revolution; to the goal of free self-government; to the attack on hunger, ignorance, and disease; and to the unending quest for peace.

FARM INVESTMENT PROTECTION FOR CITIZEN-SOLDIERS

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that many young farmers may be drafted or recalled to active duty from Reserves or the National Guard in the near future because of Vietnam, I am today proposing an amendment to current farm law designed to protect their farm investments in their absence.

My bill, the first of its kind to be introduced in Congress, would permit such farmers, on notice of induction or recall to active military duty, to receive first preference in retiring their cropland under provisions of the Cropland Adjustment Act passed by Congress last year. Additionally, participants could retire land only for the duration of their military obligation if they preferred this to the standard 5- or 10-year retirement program.

If the term of the land retirement agreement were to end after the normal planting season, the returning serviceman would have the option of extending the agreement to the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, we need to realize that the young farmer just getting started often has indebted himself substantially for equipment and farm rental. When he is called up with as little as 7-day alert, he has inadequate time to make arrangements for the running of his farm in his absence. In the past, farmers faced with this situation have often been forced to sell out at a loss, and it is time to remedy this situation.

I might say further, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation was suggested by Capt. Kenneth L. Kell, a young farmer in Redwood County, Minn., who is a member of the Minnesota National Guard. His sound suggestion was passed on to me by Maj. Gen. Chester J. Moeglein, adjutant general of the Minnesota National Guard.

Captain Keil's sound suggestion would benefit young farmers in my district as well as many others around the Nation. I would like to commend Captain Keil for his initiative, and I hope Congress will give this proposal earliest possible consideration.

I request unanimous consent to include correspondence I received in connection with this new proposal at this point in my remarks.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS,
St. Paul, February 23, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: The heavy participation by the 47th Infantry Division in the Selected Reserve Force program means that approximately 75 percent of the 10,000 members of

the Minnesota Army National Guard are subject to being ordered into active Federal service with as little as 7 days' alert. While such a requirement places a burden on all of these guardsmen, it imposes a particular hardship on individuals who are in a business or profession for themselves. Among this latter group are the farmers, who quite obviously cannot sell their farms or refrain from planting their crops based on mere probabilities.

I am enclosing copy of a letter I received from Capt. Kenneth L. Keil, commander of our unit at Redwood Falls, Minn., which contains a proposal for farmers who are also members of a National Guard or other military unit. This proposal seems to me to have merit. The Congress has by law provided protection for individuals who are in the employ of others but has so far been unable to do very little for the self-employed.

Since a GI bill for post-Korea veterans is now before the Congress for consideration, I should like to recommend that some action along the lines suggested by Captain Keil be taken to ease the situation for our many farmers who are performing their military service in the National Guard and other reserve units.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER J. MOEGLEIN,
Major General Minnesota ARNG,
The Adjutant General.

COMPANY C, 3D BATTALION, 135TH
INFANTRY, NATIONAL GUARD AR-
MORY,

Redwood Falls, Minn., December 27, 1965.

ADJUTANT GENERAL,
State Capitol Building,
St. Paul, Minn.

SIR: In the past years when our men in uniform returned to civilian life, many of them found their jobs taken and had to adjust to other means of providing for self-sustenance. Laws were passed giving these people the assurance of returning to their former employment. However, there is no provision for keeping the young men on the farm after their tour of military duty is completed. Many gave up months and years of their lives to make it possible for those on the homefront to capitalize on the misfortunes of war. When they returned, they found their land had been rented by someone else and that there was no more available. These people who stayed behind enjoyed the prosperity of good prices for their products and refused to yield to those who made it possible for their prosperity.

Many of us face this possibility again, therefore, I present to you the enclosed copy of a proposal to help these men and also aid the farm program in retiring acres from production.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH L. KEIL,
Captain, Minnesota National Guard.

DECEMBER 27, 1965.

REDWOOD COUNTY ASC,
Redwood Falls, Minn.

DEAR COMMITTEEMEN: As I and other young farmers face the possibility of entering military service in the near future, we are interested in a program of retiring our cropland. For those people that are wage earners and employed as carpenters, electricians, etc., there is provided for them by law that they will be entitled to their jobs upon returning from the military service. For the young farmer who is just beginning his life ambition as a farmer or those of us who have been in the business of farming for several years, it will be a burden and hardship for us to have our programs interrupted. I am referring now to the possibility of our National Guard unit being called to active duty sometime in the near future. There are several of us who have already been in the service for several years and we lost those

years as far as competing for land and financial gains are concerned.

I realize there are obligations on the part of everyone to their country especially the young men of today. However, it is difficult for a man to begin a farming program and to take on a great debt which is required of him in these times and to leave it for a period of time. He has a financial loss because of the depreciation of his equipment and a risk to his own life. The monetary return from the Government for his service to protect the people at home does not cover the potential income he may have derived from his agrarian operations. Also, the possibility of losing the land he is renting is very strong, and in many cases he must seek other lines of work.

Using myself as an example, I am renting my land and I would like to retire my cropland (with the consent of the landowners) either for the duration of one military tour or for a specified time, preferably during the length of tour. I have no brothers and my father is unable to continue the operations because of his age. I do not consider it economically feasible to hire anyone to carry on for me as my machinery is too much of an investment and help is not dependable. Even if I owned my own land, I would consider this program and those who have brothers and fathers to carry on should be given the same privilege of retiring their land either all or in excess of the 50-percent corn base.

Therefore, I propose the following program concerning those who must enter or reenter the military service:

Upon receiving word of induction or mobilization to active duty, the obligee (military) be given the opportunity to retire either all of his cropland or that percentage of cropland (disregarding the maximum 50 percent corn base) which cannot be operated without his assistance. This refers only to the man, himself, who has contracts on land which he himself is operating and has a financial debt or a family farm which may be hindered financially (but must be reviewed by the county committee) by the loss of this individual. In the case of rented land there must be a signed certificate by the landowner and renter agreeing to enter this program.

To retire his land, he must comply with the county committee's policies as to weed control and seeding. Also, he may be given an option of retiring this land for a number of years (5 or 10) or only for the duration of his obligation. If his tour of duty should end during the growing or planting season so that it may create a hardship on his part to accurately plant a crop, he be given the option to remain in the program for the remainder of the growing season.

The foregoing proposal is for your study and consideration. This is mainly to help us to retain our operations and provide us a future when we return. I will be willing to discuss and answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

KENNETH L. KEIL,
Captain,
Minnesota Army National Guard.

THE FIRST STEP IN PROTECTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM CRIPPLING TRANSPORTATION STRIKES

(Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) 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 introducing a resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study

and report on problems relating to collective bargaining, strikes and lockouts in the transportation industry.

It would be composed of eight Members of each House, and would be authorized to conduct hearings, investigations and studies of the entire area of transportation labor disputes and strikes.

The issue of paralyzing strikes has been with us for a long time, but it was brought vividly to our attention earlier this year when the transit workers unions in New York crippled the city in a strike felt across the Nation.

Direct costs of the strike to the city of New York have been estimated at \$50 million. Loss of wages of those people not connected with transit, but who were unable to get to work has been guessed at near \$300 million. Countless hours of productive time were lost to business and industry, retail sales dropped more than 50 percent. Hardest hit were the small businesses which were least able to recover, and the poorer workers who could least stand the financial strain. And a great percentage of the people hurt were not citizens of New York City or even the State of New York.

But this strike was only one of the series of recent walkouts that have had serious effects upon our economy. A shipping strike early in 1964 brought international shipping to a standstill, cutting off goods and services to the entire Nation. A rail crisis in 1963, only narrowly averted by special legislation, may erupt again when the contract expires.

It has become clear that something must be done.

There have been many suggestions; many bills have been introduced in an effort to remedy the situation. But the business of the Education and Labor Committee, through which the majority of this legislation must pass has been taken up with every program from poverty to the minimum wage, leaving little time for the detailed considerations necessary.

These strikes involve so many people, so many businesses, so big a part of the economy, and so many questions of Federal and State law, that an extraordinary amount of study and time is required to fully consider them. The Congress must have the benefit of the best advice available, and the machinery for a careful and thoughtful study.

The problem is so far-reaching that it must be dealt with through broad methods, fair to every dispute and, above all, to the American people. I am confident that the Congress can and will devise such a solution, but they must first have the benefit of the best advice and information available.

The joint committee which I propose will not be an investigating committee to hear recriminations on past strikes, but rather to consider ways of averting them in the future.

The principle and practice of collective bargaining have made great contributions to the development of the economy and industry of this Nation. They should be left intact as much as possible. But it has become apparent that new approaches must be found to cope with matters of national interest.

4640

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER LEE LOEVINGER REGARDING PROPOSED CATV LEGISLATION

I believe it is necessary for Congress to legislate on the subject of community antenna television and that the draft of proposed legislation submitted herewith by the FCC is the best compromise that can now be agreed upon. It is my opinion that under present statutes the Commission does not have the jurisdiction which it claims over CATV's. See my separate opinion at 4 RR2d 1679, 1712. If the Commission is to act in this field legislative authorization is, therefore, necessary.

In general I agree with the views expressed by Commissioner Bartley in his dissenting statement. However, those views are more relevant to consideration of the regulations that may be promulgated by the Commission under the proposed legislation than to the bill now proposed. The legislation proposed is basically a broad authorization to the FCC to act in this field, with a specific declaration that congressional action shall not be construed as Federal preemption. It would be desirable for Congress to establish more specific standards for administrative action than are contained in the proposed bill. But it is appropriate for Congress to delegate broad authority for the Commission to act under whatever standards Congress may see fit to establish. Accordingly I join in recommending that Congress consider the proposed bill submitted herewith and enact legislation in such form as may best express the congressional view of the proper way to deal with the problems involving FCC jurisdiction to regulate CATV systems, the operation of CATV systems, the relations of CATV systems to conventional broadcasting stations, and the relation between Federal and State jurisdiction in this field.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
 COMMISSION,
 Washington, D.C., March 3, 1966.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
 Chairman, Committee on Interstate and
 Foreign Commerce, House of Representa-
 tives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request that the Commission furnish your committee as soon as possible with our suggestions for legislation on CATV, I am enclosing proposed legislation which the Commission at its meeting yesterday agreed to recommend. The dissenting statement of Commissioner Bartley and the separate statement of Commissioner Loevinger are also attached.

Because of this urgent request, and the fact that the bill has just been drafted, it has not been presented to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. However, a copy is being sent to that Bureau forthwith.

Please call on me if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
 Chairman.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PLANE

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, to be financed with funds obtained from the general public rather than from the U.S. Treasury.

The President's transportation message yesterday contained a request for

an additional \$200 million to initiate the prototype of a supersonic aircraft. We have already appropriated \$231 million to this project.

I have believed for a long time that this is a burden which could be carried by private rather than Federal funds, and I think the war effort makes it imperative that we develop a sound plan to do so.

The bill I introduce today provides such a plan. It incorporates suggestions made to the Appropriations Committee last September 8 by Col. W. S. Whitehead whose firm, Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., has been engaged in a 3-year study on financing an SST.

If we are to relieve the taxpayers of this burden, this is the critical time for decision and I hope the bill will receive widespread study and discussion.

The Bow proposal will permit the orderly and timely transition of responsibility for this development task from the Federal Aviation Agency to a proposed independent Government agency to be known as the Supersonic Transport Authority. The independent agency approach was recommended in the Black-Osborne report released by the White House in late 1963.

The Supersonic Transport Authority would be empowered to sell to the public, through normal investment channels, development bonds in the amount of \$1.5 billion.

These securities will not be obligations of the United States, but in event of any default in the payment of principal and interest, the United States will guarantee the payment thereof.

The proposed legislation requires that industry share a reasonable proportion of the cost of development, but postpones fulfillment of this responsibility until the commercial production of the SST is realized.

The patents, patent rights, and so forth resulting from development, will remain the property of the United States until all of the bonds of the SST Development Authority are paid off. When this occurs, the rights to these inventions will pass to private industry.

The advantages of the bill may be summarized as follows:

First. It avoids the necessity of appropriating huge sums by Congress for this gigantic commercial research and development project.

Second. It permits a savings feature by using all residual usable assets acquired during development, in the commercial production of the SST.

Third. It assures more effective surveillance over development costs since each separate major stage of construction will be financed separately.

Fourth. It permits an outlet for excessive investment funds now held in private hands.

Fifth. It provides an equitable and sound basis for determining industry's share of the development cost, after the fact, and not before development of the SST.

Congress is now being called upon to authorize huge sums to finance the war in Vietnam, and for enlarged and expanded domestic programs. Appropri-

ated funds required for our defense come first, especially since the President reports a long and hard war is ahead.

I strongly support the provisions of the bill I have introduced and sincerely hope all Members will recognize the wisdom of achieving the objective of developing the SST with private funds.

SERVICE FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, some disquieting information has reached me which I believe should be of concern to the House. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I would want to see that those who serve in Vietnam and return home, especially the wounded, are granted all the service to which they are entitled and which a grateful Nation can bestow.

I have learned with dismay that an inexcusable backlog, due to lack of administrative machinery to process discharges, has resulted in the virtual confinement of Purple Heart cases.

I understand that the situation prevailing at the Forest Glen facility at Walter Reed is characteristic of other medical separation centers. At Walter Reed, wounded veterans from Vietnam, who have already undergone thorough treatment, are made to wait for prolonged periods before they can be released to return home. In other words, despite the fact that they have received all possible treatment and are ready for discharge, they are kept from returning to civilian life, mainly because of bureaucratic redtape.

Military authorities state that the reason for this delay is that men must await due process of boards to adjudge disability ratings. Their treatment is completed; their medical case files are in order; but they must wait for a brief appearance before the disability board. I quite agree that this separation process is essential.

However, in some instances wounded veterans have been detained for as long as 2 months while awaiting their cases before the board. It seems to me outrageous that men who bore the brunt of battle in Vietnam and who suffered amputations and other injuries are prevented from rejoining their families because of the shortcomings of the separation system. In this age, it is unconscionable that we lack the personnel and the means to discharge these men without undue delay.

Anything short of an expeditious and efficient separation worthy of the courage of these wounded men fails to recognize their gallantry and sacrifices. It seems the least a grateful Nation can do.

The urgency of the situation is dramatized by the news that last week's total wounded in Vietnam action was 747, representing over 100 per day. Many of these wounded will soon arrive back in the States, increasing the number of those detained by the already jammed facilities.

I think we should do everything possible to expedite final clearance procedures for these men.

their size or nature, need not be encompassed within the regulatory scheme. For example, the Commission's present regulations exempt systems serving fewer than 50 subscribers or which serve only 1 or more apartment houses under common ownership, control or management. (See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. 21.710(a).)

Of prime importance is the proposed new section 331(a)(1) of the act, which would expressly confer upon the Commission, in broad and comprehensive terms, authority to regulate community antenna systems in the public interest. This authority is to be exercised only to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the Communications Act, particularly the establishment and maintenance of broadcast services and the provision of multiple reception services. There is thus a congressional recognition of the public service rendered by the broadcast and CATV industries and a directive to promote the orderly growth of both industries.

We recommend the broad approach along the lines of proposed section 331(a)(1) because of the dynamic and relatively new nature of the CATV field. We believe that it would be difficult and indeed impracticable to attempt to delineate precisely in a statute all of the possible areas in which the public interest may in the future require Commission action. Had legislation been drawn so deal specifically with the problems posed by CATV in the fifties, it would have been inadequate as to such present problems as those raised by CATV entry into the major markets. Today, for example, because there is so little program origination or alternation or deletion of broadcast signals being carried, there would appear to be few, if any, problems concerning the carriage over CATV systems of political broadcasts or of appropriate identification announcements with respect to sponsored material, including programs involving controversial issues. But there could be future problems in these respects, requiring regulation along the lines of sections 315 or 317. The broad regulatory approach we urge is similar to that adopted by the Congress for regulation of radio, and the following quotation from the landmark Supreme Court case construing the Communications Act is equally pertinent to the dynamic and new field of CATV:

"Congress was acting in a field of regulation which was both new and dynamic. * * * While Congress did not give the Commission unfettered discretion to regulate all phases of the radio industry, it did not frustrate the purpose for which the Communications Act of 1934 was brought into being by attempting an itemized catalog of the specific manifestations of the general problems for the solution of which it was establishing a regulatory agency. That would have stereotyped the powers of the Commission to specific details in regulating a field of enterprise the dominant characteristic of which was the rapid pace of its unfolding. And so Congress did what experience had taught it in similar attempts at regulation, even in fields far less fluid and dynamic than radio. The essence of that experience was to define broad areas for regulation and to establish standards for judgment adequately related in their application to the problems to be solved." (*NBC v. U.S.*, 319 U.S. 190, 218-219).

There is one area which we believe that Congress may wish to consider specifically at this time, rather than leaving to subsequent regulatory decision under the proposed section 331(a)(1); namely, whether community antenna systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station before retransmitting the station's signal over the system. It has been urged that such a requirement would obviate the need for much, if not all, of the Commission's present regulations in this field. The Commission is not now in a posi-

tion to state whether a so-called section 325(a) approach would be effective or fully consistent with the public interest. The matter is one of such a nature that we believe it should be more appropriately considered by the Congress. In this way, there could be congressional hearings on how such a retransmission consent provision would function as a practical matter, whether there should be special provisions for the CATV systems operating in a small community, and whether and to what extent there should be "grandfathering" of existing systems. The statute finally enacted could then reflect the congressional judgment on this important aspect.

The proposed new section 331(b) of the Communications Act deals with the question of possible program origination by community antenna systems. We believe it would be inequitable to allow unlimited program origination, since this would permit community antenna systems to use the distribution of free television broadcast signals as a base for engaging in pay-TV operations.³ Moreover, the Commission, and indeed the Congress, has had a continuing concern with the possible impact of subscription television service on the free television broadcast service. The Commission currently has before it a petition requesting the institution of rulemaking proceedings to provide for subscription television service, on a permanent and carefully regulated basis throughout the country, utilizing the facilities of television broadcast stations. Because of the foregoing considerations, the proposed section 331(b) would bar any general pay-TV operation by a community antenna system.

While convinced that community antenna systems should not be permitted unlimited program origination, we are not recommending that Congress impose a complete ban on program origination. There would appear to be various possible exceptions (e.g., the fairly common time and weathercasting channels on CATV systems; see also paragraph 57 of our Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Docket No. 15971, 1 FCC 2d 453, 474-75). The scope of such possible exceptions to the ban could only be determined after appropriate proceedings. Because of the importance of the matter, we would suggest that Congress, upon the basis of its hearings, resolve this question and enact specific statutory guidelines.

Absent such congressional guidelines, the Commission recommends that Congress follow the approach set out in the new section 331(b). The proposed section 331(b), in addition to barring program origination by community antenna systems, would permit the Commission to grant exceptions subject to several limitations. An express finding would have to be made, after appropriate proceedings, that an exception would serve the public interest; it could be granted only by general rule; and no additional charge to subscribers would be permitted under any exception granted.

Finally, the Commission believes that congressional consideration should also be given to the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction over community antenna systems, particularly with regard to initial franchising, rate regulation, and related matters. The Commission generally has not proposed to exercise any jurisdiction with respect to these matters. (See par. 32, Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Pro-

³Specific charges to subscribers for programs originated by a community antenna system could, of course, be barred, but it might be difficult to insure that monthly rates charged to subscribers were not being set at a level which would take into account programs originated by the system, particularly in the case of a new system.

posed Rulemaking, Docket No. 15971, 1 FCC 2d 453, 466.) Rather, it has recognized that many local governmental bodies, usually in connection with the grant of franchises, have asserted some jurisdiction with respect to rates charged subscribers and similar matters. At least three States (Connecticut, New Jersey, and Rhode Island) have held that CATV systems are public utilities.

In our opinion, the public interest will best be protected by permitting State and local regulation to continue with regard to those matters not regulated by the Commission. We are therefore recommending legislation along the lines of the proposed section 331(c). That section provides that there would be no Federal preemption except to the extent of direct conflict with the provisions of the Communications Act or regulations enacted by the Commission. This would permit State and local action, but would not foreclose Federal action to carry out the purposes of the act and to promote the "public interest in the larger and more effective use of radio" (sec. 303(g)), where such action becomes necessary.

Adopted: March 2, 1966.

DISSENTING STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

I believe that telling the public it cannot receive broadcasts it wants and is willing to pay for via CATV is unsound public policy.

People willing to pay extra should be allowed to bring in broadcasts which they would not otherwise receive as well or not at all.

Conditions which the Commission would impose on CATV as to carriage, nonduplication and procedural impediments to development in the top 100 markets appear to be for the economic protection of television stations. Experience indicates that economic protection begets more regulation.

The heart of concern over CATV is its possible evolution into pay television. Fear has been expressed that the community antenna systems will be built and made viable by using free broadcasts from television stations; then, after the systems have acquired a sufficient number of subscribers, they could afford to originate their own programs, and pay television would result.

Consideration need be given to the existing types of systems, (1) community antenna systems which receive, and distribute to subscribers, transmissions of broadcast stations, and (2) closed-circuit systems which originate their own special programming and distribute it by wire or cable to the theaters, business establishments or homes of subscribers.

I believe we should not discourage closed-circuit systems built and made viable by distributing their own programs.

It is the mixing of the two types of systems which would give rise to an unfair competitive advantage. It would be inequitable to allow programs origination since this would permit community antenna systems to use the distribution of free television broadcast signals as a base for engaging in pay television operations.

Accordingly, at the present time, I would recommend the following legislation, limited to prohibiting program origination by community antenna systems:

Section 3(h) (definition): Community antenna system means a facility which receives any programs transmitted by a broadcast station and distributes such programs by wire or cable to customers paying for the service.

Section 331: No community antenna system shall distribute programs other than those received from transmissions by broadcast stations.

March 3, 1966

4641

If it is any consolation to those who are now inexcusably bogged down in administrative redtape, I am certain that once their cases are passed on to the Veterans' Administration, they will receive the benefit of the efficient processes of the highly experienced VA.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for over 25 years Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has been sending "greetings" to draftees. His name has become synonymous with the Selective Service and all too frequently attacks at the System itself have been aimed directly at him. This is wrong and quite unfair to a man who has served his country so admirably for so many years and who at age 72 is still going strong.

There is much confusion and misunderstanding over just what the prime function of the Selective Service System is. It is primarily to select a man and deliver him to the Armed Forces. Selective Service does not prescribe nor administer the mental and physical examinations, for instance. It was the Army that refused to take Cassius Clay originally, and the blame cast upon Selective Service was in error. All Selective Service did was reclassify him after the Army had delivered its first opinion of him; that is, after Clay had failed the mental examination. Now that the Army has lowered its standards—mark that well, the Army has changed, not Selective Service—Clay has been reconsidered and reclassified, and it is incumbent upon all Selective Service boards to reshape their classifications, based upon the Army's changed requirements.

The deferment process is also misunderstood. The only deferment specified by law is I-S. This category applies to high school students who are of registration age—18—but not yet 20; they hold this classification until graduation or age 20 or until they cease to attend school. It also applies to college students until the end of the academic year. Deferments beyond the academic year are solely the result of Presidential direction. On the basis of the law itself, college deferments would only be for the completion of the academic year.

At this time plans are underway for a series of tests and examinations to be given to college students on behalf of the Selective Service System to determine their progress and academic ability. This was last done during the Korean war. It very well may lead to reclassification for many.

The real authority as far as the drafting of men into the armed services is concerned lies with the President. The Chief Executive is specifically given the power to select and induct as many men as are required. The Selective Service System merely follows policy set by the President and his advisers.

It is the same situation in the case of deferments. Save for the student defer-

ments specified by law, the President has the authority and responsibility to provide, by rules and regulations, for deferments involving occupations, dependency and fitness. Recent cancellation of an order exempting men married before a certain date from induction is a good example of this.

As the U.S. Government Organization Manual states:

The purpose of the Selective Service System is to assure the Armed Forces a supply of manpower adequate to insure the security of the United States, with concomitant regard for the maintenance of an effective national economy.

It is the President who decides the number desired and what their qualifications should be. The selective service merely processes the young men and establishes their priority under existing law and presidential directives.

The House Armed Services Committee will in the near future review the operation of the Selective Service System to determine whether additional legislation is needed.

NEWT GRAHAM LOCK AND DAM

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I have placed in the hopper a bill that I hope in some small way will pay proper tribute to a dear and personal friend of mine, the late Newt Graham, of Oklahoma. I have asked that lock and dam No. 18 on the Verdigris River in Oklahoma, and the lake created thereby, be named for this wonderful Oklahoman, and that they be called the Newt Graham lock and dam and the Newt Graham Lake.

This small honor is not one that I had to pull out of the thin air; for Newt Graham's fondest dream for many long years was the development of the Arkansas River Basin. Why, I can remember Newt talking enthusiastically about his ideas when in some places along this little stream it was so narrow you could step across it. And you can imagine what a good many of the home folk thought about such a "wild dream" at that early stage.

But my good friend did not falter. He kept right on working toward his goal. And I can remember the magnificent job he did in selling this project to one Governor after another who had never heard of such a thing—one of them being the late Senator Kerr when he was Governor. Newt Graham just was not fickle—he carried a torch for this dream to the end.

For as long as I can remember almost, my dear and personal friend kept at this post of duty, with great vision, and I feel did more than any other man to get the Arkansas River development basin started. Year in and year out, season in and season out, Newt's work never ceased in this endeavor.

A few years ago, dear old Newt passed away without living long enough to see the completion of his finest dream; and perhaps without realizing the great

gratitude that not only Oklahomans felt for him, but also the folk in Arkansas and Kansas—for the Arkansas River development basin has literally meant the life of a good many locations in these States.

I am happy and honored to try in some small way to perpetuate the memory of this fine Oklahoman by asking that this lock and dam and the lake be created in tribute to him. And I know this will meet with the great approval of the thousands of friends Newt has in Oklahoma, Kansas, and Arkansas, who knew him over those trying years.

Someone has wisely said that the good a man does lives after him. This is certainly proved true in the case of my dear friend, Newt Graham.

JOB CORPS DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1966, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and I took the floor to discuss a serious incident that occurred at a Job Corps Camp in Mountain Home, Idaho. We described an attack by a Job Corps enrollee on a fellow corpsman. The reason that we brought the attention of our colleagues to this unfortunate occurrence was to point out the lax enrollment and disciplinary procedure of OEO that is endangering the entire Job Corps concept.

I am gratified to learn that other persons, more intimately involved with Job Corps operations, are also concerned about present procedures and share our desire to see the potential of the Job Corps concept be fulfilled.

The Washington Evening Star carried a front-page article yesterday, March 2, which described a directive issued by Mr. Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Bureau of Land Management which runs six Job Corps centers, including the one in Mountain Home, Idaho. According to the Star, the directive orders directors of Interior Department Job Corps centers to disregard procedures established by OEO that no enrollees may be dismissed without clearance by OEO. Mr. Stoddard says that his camp directors, contrary to OEO policy, may refuse to accept enrollees whose advance records indicate the enrollee has a history of serious and repeated law offenses.

Serious disciplinary problems are said to be caused in the centers by present policies and, as an example of such problems, Mr. Stoddard described the same incident to which Congressman GOODELL and I referred about a month ago. In the words of Mr. Stoddard:

On October 19, 1965, we were notified by the center director at Mountain Home that 18 enrollees of a group of 37 scheduled for input at his center had criminal records, several with serious and repeated offenses. In spite of appeals from the center director and from the departmental Job Corps staff, OEO proceeded with the scheduled input. One of these enrollees performed the stabbing which led to the recent notoriety at that center.

I might remind my colleagues that in answer to our remarks about this same

March 3, 1966

incident in January, one of our colleagues stated that the Job Corps authorities at Mountain Home had no knowledge of the criminal record of Mr. Jones. The Office of Economic Opportunity did not give my colleagues the correct information. The welfare of Job Corps enrollees is being sacrificed to maintain a favorable public relations image for OEO.

I would like to commend Mr. Stoddard for his forthright stand in recognizing the problems in the operation of the Job Corps program and taking measures to correct them. It is regrettable that one Federal agency has to defy another agency, but I hope that OEO will soon adopt the wise and sound policy acceptable to Mr. Stoddard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this point to include the article from the Evening Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 2, 1966]

QUEST UNSUITABLE BOYS, SIX JOB CORPS UNITS TOLD—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTING ALSO TO BAR FURTHER PROBLEM RECRUITS

(By Orr Kelly)

The directors of the six Job Corps Conservation Centers operated by the Bureau of Land Management have been ordered to refuse to accept delivery of problem boys and to discharge unsuitable corpsmen.

Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Bureau, said he had held up the effective date of the order during the negotiations with the Office of Economic Opportunity but that it would go into effect in a week.

His order, issued in a teletype message February 24, is the first open break between OEO and the head of one of the many Government agencies that operate the Job Corps camps. Many others, however, are reported to be as disturbed as Stoddard.

Stoddard's order, which was obtained by the Star from sources outside the Department of the Interior, said:

DISCHARGES URGED

"It is apparent from continuing incidents at your centers that poor screening of candidates for enrollment in the program has and is having a deleterious effect on the program. Additionally, your lack of authority to immediately discharge unsuitable corpsmen has led to serious troubles in maintaining discipline.

"For above reasons I direct you to review records you now have on your corpsmen and to discharge immediately any who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property, extreme sexual deviation, or emotional disturbances.

"You will take this action without regard to procedures established by OEO when delay will cause overburdening of your staff, adverse community relations, escalation of discipline problems with other corpsmen, or serious morale problems at your center.

REJECTIONS ORDERED

"As you receive additional new enrollees and advance records indicate problems of the nature stated above, you will not accept delivery of corpsmen but will return them to their homes immediately.

"Should you be questioned from any source as to your authority to take the above actions, you will quote this communication from me."

Stoddard said the Bureau of Land Management, a part of the Interior Department, operates the six Job Corps centers with money appropriated for that purpose. The centers have an enrollment of about 1,000 youths, with a weekly turnover of about 5 percent, he said.

The OEO retains control over education and discipline, he said, and all cases involving major disciplinary action must be cleared with OEO in Washington. "It is days and sometimes weeks," he said "before a decision comes back from Washington."

SPECIFIC CASES SOUGHT

Directors of the centers have been asked to send Stoddard reports of specific cases to back up his order giving them disciplinary authority.

"I hope to have a good, tight case in a week or so," he said.

Stoddard said he had heard nothing directly from OEO since his order went out, but "we've been talking to them for a year and getting nowhere."

One of Stoddard's major complaints is that the OEO does not operate screening centers and the result has been that youths with criminal records and serious emotional disturbances have caused serious problems at the Job Corps centers.

In a memorandum to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall telling about his order, Stoddard said:

"Over many years the BLM has built favorable relations with communities in which our field operations are situated. Assurance was given the public that youths who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property would not be enrolled in the program. This has not been the case.

"To illustrate this point, I cite the difficulties experienced at our center at Mountain Home, Idaho, which was the subject of considerable discussion recently in the House of Representatives.

"On October 19, 1965, we were notified by the center director at Mountain Home that 18 enrollees of a group of 37 scheduled for input at his center had criminal records, several with serious and repeated offenses. In spite of appeals from the center director and from the departmental Job Corps staff, OEO proceeded with the scheduled input. One of these enrollees performed the stabbing which led to the recent notoriety at that center."

OTHER INCIDENTS CITED

In a separate statement of the underlying reasons for his order, Stoddard cited a number of other incidents and said:

"This series of events need not have occurred. From the beginning the record will show that I have asked for disciplinary authority on the part of center director who is in the final analysis as responsible for his camp as the captain of his ship.

"Furthermore, I have exhausted every channel of communication to urge OEO to establish reception centers as a means of screening misfits, outfitting, providing medical examinations and adequate orientation prior to arrival at camp * * *.

"Many people in the national conservation movement who worked strongly for the passage of the Antipoverty Act did so only because the Youth Conservation Corps program was an integral part of it. They are deeply concerned over the failure to date, and wish to see corrective action taken immediately.

POORER QUALITY DUE

"But in December the Federal conservation agency liaison people were told that the enrollee input would be of poorer quality than previously and that boys not capable of meeting urban center standards would go to conservation centers. If these moves were not calculated to ruin the program this could be their only result.

"If OEO will establish reception centers and delegate adequate disciplinary authority to Job Corps camp directors, these easily preventable situations will not occur. As soon as this is done, I will be glad to rescind my order of February 24. Furthermore, I will request a leave of absence from the Sec-

retary of Interior to direct this program into a successful operation."

The Bureau operates Job Corps Centers at Kingman, Ariz., Mountain Home, Idaho, Antelope Mesa, Nev., Fort Vannoy and Tillamook, Oreg., and Castle Valley, Utah.

Other centers are operated by Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, National Park Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, and the California Resources Agency.

JOB CORPS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any prepared remarks, but I have done some on-the-spot investigation of the charge that has just been made here by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUER]. I talked to Mr. Stoddard last night as soon as the article to which the gentleman referred appeared in the newspaper, and he appeared at my request in my office this morning.

I said, "Mr. Stoddard, let me see the documentation you have for this charge. How many people do you know of? How many corpsmen have you asked to have discharged because of their character and record?" I said, "Has it been more than 100?" He did not know. I said, "Has it been less than 10?" He did not know.

I submit to my colleagues this man is the kind of man who, when he sees a fire, would throw gasoline on it rather than try to put it out.

The whole purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act and the Job Corps Centers is to take disadvantaged people from disadvantaged surroundings and try to uplift them, try to make productive citizens out of them. That is what we are trying to do.

When you deal with this segment of society, you are going to have a few problems. We cannot run away from those problems. These problems exist. We as Americans and Christians have a responsibility to do something about them.

I would suggest that my colleague pay a little more attention to how these camps are operated and not criticize so much. If he does criticize, I suggest that he get his facts straight.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS TO SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the able and distinguished minority leader of the other body of this Legislature has been named the recipient of the Congressional Award of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for his outstanding work in Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join with me in congratulating Senator DIRKSEN. And this House will be overwhelmingly represented at the VFW's

March 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4637

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Roubush against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. Minish against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Felghan.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Cameron with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Gialmo.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Evins.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Rostenkowski.

Mr. DOW, Mr. VIVIAN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. DONOHUE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MOST SENSIBLE RECOMMENDATIONS ON VIETNAM MADE BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the most sensible recommendations on Vietnam made in recent weeks are those advanced by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

He believes that the United States should take those measures necessary to win in Vietnam and I am absolutely certain that a great majority of Americans agree with him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a copy of an editorial in support of Senator SYMINGTON's position, written by Joseph R. Snyder in the Gallatin, Mo., Democrat:

SYMINGTON'S VIEWS

Of all the people in high Government places who have issued public statements on the war in southeast Asia, the words of Missouri's own Senator STUART SYMINGTON come closest to matching the thoughts this newspaper has entertained. Of all the people in Government, outside our generals in the Military Establishment, we are more inclined

to trust SYMINGTON's judgment on the situation than any other. Happily his views are largely shared by the military.

There is, of course, a realistic way to win the war in Vietnam. Senator SYMINGTON is persistently urging it upon President Johnson and his advisers. The Senator has an exceptionally fine background of Government service in areas of defense upon which to base his views. He has projected his opinions to the public only after completion of a several weeks visit in the Far East during which he was able to obtain vital information on the spot.

That war can be ended and many lives saved, the Senator asserts, by a blockade and mining of Haiphong waters, which is the principal North Vietnamese port. This could cut off about 80 percent of the supplies reaching the Vietcong.

SYMINGTON also urges air attacks on important military targets such as powerplants, oil supply, docks, etc., to destroy the Vietcong's capacity to wage war. He further recommends fuller use of U.S. naval power to pound enemy troop concentrations and supply lines along the coastal areas.

As he so aptly puts it: "We should either move ahead or move out." It is our feeling that a majority of Americans feel the same way about this conflict. We commend him for hammering away at this theme.

History shows that limited war in southeast Asia is a failure. It is not the American way to give the enemy every advantage, permitting him to choose the time and place of battle and sanctuaries from which he can attack, fall back, gain strength, and then attack again.

It is our opinion that once America decides a situation has become so intolerable we must take action on the field of battle, Congress should authorize the conflict by a formal declaration of war. We do not like one man—the President, no matter who he is—having the power to commit this Nation to war without approval from the people through Congress. We also do not like a war being fought by a relatively few while the Government pretends "business as usual" and hopes the public won't notice the casualty lists.

It is our belief that once the United States is committed to battle, we should go on a war footing and end the fighting as quickly as possible. We further believe that military decisions should be left to military people. Had this been done in the past we would not now be fighting in Vietnam.

The question of whether we should be in Vietnam at all is not the point of this editorial. We recall with irony, however, that every top general we have had has warned against becoming involved in a land war in Asia.

We believe the American people will support the action called for by Senator SYMINGTON. We believe they are tired of the lack of decision and purpose displayed thus far. We believe they want a victory in Vietnam as quickly as possible and a halt to confusion and half answers. Ho Chi Minh will not be ready to talk peace until he's hurt. We must make the cost of aggression too high to endure.

APOLOGY AND CLARIFICATION REQUIRED ON RELEASE STATING THAT FBI WAS BEING ORDERED TO INVESTIGATE REGISTRATION PRACTICES IN "SAMPLE COUNTIES" IN TEXAS

(Mr. CABELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of an ill-conceived release from the Office

of the Attorney General that implies an indictment of the people of my district and of my State of Texas, I consider a clarification and an apology to be in order.

This release stated that the FBI was being ordered to investigate registration practices in "sample counties" in Texas.

No such implied indictment can be allowed to go unchallenged. I, therefore, submit for the Record my reply to the Attorney General:

MARCH 3, 1966.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
The Attorney General,
The Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Never in my career as a citizen-businessman, a municipal official or more lately, as a Member of Congress, have I observed such a flagrant, and cheap, abuse of power as that recently demonstrated by your appointment of voter registration "monitors" in Texas, and particularly in my home district of Dallas County.

Not only is this a debasement of your hitherto respected office, it is also a debasement of many fine segments of our society and is a relegation of one of our most respected agencies (FBI) to the status of a cheap political tool.

The victims of the insult include:

1. The Negro citizens of Dallas County and Texas. They have consistently exercised their voting franchise, without any form of coercion. In 1964, the Negro citizen qualified by registration or by payment of poll tax, a higher percentage of their potential than did their white counterparts.

2. The white citizenship of Dallas County and the State of Texas, and all elected officials. They have consistently provided untold numbers of volunteers, both white and Negro, who were deputized to issue registrations and poll tax receipts, and who worked diligently in all communities from the period, October 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966. All of this was done without reference to race or color.

3. The Dallas County leadership of both political parties. All these leaders have encouraged voter participation of all races, and they have endorsed the candidacy of Negroes as nominees of both parties to the State legislature in the forthcoming elections.

4. The Federal Bureau of Investigation. Through the years they have enjoyed world renown as the most respected such organization in the world. If the duties of the Bureau are to be reduced to such muckraking, then the present high caliber personnel will neither be needed, nor be retained.

As a citizen, and as a public official, I welcome any legitimate investigation, but I definitely question the motives behind this one. When has it been the practice of the FBI to publicize and signal its intention to conduct an investigation on all subjects? Publication of such intent is an indictment, per se, in the eyes of the general public.

In closing, let me express the hope that this decision was the brainchild of an unqualified underling, and that clarification, and apology, will be forthcoming from your office.

Respectfully yours,

EARLE CABELL,
Member of Congress.

FREEDOM'S BEACON

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

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News points out in a recent editorial:

In one of his most eloquent speeches, President Johnson answered 10 questions still being asked about Vietnam, within the broad context of freedom and what freedom means.

It goes on to say:

What emerged was not only a clearer definition of the self-imposed limits operative in southeast Asia, but a clearer vision of American aspirations and the guidelines for world leadership as the President sees them.

The paper believes that:

Surely freedom is at the heart of the struggle in Vietnam and no less involved in the great issues of race, religion, and politics that suffuse both the domestic and the international scene. And freedom was and is the beacon that the United States has held aloft for the world.

The appraisal given by the Chicago Daily News will be of interest to others, and because many will want to read the editorial in its entirety I herewith offer it for publication in the Record:

FREEDOM'S BEACON

The critics of the administration's Vietnam policy—the hawks and the doves and the dawks—have all had their turns at pecking in recent days. Wednesday night came the turn of the man who alone bears the burden of final decision.

In one of his most eloquent speeches, President Johnson answered 10 questions still being asked about Vietnam, within the broad context of freedom and what freedom means. What emerged was not only a clearer definition of the self-imposed limits operative in southeast Asia, but a clearer vision of American aspirations and the guidelines for world leadership as the President sees them.

For the doves, Mr. Johnson had reassurance that the United States is not "caught in a blind escalation of force that is pulling us headlong toward a wider war." For the hawks, he had the promise that aggression will continue to be opposed by whatever force is required to stop it. For the government in Hanoi, he had a warning that free discussion in a free nation means neither weakness nor indecision:

"We are united in our commitment to free discussion. So also we are united in our determination that no foe anywhere should mistake our arguments for indecision—or our debates for weakness."

But in addressing Freedom House and accepting its award, the President also took the occasion to reevaluate and expand a vision of a quarter-century ago. Harking back to Franklin D. Roosevelt's "four freedoms," he noted the considerable progress America has made toward achieving the goals of freedom from want and fear, and preserving freedom of speech and worship.

Then, to the original four, he added three of his own: Freedom to learn, freedom to grow, freedom to hope.

Like his idol, President Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson put his "freedoms" in a global setting, not as goals merely for Americans, but for all mankind. There is, in this declaration, an extension of a pattern that has been evolving in Mr. Johnson's recent messages on foreign policy and foreign aid, and especially in his emphasis on the civilian aspects of the struggle in Vietnam.

Some may see the emerging pattern as an attempt to export the Great Society before we have made adequate progress in building it here. Others may see it as unconscionable meddling or a meaningless mixture of corn and politics. Still others may view it as unbridled idealism—lovely to look at but without substance.

There may indeed be some or all of these elements in Mr. Johnson's vision of freedom

in a world that has too little of it. Yet surely freedom is at the heart of the struggle in Vietnam and no less involved in the great issues of race, religion, and politics that suffuse both the domestic and the international scene. And freedom was and is the beacon that the United States has held aloft for the world.

Perhaps the world will understand us a little better because of what Mr. Johnson said Wednesday night and see us for what we are: a nation striving in an imperfect way to kindle the aspirations of mankind and lead—or at least point—the way toward a better life in a freer world.

LEGISLATION TO REGULATE COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

(MR. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include pertinent material.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which has been submitted by the Federal Communications Commission which would authorize the Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna systems. This bill has been submitted to the Congress in accordance with the Commission's earlier statement that it would recommend legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in order to advise the Members of the House and the public in general of the reasons which moved the Commission to submit this particular bill, I am including in the Record at this point the text of the bill, an explanation of the bill submitted by the Commission, and a letter from Chairman Henry addressed to me in connection with this legislation:

H.R. 13286

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(gg) 'Community antenna system' means any facility which, in whole or in part, receives directly or indirectly over the air and amplifies or otherwise modifies the signals transmitting programs broadcast by one or more broadcast stations and distributes such signals by wire or cable to subscribing members of the public who pay for such service."

SEC. 2. Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

"SEC. 331. (a) The Commission shall, as the public interest, convenience or necessity requires, have authority—

"(1) to issue orders, make rules and regulations, and prescribe such conditions or restrictions with respect to the construction, technical characteristics, and operation of community antenna systems, to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, with due regard to both the establishment and maintenance of broadcast services and the provision of multiple reception services; and

"(2) to make general rules exempting from regulation, in whole or in part, community antenna systems where it is determined that

such regulation is unnecessary because of the size or nature of the systems so exempted.

"(b) No community antenna system shall transmit over its system any program or other material other than that which it has received directly or indirectly over the air from a broadcast station, except that the Commission may, upon an express finding that it would serve the public interest, authorize by general rule limited exceptions to permit such transmissions without any additional charge to subscribers.

"(c) Nothing in this Act or any regulation promulgated hereunder shall preclude or supersede legislation relating to, or regulation of, community antenna systems by or under the authority of any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or any possession of the United States except to the extent of direct conflict with the provisions of this Act or regulations promulgated hereunder."

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, CONCERNING REGULATION OF COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

These proposals for amendments to the Communications Act are submitted pursuant to the Commission's determination, announced in its public notice of February 15, 1966, that it would make the following recommendations for legislation to the Congress:

(a) Clarification and confirmation of FCC jurisdiction over CATV systems generally, along with such specific provisions as are deemed appropriate.

(b) Prohibition of the origination of program or other material by a CATV system with such limitations or exceptions, if any, as are deemed appropriate.

(c) Consideration of whether, to what extent, and under what circumstances CATV systems should be required to obtain the consent of the originating broadcast station for the retransmission of the signal by the CATV system.

(d) Consideration of whether CATV systems should or should not be deemed public utilities. In this connection, Congress will be asked to consider the appropriate relationship of Federal to State-local jurisdiction in the CATV field, with particular reference to initial franchising, rate regulation, and extension of service.

The Commission has determined that it has jurisdiction over all CATV systems, and it has asserted that jurisdiction to the extent necessary to carry out the announced regulatory program. However, given the importance of CATV, we believe it highly desirable that Congress amend the Communications Act to confirm that jurisdiction and to establish such basic national policy as it deems appropriate.

The proposed new subsection 3(h) of the Communications Act broadly defines a "community antenna system" to include any facility which receives broadcast signals¹ over the air² and distributes them by means of wire or cable to subscribing members of the public. While the definition is all-inclusive, we believe it is unnecessary to impose regulations on all systems. Therefore, the proposed new section 331(a)(2) would empower the Commission to exempt from regulation, by general rule, systems, which, because of

¹ Both radio and television signals are included. While we are aware of no community antenna system which now distributes only radio signals, some systems do distribute signals from both radio and television broadcast stations.

² This would include signals received directly off the air from a broadcast station, as well as those broadcast and then relayed by means of a microwave relay system.

March 3, 1966

"But," asks the Camp Parks director, "what is the cost going to be if we continue to neglect this problem?"

A Sellout Coming in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, is a shapeup for the sellout gaining momentum? I bring to the attention of my colleagues a column which appeared in the Miami Herald, which indicates that the Johnson administration is thinking more and more in terms of negotiating any kind of peace to get us out of the Vietnam war.

Peace with honor was once the byword of this Nation. We have made vast commitments of men and materials to Vietnam. Has our conduct of military operations been so misguided that we are now on the verge of admitting defeat?

I suggest that my colleagues read this thoughtful analysis of our present position in Vietnam. A text of the column follows:

A MODERATE FORESEES DEFEAT FOR OUR VIETNAM EFFORTS

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—A friend who is a U.S. Senator made an observation the other evening that seemed to be the most significant thing I've heard about the Vietnam crisis in some time.

This Senator expressed the belief that President Johnson, if and when it became necessary, could take to the television and convince the citizens of this country that they had to accept humiliation and a failure of mission in South Vietnam.

This comes from a thoughtful and troubled man, who has been neither an appeaser nor a bombardier in his public utterances. The importance of his words lies in the implication that the middle ground Members of Congress, and perhaps the bewildered citizens of the Nation, are getting ready for the excruciating experience of throwing in the towel.

It is difficult to believe that a President could do this and get away with it politically. Johnson would be torn to shreds as an appeaser. And the Democrats would have a terrible monkey on their back in the 1966 campaign.

But we did it in Korea. Once the military caskets began showing up in the United States in fearsome numbers, it became possible to negotiate a truce which after 16 years is most precarious.

Facing the reality of a failure of mission will be all the more difficult because of the propaganda that the White House, the Pentagon, and the Department of State have fed the people these many years about our commitment in South Vietnam.

Despite all the hopeful predictions, despite all the increased bombing pressure, the grim reality of Vietnam control of much of South Vietnam continues to stare at us as the big fact of the war out there.

And they may have to face up to the problem in that we cannot negotiate a peace unless we talk with the guerrillas who have been dug in all the time. In effect, we will

have to negotiate with burglars who have taken over the upper floors of the house.

The first day we negotiate with the Vietcong we repudiate the government in Saigon, and they go down the drain. After all the months and years of mish-mash that we have been "defending freedom," out in South Vietnam, the repudiation of our wards in Saigon will come as a pretty tough blow.

But when moderate men are speaking privately of President Johnson's ability to make the American people accept the humiliation of defeat, it may be later than they think over in the Pentagon.

With the bar of the eastern district of Wisconsin, I believe that Wisconsin's eastern district already needs three permanent judgeships. If this need is not yet clear—as the Judicial Conference and the Judiciary Committee appear to believe—surely the eastern district of Wisconsin is on the brink of having a continuing workload that would fully justify three permanent judgeships.

As the judicial business of the district continues to grow, I hope that Congress will make the third judgeship permanent.

Additional Federal Judges and Districts

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

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 (H. Res. 734) providing for consideration of S. 1666, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support S. 1666, to provide additional district and circuit judges.

In the eastern district of Wisconsin—which encompasses territory with about two-thirds of the State's population, its highest growth rates, and its chief centers of industry and commerce—there has long been a need for additional judicial manpower.

As of June 30, 1963, 11.6 percent of the pending cases ready for trial in the eastern district of Wisconsin were more than 3 years old. For the Nation the figure was only 8.4 percent.

At that time, the median period from filing to disposition of cases was 29 months in the eastern district of Wisconsin and only 16 months on the average across the Nation.

Litigation was being seriously delayed and this was of great concern to all who recognize the validity of the maxim that justice delayed is frequently justice denied.

In October, 1963, I introduced legislation to provide a third Federal judge in the eastern district of Wisconsin. The bill was referred to the Judicial Conference which in March, 1965 recommended an additional judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, on a temporary basis.

The Judicial Conference's recommendation is included in the excellent legislation before us today.

The passage of this bill and the appointment of an additional judge of the eastern district of Wisconsin will provide for the elimination of the large backlog of pending cases and will substantially improve the administration of justice in that district. It will alleviate the very heavy burden on our present judges, Robert E. Tehan and John Reynolds.

My only regret is that the judgeship for Wisconsin will be temporary.

Our Presence in South Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now debate has raged and many questions have been asked concerning the rightness of our presence in South Vietnam and the rightness or wrongness of the way in which we are conducting our mission there.

It was my privilege, within the past two weeks to visit southeast Asia on the occasion of the Lincoln Day recess. I felt there could be no more appropriate way to spend it than with our troops who are fighting for human freedom in South Vietnam. So it was I spent 6 days in the field, observing our men, what they are doing, and how they are doing it. This trip was not made at Government expense, but was financed by friends in my district, and it had a rather special purpose.

BIRMINGHAM'S ADOPTION OF 1ST INFANTRY

Back in January I informed the House that during the fall recess my city had adopted the 1st Infantry Division. We did so as a sign of our support for the men in Vietnam, for our soldiers, and for what they were attempting to do there. This idea was first conceived by retired Brig. Gen. Edward M. Friend, Jr. It was a good choice.

The Big Red One is this country's oldest division, and has an outstanding and much-decorated history. It was first to shed American blood in France in World War I, and it was the first to land in North Africa in World War II. It spearheaded the conquest of Sicily; it stormed across Omaha Beach in the D-day assault at Normandy, and was first to be in Germany. It was the first infantry division to sweep across the line into Czechoslovakia, the farthest advance of U.S. troops in World War II. The 1st Division is now distinguishing itself in the battle for the freedom of the people of Vietnam. It was my pleasure to go as

March 3, 1966

the people's representative to tell these fighting men of our support for them and our pride in them.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of this adoption became a reality when the mayor of the city of Birmingham, the president of the county commission, the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Birmingham News, and others, got together to organize a coordinated council of distinguished citizens. It was fulfilled by the overwhelming support of the people of Birmingham. In this plan, particular civic groups and other organizations are serving as sponsoring or adopting units for particular units of the 1st Division. While there have been many letters, Christmas gifts sent, and so forth, to individual soldiers by sponsoring groups, the primary emphasis has been on joint projects for the benefit of the Vietnamese people in the III Corps area. For example, the Birmingham Retail Druggists Association has donated medicines and supplies for use in dispensaries set up by the 1st Division for citizens of hamlets and villages there. Many hundreds of people are receiving medical help heretofore not available from any source in this way. Berry High School in Birmingham has adopted an orphanage. The list of such activities goes on and on.

At the kickoff of this project, Sgt. Maj. Bill Woolridge of the 1st Division came to Birmingham to represent the Big Red One. He promptly won the hearts of our city for himself and for his division. Later, the Birmingham News sent two representatives, Alf Van Hoose, correspondent, and Tony Faletta, photographer, to cover the 1st Infantry's operation and to provide the communications necessary to maintain the relationship. These two fine ambassadors for Birmingham accompanied me throughout my tour in Vietnam.

QUESTIONS NEEDING ANSWERS

There was a second reason for my visit. I have many constituents and sons of constituents who are engaged in the Vietnamese action, and I have personally written too many letters to the parents and to the wives of servicemen who have given their last full measure of devotion for the freedom of southeast Asia.

Therefore, in my own mind, as I know has been the case with many Members, there were questions: Is what we are doing in Vietnam necessary? Are we doing it right? Can we succeed in our mission? How is the morale of our troops? Are they adequately trained? And are they adequately supplied?

To seek out the answers, I spent 2 days in the field with the 1st Infantry, touching all its units and operations, then the balance of my time touring from the engineering miracle of Cam Rhan Bay to the Marine's domain in Da Nang and the far north; touching all our major forces, plus the crack Republic of Korea Tiger Division; visiting the "golf course" at An Khê and spending the night on America's nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, with its awesome striking power.

I came back encouraged and inspired by what I found in Vietnam. There has never been a more classic case of good versus evil, light versus darkness, free-

dom versus tyranny than the struggle in which we are now engaged. Nor has America ever produced finer soldiers than the officers and men of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

Our forces are in large part made up of and led by regulars, fine professional American soldiers. Yet there are also represented young draftees and volunteers, taken away from a life here which had every reason to make them soft at an age in which they could not be expected to yet be men. To all the doubters of the strength or virtue of this Nation's youth I must report that these magnificent young Americans who are fighting in Vietnam are their Nation's crowning glory. They are not soft and they are fully men. They are the finest soldiers a great military tradition has yet produced. From where I stand, they look 10 feet tall.

Typical was a young man I met in a field hospital who could not have been more than 20—blond hair, young face, young-old eyes and a fine, muscular body minus one leg, lost to a Vietcong mine.

He said:

It's all right, sir. I know what I've been fighting for.

This conviction was repeated by every American I met in Vietnam. Would God the Congress—all the Congress—could know as well.

IS VIETNAM NECESSARY?

Is such a costly action as this really necessary? In answer, we must face two great grim realities about southeast Asia in our time.

The first is the fact—the reality of Communist aggression—the aggressive acts of a tyranny which would impose its iron rule upon the people of all southeast Asia if it were permitted to do so. In Vietnam we face the present and continuing aggression on the part of North Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh that is continuing every week of every month at this time. But it is not only a present aggression, an aggression we are sworn to act against and committed to act against. It is also a longrun aggression. Ho Chi Minh has been working for 20 years to establish his rule in Vietnam.

The infiltration of subversion and the terrorism in South Vietnam sponsored from the north—these things have gone on not for months but for years and because for years he has been working to infiltrate and to subvert and to capture control of South Vietnam and of its people, the Communists of the Vietcong are thoroughly woven into the fabric of the society of the Republic of Vietnam. They are deeply entrenched. They are interwoven into the whole life of the society.

They are imbedded and they are in a position so intermingled with the rest of the people of South Vietnam that their removal is a slow and painful and step-by-step process. This longrun aggression makes of this present action in Vietnam a unique kind of warfare in our history in which we are combating not only the regular troops in the field, where we can find them and get them to face us, but in which we are struggling against a very insidious kind of guerrilla warfare.

A REIGN OF FORCE AND FEAR

The reign of the Vietcong where they do have power and influence is not one of the love of peace or democracy, it is gangster government. It can best be compared to the influence and power of the Cosa Nostra—the underworld—in this country. Sixty-five percent of their actions are criminal rather than military—crimes against people.

The idea that there is any desire on the part of the Vietnamese people for the kind of government which regularly beheads those who disagree with it and which regularly uses as its methods, murder, torture, and terrorism and which rules by force and fear is ridiculous in the extreme. The benefit to the people involved in permitting VC control of or participation in government is approximately equal to letting the underworld take over the government of Chicago, or advocating that Bogalouosa, La., be run by the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Vietnam are enduring a terrible kind of tyranny and persecution at the hands of the Vietcong.

The aggression being committed in southeast Asia is a brutal and tyrannical aggression. There is nothing pretty about it. There is nothing in it that either conservatives or liberals in this country could reasonably defend. This rule of force and fear has been imposed upon large numbers of people in the Republic of Vietnam and has been sustained by terrorism. This is the first grim fact about southeast Asia.

We see in Vietnam Communist aggression which, if left unrepelled and unchecked, which if we bow before it and surrender, will extend to nation after nation until the millions of Asia are living under the dark night of tyranny.

This is the grim threat not only of the North Vietnamese but of the Red Chinese aggression—the dark night of communism which threatens all of southeast Asia is the first great reality that we must face.

THE NEED

The second is the poverty of Asia. Americans are not prepared to see the poverty which fills Asia, and Vietnam is no exception. The condition of the people stands in marked contrast to the startling beauty of the land. Poverty, disease, illiteracy are everywhere.

It is a wonderful thing that here in these United States where we have to search out the people to be the recipients of our poverty program and apparently have to use great diligence to find these persons. But the fact is one does not have to look in Vietnam.

One does not have to go anywhere at all to find poverty, disease, and illiteracy running rampant. It is unfortunate to have to say so but we were not left a very pretty legacy by the French. The citizens of Vietnam have been subject peoples most of the time for hundreds of years, and for 70 years they were under the control of the French.

Yet, when we see the legacy left us and to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, we see a country in which there are virtually no public schools. We see one in which various epidemics run rampant, and disease is everywhere, one

March 3, 1966

in which there is no kind of public health program, one in which there is great poverty and no little hunger.

We see one in which there is one hospital per province, and these poor by our standards. There are only 100 doctors in the land and most of these are inaccessible to the people. American military medics, AID people, and private agencies have become literally the difference between sickness and health—and even life and death—for countless citizens of this nation.

So if we ask ourselves is it necessary for us to do what we are doing in Vietnam, we need to answer that question in the light of Communist aggression, which left unchecked, could threaten the freedom of all Asia and, indeed, all the world.

We must also answer recognizing the poverty of Asia and the need of the people for a life that is blessed with liberty, with human dignity, and with some opportunity for economic, medical, and agricultural advancement.

OUR COMMITMENT

We must also look at our solemn commitments. Everything we are doing is in line with our commitments as a member of SEATO and our specific commitments to the Republic of Vietnam.

Those are solemn contracts of this Government which must be solemnly fulfilled.

THE INVESTMENT

We must look at what we are doing in the light of our investment in southeast Asia. We have invested not only millions of dollars economically, but also that which is most precious in our land. Some of us for the first time voted the other day for an aid bill to provide economic assistance to the people of southeast Asia.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted for that bill and for the bill this day, not only in the fulfillment of our commitment, but as a sign of our willingness to make whatever further investment is necessary to fulfill our mission there. And well we should, for we have invested our young men in Asia, and any other investment pales to insignificance in the face of their sacrifice.

During my visit to the 1st Infantry, I talked to a certain young soldier. He and another American had for some time been helping the people in a nearby Vietnamese village build a school for their children. Having worked for several weeks without incident, they had relaxed their guard a bit and had set down their weapons a little too far away. Suddenly a group of Vietcong appeared from hiding, grabbed the rifles, fired at the Americans, and ran away. One soldier was wounded, his buddy killed. This wounded soldier had requested to return to complete the project as soon as his wounds permitted. "The school is not finished yet," he explained, "and besides, now I have got an investment." America's job is not finished yet, either, in Vietnam. And our investment is too great to turn back now.

THE ALTERNATIVE

Is it necessary to stay in Vietnam? Let us answer in terms of the future

freedom and safety of all the world, because this, too, is at stake. The domino theory is not inaccurate, for if the tyrant sees he can succeed by aggression and by extending his tyranny, he will continue by force to so extend it, and he must be stopped still here and now.

THE MORAL QUESTION

Are we doing right in southeast Asia? There are the doves who say that we have no moral right to be doing what we are doing, and we ought to seek immediate negotiations and not do anything that might be interpreted as escalation of the war, that we are the aggressors, and we are the ones who are immoral.

What are we doing, and are we doing it right? It seems to me that in response to the doubters of our land we need to recognize very fully and very firmly that the President has gone the second mile and has turned the other cheek in his attempt to find the road to peace. He has sought negotiations consistently for a long period of time. He has explored through his own efforts and those of the Vice President, the Ambassador to the United Nations, the Secretary of State and others every avenue that might lead toward negotiations and toward peace.

He declared a cessation in the fighting, two holiday periods. He declared a cessation in the bombing. He has persistently sought the pathway to peace, to negotiation. And consistently Hanoi and Peiping have jeered at those efforts, and rejected them. They have rather used those times of unilateral peace moves on our part as times of reorganization, entrenchment, increasing supplies and men into South Vietnam as times of increased aggressive action.

Mr. Speaker, once, when I was a 10-year-old boy, the lesson in Sunday School one Sunday morning made a great impression on me. For some weeks another boy who lived two doors from my home and I had had a series of fist-fights almost every day over events that would develop. The Sunday School teacher said:

One should turn the other cheek and go the second mile.

Being thereby converted, I told my friend the next morning that no matter what he did, my response would be to turn the other cheek and not fight back. He became delighted at the idea. He hit me on one cheek, I turned the other, and he hit me on that one, too. While I did not completely lose my religion, it seemed I had run out of cheeks to turn, and it became necessary for me to enter into fisticuffs with him to attempt to teach him to respect other people's religion.

It seems to me that we have gone well past the second mile and we have turned all the cheeks that there are to turn in seeking the way to peace and to negotiation, and the enemy has used these to his consistent advantage and has consistently rejected our overtures of peace.

Consequently, it seems that the only thing we can do under such circumstances is to do everything in our power to render the aggressor incapable of further aggression, to stop his present

and continuing aggression, and to do all we can to demonstrate to him with all the force at our command the foolishness, the folly, of trying to get those who are firmly determined to stand for freedom and for human dignity to bow before tyranny and to accept his aggression without responding with great force and with unaltering firmness. Such a course seems the most likely way to bring the present conflict to an early and honorable conclusion. There are times when a big stick brought down with vigor upon the head of a bully is the most effective instrument of peace.

STRIKING AT THE SOURCE

I would say this would include stepping up the bombing of strategic targets, cutting supply lines, cutting the flow of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam in every way possible, increasing sanctions against those who are supplying North Vietnam, and doing anything and everything reasonably possible to stop the aggression there at its source.

PACIFICATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

There is a second task. Even if we step up the bombing of strategic targets, even if we close the harbors, even if we use strong enough sanctions against other nations so that they do stop supplying the Vietcong—he receives supplies from many places, though Red China is the primary source of supply—we must, nevertheless, do a second job, which is a job of step-by-step pacification and reconstruction in South Vietnam, in the Republic of Vietnam.

It is an oversimplification to feel that we can step up our activities against the north, against Ho Chi Minh, and that, in 6 months or a very short period of time, by escalating our own conduct of the war, we can bring this situation to a successful conclusion. The fact is that because of the long-term aggression of Ho Chi Minh and of the Communists in Vietnam, this is not enough. The only kind of action which can possibly secure the land, which can possibly put the country into a condition under which there can be such a thing as free elections, such a thing as self-determination, is action to release the people from the rule of terror and the reign of fear of the Vietcong within South Vietnam.

Our troops, in cooperation with the Republic of Vietnam, are conducting a step-by-step pacification and reconstruction program. They are going out to clear given areas of the Vietcong, and they are moving in to convince the people of those areas that we can protect them from the one who holds his gun to their heads. If elections were held all over South Vietnam now, in those areas where he has influence and power, he would respond with murder to any who opposed him.

We must, as we are doing now, seek out the hidden enemy. He is hidden and entrenched as a guerrilla. For example, tunnels have been found that have been as long as 2 miles, and six layers deep. Also he dissolves into the populace. Because people fear him, they do not always readily identify him, until they are sure we can provide them security from his reprisal.

March 3, 1966

We must, therefore, convince the people that this enemy who dissolves himself into the civilian population, and who remains unidentified, because of the fear the people have of him, is one from whom we can and will protect them.

In the second place, we must convince them that we are their friends. Regrettably, one of the propaganda instruments the Vietcong have used rather effectively against the Americans has been to compare them to the French, by saying, "They are here to rule, to exploit."

The French soldiers in many instances were mercenaries. They were fighting for pay and for the loot they could take, and their record was not always what it should have been. The French rule did not accomplish for the people of Vietnam what might have been accomplished by more humane and enlightened policies.

Therefore, we must overcome this and other forms of propaganda against our troops. We must persuade the people that we are their friends, that we can protect them and that we want to help them.

Mr. Speaker, everywhere I went I was greatly impressed by the understanding of this phase of our mission possessed by our troops. They understood they had a military mission to meet the enemy on the field, as regular troops. When this has been done they have made a marvelous record and have totally defeated the enemy.

They also understand that they have to search out the guerrilla forces, which is a step-by-step as well as a dangerous and time-consuming occupation, requiring many troops. They are doing this and doing it well.

But a civic action phase of our mission goes hand-in-hand with the military program. We are helping to demonstrate concretely our friendship for the people of Vietnam, our desire to help rather than to rule them, by helping them to construct roads and schools and churches. We are helping them to meet their medical needs by setting up dispensaries all across the land, and are conducting a variety of other programs of civic action, all in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. This is being done in cooperation also with our AID people and our private civilian agencies, and it is being conducted in many instances by our military personnel.

THE GREAT HUMANITARIANS

Our men are demonstrating once more for the world to see that GI Joe is the world's greatest humanitarian. Their understanding of this part of their mission and its necessity and the way they are performing it is an inspiration to behold. These men understand that they must win the friendship of the Vietnamese people, and they are doing so. It is apparent to anyone.

The fine young officer assigned to escort me was Capt. Bert H. Custer, a West Pointer, a fine soldier, a good example of the kind of fine professional that we have at every level of leadership in Vietnam. His easy but firmly disciplined relationship with both senior officers and enlisted men was matched by his rapport

with the people of Vietnam. He has been a fine fighting soldier as well as having the kind of finesse and patience necessary to serve as a congressional escort.

On the day of my departure from Vietnam, he and I went to visit an orphanage in Saigon. This orphanage was one that Dr. Tom Dooley had helped begin. When we entered the grounds little Vietnamese children swarmed around us and surrounded us. They lifted their arms to us with their faces lighted in smiles. In the wisdom of their innocent hearts they knew that Americans were the good guys.

Those tough combat soldiers who had come into Saigon for an evening and taken a little group of orphan children to the zoo and who had hearts as big as all outdoors—the children knew them to be their friends, and so did the people in the villages and the hamlets.

When people have had sick children for many months, and the Americans have come in to provide medical care to help heal their children, such people understand that we have come in friendship. As they understand they begin to have confidence in us and in their Government, which Government looks more hopeful than any we have seen for some time in Vietnam. They are beginning to warm up to us and to gain courage to identify the hidden enemy in their midst, the local Vietcong, so that the Government of the Republic of Vietnam can deal with these enemies.

Now, this step-by-step part of succeeding in our mission will take time and will take troops. This will require firmness of purpose; it will require patience at home; but unless we do this to free and liberate the people of the Republic of Vietnam from the power and influence of this long-term aggression of the Vietcong, and unless we stand firm until we do this, we cannot succeed in our mission in Asia.

CAN WE WIN IN VIETNAM?

This brings me to another question; namely, Can we succeed? May I say that I have never seen anything quite matching the high morale of our troops in Vietnam. These men, everywhere I went, wounded men, generals and privates, men in the hottest spots in Vietnam, and everywhere in that area, universally reflected high dedication matched by understanding of and an unshakable faith in the rightness of their mission. They also demonstrated the confidence and conviction that they were going to succeed in their assignment in Vietnam. Their morale was as high as I have seen anywhere.

LEADERSHIP

We shall succeed in Vietnam because these men who would match any soldiers that this country has ever fielded in any of its wars, and we will succeed in this mission because we have great military leadership. The men who are leading the combat there in this supporting role of ours read like a roll of honor. First among them, of course, is Gen. William Westmoreland, who is a gifted military general and who has also a gift for understanding the delicate political and diplomatic phases of his mission. He re-

spects his supporting role in the Republic of Vietnam and remains in that role, but he manages to lead magnificently from that position.

I found confidence, unshakable confidence, in General Westmoreland on the part of every man under his command as well as on the part of the Vietnamese everywhere. This man has done nothing less than a magnificent job of leadership, and we owe him a debt of great gratitude. Such was also the case with each of his field commanders.

Gen. Jonathan O. Seeman, who is commanding officer of the 1st Infantry Division, with which I spent much of my time, is the finest kind of military leader. High quality marks the leadership of the 1st Cavalry, the Air Force, the Navy. Nor could any military force boast greater leadership than that of General Walt with whom some of us were privileged to meet this day. The Marines under his command are living up to the highest traditions of their corps. Everywhere one goes in Vietnam, one is impressed with the high caliber of both officers and men.

General Westmoreland gives to every man who becomes a part of the U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam nine rules for personnel to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include them in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

NINE RULES FOR PERSONNEL OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the Communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their Government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Vietcong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

1. Remember we are guests here: We make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people. Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right-of-way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. Military Forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, these rules are abided by, and our men are following them and following them well.

MOBILITY AND FIREPOWER

We shall win because we have superior mobility and firepower. This is being used with increasing effectiveness to rout the Vietcong. There has never been more extensive use of air transportation

March 3, 1966

and air support, from helicopters to bombers and from light reconnaissance to heavy transport. Helicopters are used with great flexibility and effectiveness—transporting troops and supplies, rescuing downed aviators and wounded men, and flying combat missions. Armed helicopters are proving of great value in this operation. Artillery is being widely and effectively used against Vietcong strongholds.

Ground-air support and bombing missions by Air Force, Marine, and Navy jets are having a cumulative effect both in casualties and in their demoralizing effect upon the Vietcong. As our intelligence improves, these become increasingly effective. Skill and science, men and morale, mobility and firepower are being blended into a devastating combination which is playing havoc with the enemy.

MEDICAL AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, the medical work we are doing outstrips anything we have ever done. We have stationary hospitals which are in a central location. Since the conflict is everywhere, and there are not fixed battlelines, as in previous wars, rather than having field hospitals which normally follow the troops, helicopters bring into this central location men who have been wounded in battle. A doctor there at one of the hospitals told me that often within 30 minutes of the time a man was wounded he had him in surgery at that particular hospital. We are losing almost no men who get to the hospital and who have been wounded. The ratio is extremely low. This work has been outstanding.

We shall win because the men who are there have had excellent training. They are marvelously trained. They are highly motivated. They understand their mission. They have excellent medical care. And they are well supplied. In spite of the engineering and logistical miracle required to move 150,000 troops into this little country with no real port facilities, few roads, none of them safe, and limited railway, persistently interdicted by the Vietcong, and then sustain those troops and support the military actions of a highly mobile army, this has been done. We are developing the port facilities. We are moving the supplies. I found no present shortages anywhere I went, and I went almost everywhere.

ROTATION POLICY

Mr. Speaker, another thing that means a great deal to them is this: We have a policy of rotating each man after 1 year. While morale is of the highest, every man there can tell you to the minute how much time he has left on his tour and on his mission. This is a system worth maintaining.

A STABLE GOVERNMENT

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the encouraging South Vietnamese progress.

This government is taking seriously the need for reconstruction in order to meet the needs of the people and is determined to lead the way to a better life for them. This government is determined to successfully complete its military operation. It is committed to free elections as soon

as security is established. And it shows signs of strength and stability that are greatly encouraging to see.

Mr. Speaker, we have another encouraging factor, and that is the participation of the forces of the Republic of Korea. It was my privilege to visit the Tiger Division and to see with my own eyes as fine a group of fighting men as I have seen anywhere. These men are the reflection of our earlier investment and continuing investment in this part of southeast Asia.

It was with particular interest that I visited with this Republic of Korea division and saw its outstanding work, because the blood of my own family was shed in Korea, for the people of southeast Asia. Their devotion to freedom is an inspiration to behold.

Mr. Speaker, this represents another indication of the fact that what we are doing is right, and that indeed we can succeed. I believe we shall succeed, not only because of our superior mobility and firepower and magnificent leadership, not only because of the high morale and courage on the part of our troops doing an outstanding job, not only because of the new hope on the part of the South Vietnamese Government, and the other hopes that we see reflected in Korea and in its people there, but I believe that we shall win because in the last analysis, as Abraham Lincoln said, "Right makes might."

RIGHT MAKES MIGHT

We are on the side of truth and justice in Vietnam. The Communists murder and steal and dismember and destroy. We heal, and we help. They tax away the people's rice. We take it away from the Vietcong, and give it back to the people. They tear down. We build up. They terrorize. We make secure. They enslave. We set free. There may be those in the other body of this Congress, and there may be those elsewhere, who will question the rightness of what we are doing in southeast Asia. But there is no question on the part of our military forces there. We are fighting a battle to liberate a people from a tyranny and from poverty and sickness. We are fighting a battle to bring new hope to the millions of Asians. We are fighting the eternal battle for human freedom. This is perhaps the most crucial battle of all in the modern history of Asia. This can be the turning point, introducing a new era of hope, of freedom, of self-determination, of individual liberty and human dignity for the people of southeast Asia, or it can be the beginning of the darkest night that Asia has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, there is much at stake in Vietnam. We have invested much, because we have invested there our young men. But we must not swerve in our purpose. We must recognize the necessity of victory for freedom and the danger of settling for anything less. Our President must stand firm, and we must stand firmly behind him.

THE SUPPORT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, on the day on which I left Saigon I had the privilege of visiting with Mr. Mann of our AID program. He made a suggestion which I am glad

to pass on to my colleagues. There are some 43 provinces in Vietnam, each roughly equivalent to a State. He recommended that it might be a good idea if each State in these United States adopted a Province. I had told him about my city's adoption of the 1st Infantry Division, relating that since the men's needs were met, other than the need for the knowledge of our support, we had agreed that what we could do best was to work together on civic action programs to help the Vietnamese people of the area of operation of the 1st Infantry in Vietnam.

So we are doing so in a number of concrete ways. I told him about it and he said that he would like to see each State of our Union adopt a Province in South Vietnam. There is such tremendous popular support for what we are doing in southeast Asia.

There is a great desire on the part of millions of Americans to demonstrate how much they stand behind our troops, and how much they believe in this battle for human freedom. Here is a concrete way to demonstrate that support and to turn it into a constructive channel that can help us fulfill our mission and succeed therein.

NO TURNING BACK

There can be no turning back in southeast Asia. The battle call is sounded. The troops are in the field and human freedom and human dignity and all the things that all the years of American history stand for are at stake. If we fail in our mission, we shall not only fail the people of Vietnam but the people of southeast Asia and not only the people of southeast Asia but the hope for freedom for the people of all the world in our time. If we fail, we shall have betrayed our own heritage and our own future.

If we become weak and if we do not stand firm, we shall betray everything that America has stood for in all its shining years. In our weakness and in our failure, we shall become traitors to our own destiny, and the Judas Iscariots of a civilization.

We have no choice in southeast Asia but the choice that was made by the men of the Continental Army and by Americans in each succeeding generation: That we will pay whatever price is necessary that freedom might live in our time.

John T. O'Rourke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of John T. O'Rourke this week, the free press everywhere has lost the active service of one of its most vigorous advocates. Mr. O'Rourke, the editor of the Washington Daily News for 27 years, has been admired throughout the ranks of journalism for his intelli-

gence, energies, and enthusiasm. I wish to bring to the attention of Congress just one of the many tributes to Mr. O'Rourke and the fine tradition he has advanced, and insert in the *Record* at this point the following editorial from the *Washington Post*, which has tilted many journalistic lances with Mr. O'Rourke over the years:

AN EDITOR RETIRES

John T. O'Rourke was editor of the *Washington Daily News* for nearly 30 years and his retirement ends an era in Washington journalism. The three decades in which he served at the top of his profession were exciting decades for Washington, for the country, and for the world. John O'Rourke enjoyed the excitement and participated in the life of his times with zest and enthusiasm.

He was in the best tradition of his craft. He was a good writer. He had a sharp nose for news. He had a heart easily stirred by misfortune and a temper easily roused by injustice or wrongdoing. His mind was alert to developments in many fields—aviation, art, and music were within the range of his most intense interest.

For many years he has been a leading figure in the Inter-American Press Association. He is known and admired by editors throughout Central America and South America. He has labored to lift up the standards of his profession. He has struggled to increase understanding among Americans North and South. He has fought for a free press throughout the hemisphere. His colleagues in Washington cherish him as a friend and respect him as a keen newspaper competitor.

Old Myth and New Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial from the March 1, 1966, issue of the *Peoria Journal Star*:
SENATOR FULBRIGHT: "OLD MYTH AND NEW REALITY"

Two years ago Senator FULBRIGHT wrote a book called "Old Myths and New Realities."

Let's look at some of the things he set down then, coolly and soberly.

"It is difficult to see how a negotiation, under present military circumstances, could lead to the termination of the war under conditions that would preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. It is extremely difficult for a party to a negotiation to achieve by diplomacy objectives which it has conspicuously failed to win by warfare. The hard fact of the matter is that our bargaining position is at present a weak one, and until the equation of advantages has been substantially altered in our favor, there can be little prospect for a negotiated settlement.

"It seems clear that there are only two realistic options open to us in Vietnam in the immediate future: the expansion of the conflict in one way or another, or a renewed effort to bolster the capacity of the South Vietnamese to prosecute the war successfully on its present scale. The matter calls for continuing examination by responsible officials in the executive branch of our Government.

"Until and unless they conclude that the

military situation in South Vietnam, and the political situation in southeast Asia, warrant the expansion of the war, or that the overall situation has changed sufficiently to establish some basis for a successful negotiation, it seems to me that we have no choice but to support the South Vietnamese Government and Army by the most effective means available."

In the same book, he suggests that carrying the war to North Vietnam might be necessary in order to bring them to the conference table.

This is the same FULBRIGHT who now publicly "wonders" how we got into this situation? Who throws up his hands at what the President has done as if it were carried out mysteriously and secretly behind his back? And, above all, as if he never, never consented to such action?

Is it the same Senator FULBRIGHT who had earned a considerable reputation for responsibility in his long years in the Senate, and who wrote those words just 2 years ago—is this the same man who turns over his Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate's long-recognized prize eccentric, WAYNE MORSE, for the kind of diatribes against the United States and its Government that have characterized him for a dozen years?

Is this the same man who now permits his committee to be a platform to make a loner, the "black sheep" of the Senate appear, falsely, before the American people to be the voice of the U.S. Senate?

Something has happened to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Something sad.

And something dangerous too, because the new, strange FULBRIGHT carries over something of the shred of reputation, at least, earned by a different kind of man—the man he was before.

How else to explain that a man who explained 2 years ago that we cannot negotiate from weakness, is now engaged in making our position to achieve negotiations weaker?

Was the Fulbright reputation an "old myth," and is this sorry spectacle, the "new reality?"

Francis J. P. Cleary, Retired Employee of Department of Agriculture and Friend of Congressional Staffs, Dies at Age 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress and many veteran staff members will recall pleasant associations with Francis J. P. Cleary, who headed what later became the Congressional Inquiry Unit of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and who retired in 1946.

I have been asked to advise Mr. Cleary's friends that he passed away at the Susan B. Miller Nursing Home in Woodstock, Va., last Monday at the age of 90. Funeral services for him were conducted this morning.

I am told by a member of my staff who knew him intimately that Mr. Cleary had a Horatio Alger type of rise to prominence in the career ranks of the Government. I understand he started his Gov-

ernment service as a messenger at the age of 16 and in 54 years rose to a key position through which many congressional offices successfully channeled their inquiries and problems involving the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Cleary was born in Nenagh, Tipperary, Ireland, on March 2, 1876, and was brought to the United States as an infant by his parents, Dr. Frank P. Cleary, U.S. Army, and Nora Egan Cleary. His earliest years were spent in Illinois, and the family moved to Washington, D.C., in 1881. Mr. Cleary attended public and parochial schools in Washington and was graduated from the School of Law of Georgetown University.

At the age of 16, Mr. Cleary entered Government service as a messenger in the Department of Agriculture. He served for 54 years in the Department, retiring in 1946 at the age of 70. He rose through the ranks as a career employee and was an administrative assistant to the Director of Information when he retired. For many years he was the employee-elected member of the Personnel Appeals Board of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Cleary's late wife was Frances Ann Whalley, sister of Mrs. F. Wilson Gearing of Woodstock, Va. Mrs. Cleary died in 1950, and since 1951 Mr. Cleary had resided in Woodstock.

An active participant in sports in his youth, Mr. Cleary was an avid sports fan. During his long career in Washington he also was active in amateur theatricals and in the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Cleary is survived by his brother-in-law and sister-in-law, Dr. and Mrs. F. Wilson Gearing of Woodstock, Va., and by three nephews and two nieces, Dr. F. W. Gearing, Jr., of Harrisonburg, Va., and John K. Gearing, W. John White, Mrs. Clarence R. Gorman and Mrs. R. Earl Harron of the Washington area.

In behalf of a number of veteran staff members on Capitol Hill who were acquainted with Mr. Cleary, I want to extend condolences to the family.

Democracy: What It Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following speech, "Democracy: What It Means to Me," which was given by a young constituent of mine who has made an outstanding record in scholastic endeavors.

Mr. R. Glen Smiley, of Bozeman, Mont., was the winning contestant from my State in the annual Voice of Democracy contest put on by the ladies auxiliary of the VFW. I urge my colleagues to visit with the winners from their respective States at the VFW annual congressional dinner, March 8, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

March 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1145

service. A conscientious employee should not want to do useless work or do useful work in an inefficient manner. A loyal employee should be as much opposed to overstaffing, incompetency, and inefficiency as he is to acts of espionage, sabotage, and treason.

UN

Neither Withdrawal Nor Escalation Is the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that neither withdrawal nor massive escalation is the answer to our dilemma in Vietnam. The Pittsburgh Press, in a recent editorial, said that the American people must exercise great patience in dealing with this crisis.

The danger—

As the Press editorialist points out—is that for lack of obvious battlefield victories, will either pull back and prove to the world our anti-Communist role is too big for us—or will expand the conflict at vast, unnecessary cost in lives and money.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the entire editorial, entitled "A New Kind of War," as published in the Pittsburgh Press February 13, 1966, in the RECORD at this point:

A NEW KIND OF WAR

Confusion and divided counsels on Vietnam largely result from a lag in imagination—the tendency always to fight the new war in terms of the last.

A bookful of examples might be offered to illustrate this stubborn habit. British military brass scorned the tank in the First World War. American military authority practically had to have the airplane shoved down its throat.

Even as late as World War II the Poles sent cavalry against Hitler's tanks. De Gaulle sensed the futility of the maginot line but couldn't get French authority to listen.

The French used World War II tactics in Vietnam and were beaten by much smaller native forces, mainly armed with captured guns. The American military has had to learn the hard way how to fight a guerrilla war which is kept in bounds by common fear of nuclear weapons.

To the fixed idea as to how a war should be fought, Vietnam is bound to be frustrating. War should involve front lines which are attacked or defended, with progress computed in terms of slain enemies or gained real estate.

So far as the Vietnam phase of the present war is concerned, this is an outmoded concept. The big victories are gained maybe thousands of miles from battles which involve only a relatively few men.

This is too little comprehended by critics of U.S. policy—either those who think we can't win in Vietnam and should get out or those who appear to think we can clean this one up promptly if we just throw enough bombs.

True, in terms of the two prior world conflicts, this is a "no win" war. But, granting that Red China is our principal, immediate enemy in Vietnam, cast up the scores:

The Communist effort to take over Indonesia has collapsed in armed revolt which essentially has destroyed the Indonesian Communist apparatus. Does anyone honestly believe the Indonesian conservatives would have dared challenge the Communists with the United States either losing or withdrawing from Vietnam?

As result of Communist defeat in Indonesia the Indonesian assault on Malaysia has faded from view. Only a short time back this looked like big trouble.

A truce has been called in the menacing war between India and Pakistan. The Red Chinese invasion of India has not been renewed.

These are the "front lines" in the type of war we are fighting. Our weapons include food as well as guns. Our allies are the Indonesian patriots, the economists struggling with inflation in Brazil, the statesmen counseling faith in Africa.

In each of a hundred nations there are varying sets of political opinion as to which way to jump in order to get on the winning side in this struggle between America and the Communist powers.

This is coolly calculated. Only the strong can afford to stand up for principle. The weak must concentrate on saving their own hides and making the best possible deal with whichever of the big fellows comes out on top.

These people now watch Vietnam for evidence that the United States has either the will or the weight to fulfill its avowed commitment, which is containment of communism. The generally favorable trend of affairs in southeast Asia, indeed the generally favorable trend around the world—in Africa, Latin America, Western Europe—evidence world opinion as to who is winning the war in Vietnam.

It is a war requiring vast patience on the part of the American people because the local results are not immediately obvious and because it is difficult to associate cause and effect in events far from Vietnam.

The danger is that, for lack of obvious battlefield victories, we will either pull back and prove to the world our anti-Communist role is too big for us—or will expand the conflict at vast, unnecessary cost in lives and money.

Much depends on understanding of this if America is to be the eventual victor in this oddly fought third world war and avoid world-destroying nuclear conflict.

Albert Thomas

SPEECH
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to note the passing of a beloved colleague. Too often the stalwarts of the Congress, who have written so much of the history of their times, are suddenly gone from the scene. In awe of God's inscrutable ways we meet today to register our sincere thoughts of ALBERT THOMAS, what he meant and how we will miss him.

To know ALBERT was to love and respect him. During the years he so ably served the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities to his people. Loved and respected for his fairness,

sound judgment, deep courage and devotion to America, his rare capacity for leadership will be sorely missed in the years to come.

He was quiet and soft spoken, and as he went about his daily tasks, he had a kind greeting for everyone.

In thinking of ALBERT, I am reminded of the words penned by the late Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician:

I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward those committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

ALBERT THOMAS fully measured up to such ideals. We shall miss him, but he has left forever with us countless memories of a wonderful person.

Some Commonsense Words About Our Supplementing World Food Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting in Albany, N.Y., held recently for northeastern dairy co-op leaders, Lester Martin, president of the 15,000-member Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, spoke some words of uncommon commonsense about the role of the American farmer in any new programs to supplement world food supplies.

As we prepare to consider the alternatives available to us in this connection, it would be well for us to pay heed to Mr. Martin's ideas, and, under my leave to include extraneous material, granted to me on February 8, 1966, his speech is now set forth:

STATEMENT BY DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE PRESIDENT TO THE LEAGUE'S AFFILIATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

Much has been written and spoken in recent months about the great population explosion in the world and the virtual inevitability of a widespread food shortage in some of our most populous countries.

The U.S. Government, both in Congress and in the executive branch, has expressed concern over this critical situation and recommendations have been made at both levels for action to expand American food production to meet the emergency.

As a farmer and as an elected head of a major farm organization, I am ready, willing, and eager to see the untapped productivity of this Nation mobilized to aid everyone, at home or abroad, who faces a shortage of food. No one should go hungry if food can be made available to feed him.

At the risk, however, of being called selfish, I must urge all farmers, whether milk or grain producers, to stop, look, and listen before plunging headlong into expensive investments in more production facilities.

March 3, 1966

Whether the motive is a desire to cash in on the expected bonanza of foreign aid, or a desire to respond to the world need for more food—or a combination of both—let us not create a situation in which we can rapidly find ourselves once more the victims of our own efficiency.

For some 20 years the milk and grain producers of this country have been criticized, ridiculed, and generally ill-used by the press, politicians, and the public because of the national commodity price support program. In addition, farmers have been saddled with the economic distress that has accompanied an unbalanced supply-demand situation.

Most of this criticism was unjustified. The food surpluses that arose after World War II were an outgrowth of the war and the postwar needs of the world. They were advocated and encouraged by our Government to meet an urgent need. It was unrealistic to expect them to simply disappear when the need declined. The Federal price support program was used to prevent economic disaster to the industry that virtually kept a large part of the world alive during its darkest hours. It soon, however, became a political chopping block and an easy source of headlines. The farmer's role in feeding the world was forgotten. The new image of history's greatest provider, the American farmer, was that of a greedy hick with one foot in the tax trough and the other on the neck of the consumer.

If we, as farmers, let that happen again we deserve to wear the biggest and brightest durce cap history can devise. At long last, consumption and production in this country are beginning to attain a reasonable balance. Prices to food producers have improved and will likely continue to do so if we exercise reasonable restraint in our expansion programs.

President Johnson this month sent a message to Congress dealing with the need for American efforts to curb world hunger through a food-for-peace program. His program would lead to increased food production in this country, stocking of domestic reserves, and use of some nonprice supported commodities purchased in the market for foreign aid. He also promised to make use of present legislative authority to buy dairy products on the open market "whenever necessary" for use overseas.

These are constructive steps. But they are not enough. They provide some incentive for the present, but no assurance for the future.

The American farmer does not need to expand his production facilities beyond the normal pace that can meet expected growth in commercial demand. To exceed this rate of expansion is to court eventual disaster. If our Government desires a faster or more extensive rate of expansion, then let us have adequate legislative guarantees from Government that we will not be left holding the bag a few years, or even 10 years, from now. Statements of good intentions are not enough.

Let the Government establish a specific national food reserve by law, one which the experts feel is adequate to protect this country in time of emergency. And let this reserve be totally and legally isolated from the marketplace. Make it ironclad that no representative of Government can use the reserve to put an artificial lid on farm commodity prices by selling off quantities of it in the market whenever prices threaten to rise above some arbitrary figure. I know of no such lid on wages or on the price of food production supplies and equipment.

Further, let the Government use its considerable facilities to estimate its needs, for foreign aid in various commodities, years in advance and let us have legislation enabling the appropriate agencies to contract for supplies of these commodities in the marketplace in advance. American agriculture does

not look forward to expanding production so that Government warehouses may be used as cheap middlemen to supply foreign aid programs with food purchased at cutrate prices from farmers. If more food is needed to implement our foreign relations, then let us do it on a sound businesslike basis with the cost being borne by all American taxpayers, the same as is done when our Government makes tanks or guns available to foreign countries. Let us not continue it as a lopsided burden on food producers.

If there is an excess supply after these controls have been established, then it can truly be called a surplus and treated as one.

Finally, we must have safeguards to protect our additional investments in production facilities when and if the need and the urgency for new food supplies ends. It could happen in a few years, or it might not happen at all. Past history, however, leads us to be cautious. A farmer who has spent 20 or 30 years building up equity in his operation would be a fool to mortgage that equity on the gamble that his increased investment will pay for itself through sales and prices created by the food-for-peace program.

If the cost to the taxpayer became burdensome enough, Congress could chop this program in half or even end it overnight. And where would the mortgaged farmer's equity be then?

Let us have legislation that will provide a financially sound program to assure farmers that the additional investments they make to meet the world emergency will not be their risk alone. If it is argued that such a provision is not necessary because the increased demand for food will never end, then I say the provision will never have to be used—so why object to it?

Smarter men than I will have to figure out the details and language of the legislation I am proposing, but without such assurances I strongly urge all farmers to view any temporary inducements for rapid expansion of production with suspicion, and to act with extreme caution. A sudden bonanza for the machinery manufacturers, the banks, the feed dealers and land speculators, could well then turn into an eventual depression for farmers.

If we build again, as we did in World War II, in the postwar period, and during the Korean war, let us build on a better foundation than high hopes and higher mortgages.

American Lithuanian Council of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to address the American Lithuanian Council of Boston, Mass., on Sunday, February 20, 1966. The ceremonies were held to commemorate the 48th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, now only a bright memory in the heavy hearts of all Lithuanians.

I insert here my remarks on that occasion, as well as those of the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, who was in attendance representing the Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor. I include, too, a list of the principal officers and guests who were present, and a copy of the resolutions adopted by the council at that meeting:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE

More as a friend and neighbor of my fellow American-Lithuanians, than as a U.S. Representative in the Congress, I consider it a particular privilege to take part in this program commemorating the 48th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

This annual ceremony is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their American friends because it is held to recollect the date of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule. Back on that joyful day, Lithuania stood forth as an independent democratic republic. There was cause for celebration then and the future was faced with confidence. Your homeland people were happy and prosperous in their own sovereignty.

Unfortunately, in this year of 1966 our observance here must be shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the continuing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The brutal tyranny now being forced upon Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a continuing challenge to the moral conscience of our Nation and the United Nations to reestablish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples. In simple justice, our Government must perseveringly insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

The major world powers, including the United States should not remain acquiescent parties to the disgraceful betrayal of the smaller nations like Lithuania—which betrayal defies every decent concept of self-determination and democracy.

On this occasion dedicated to the memory and future objective of Lithuanian independence, I again say that the United States and the United Nations must increasingly call upon Russia to give up her occupation and control over Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly violated the political pledge made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Unless restitution is made, the United States should not be held bound by such unratified agreements. We must continue to use our moral leadership in the United Nations to demand that the suppressed rights of Lithuania and other subjugated nations to govern themselves be restored.

Although we mourn over her present plight, there is no cause for despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has proved that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumphs of oppressors. The Christian faith, which in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. From my own knowledge and experience with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, I know that deep in the heart of every Lithuanian is that passion for liberty and freedom which never dies. There is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

As the keynote of this ceremony, may I suggest that we rededicate ourselves in the determination to perseveringly reveal and present to the Christian world the facts and the truth about the persecution of Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the United States will be inspired to accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring Lithuanian independence.

In this rededication, I am sure you will have the complete support of all Christian, freedom-loving people throughout the world. I am confident you can rely upon them to join in your efforts and prayers that your homeland may once again be free. May God

A1134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 3, 1966

Charles Martel deal with the Moors by taking the field at Tours with an offer of a few fat bucks if they'd just retire beyond the Pyrenees.

Mr. Johnson must be succumbing to the infection of the appeasement wing in his own party—the BOBBY KENNEDYS who would welcome the Vietcong into the Saigon Government, the FULBRIGHTS who are forever carping about a policy that requires standing up to the Communists at all, the MORSES who contend it would be no weakness if we bugged out.

Senator FULBRIGHT's Foreign Relations Committee recently heard a pointed warning from Gen. Maxwell Taylor that the leaders of North Vietnam still hoped "for some kind of victory in the south," apparently because they were convinced that the United States be detached from support of South Vietnam. The stream of criticism against the war which comes from Democrats in Congress is one reason for this Communist conviction.

"They have not," the general said in reference to the Communists, "forgotten that the Vietminh won more in Paris than in Dienbienphu and believe that the Vietcong may be as fortunate in Washington." Dienbienphu was a climactic French defeat in 1954, but the French at home had lost stomach for the war after 7 years, just as they later lost heart in Algeria, where French arms had succeeded in checkmating the guerrillas.

Our recent history amply demonstrates that wars can be more readily lost in Washington or at the conference table than in the field. Franklin Roosevelt threw away the fruits of military victory at Tehran and Yalta. Our allies, notably the British under the Socialist Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, became terrified lest the United States defeat the Communists in Korea. General MacArthur was handcuffed by Washington, and the victory that was possible was sacrificed in favor of an ignominious stalemate, equivalent to the first military defeat in this country's history.

It is all in process of happening again. The Communists know what rides on the stakes, for the North Vietnamese commander in chief, General Giap, has said, "If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world." South Vietnam is the acid test whether Communist wars of national liberation are to sweep the world.

"Despoilers of Democracy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a highly respected Washington newsmen and Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter, Mr. Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Cowles Publications, has authored a book entitled "Despoilers of Democracy."

In this straightforward writing, Mr. Mollenhoff has described, detail by detail, a record of cynicism and deceit on the part of some Government officials. Mr. Mollenhoff asks whether or not the American people are willing to tolerate

the censorship which today surrounds many Government agencies, especially the Department of Defense and the White House—censorship which permits questionable policies to be pursued and which allows bureaucrats the opportunity to violate the public trust.

I recommend the reading of this book by all persons concerned over the tendency of Government today to keep the lid of secrecy tightly clamped on even the most trivial matters.

Following is a review of "Despoilers of Democracy" which was published in the January 1966 edition of the Washington World magazine:

"DESPOILERS OF DEMOCRACY," CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF (DOUBLEDAY)

In his unsuccessful 1964 campaign Senator Goldwater attempted to focus attention on the topic of corruption in Government and the need for the revitalization of the American Governmental processes. Clark Mollenhoff, a perennial critic of the political scene, in his heavily documented and incisive analysis, considers the background and intricate interaction between the problem of distorted democratic government and the breakdown of the independence of the several segments of our Government. The traditional balance of the divisions of our Government has lent stability in minimizing the problem of corruption in Government. Mollenhoff examines as principal figures in this breakdown the situations of such individuals as Bobby Baker, Billy Sol Estes, and in a different vein, Otto Otepka.

The use of Federal power for its own end is illustrated by the experiences of Don Reynolds who testified against Bobby Baker before the Senate Rules Committee. Reynolds, himself a controversial figure, was allegedly harassed by the Government to an almost unbelievable extent. Mollenhoff writes, "He [Reynolds] revealed that he had been questioned many times by the FBI, by tax agents, and by the Senate Rules Committee staff, and that the pattern of questioning made it appear he was the target of major emphasis, not Bobby Baker or others." Clearly this is a misuse of Federal power and an area of concern for those dedicated to the preservation and advancement of civil liberty for all our people regardless of their individual philosophy as Mollenhoff so compellingly discloses.

The author presents specific proposals to eliminate and cut down the threat of corruption to democracy and erosion of basic liberties. His strong arguments emphasize the decline in the independence of Congress in the context of American democracy in the 1960's and the companion decline in the independence of the American press under the influences of the Federal Government and the competition of centrally controlled media. To him the only way this Government decay can be effectively halted is if the people sense the problem, grasp its importance, and "demonstrate that the people are the masters." The public must become aware of the dangers of massive presidential political power and the effects on the governmental machinery of enormous Government contracts and Federal handouts. For Mollenhoff "in the end the responsibility for good Government rests with the people. America will get as good a government as Americans demand." Of course, as is so often the case in such writing, Mr. Mollenhoff fails to explain just how the people will become so aware and so aroused given the situation he describes. One obvious way would be to read his book.

Vice President's Mission Hailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the 43,000-mile mission to Asia by Vice President HUMPHREY was hailed in a recent column by David Lawrence who said it was "sensible tactics for the Vice President" to go around the world making speeches, especially during critical times when the Communist propaganda machine is so active in sneering at or denouncing American policies."

The article is an interesting appraisal of the broadening duties of the Vice President, and because many will want to peruse its contents I am offering it to the Record for publication there:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Feb. 28, 1966]

THE NEW GLOBAL DUTIES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Originally, the chief function of a Vice President of the United States was to preside over the Senate. Nowadays, however, he plays a far more important role as an unofficial member of the executive branch of the Government. This practice arose only in recent years, when America began to participate actively in world affairs and the help of allies in meeting emergencies became essential.

Vice President HUMPHREY, who returned last week from a 43,000-mile journey to Asia, can do more during brief visits to the various capitals of the world to publicize American policies than sometimes can be accomplished in longer periods of time by the ambassadors or ministers accredited to those countries. This is because diplomatic representatives must be supercautious in what they say, as they have to stay at their posts the year around. But a Vice President, as the No. 2 man in the U.S. Government, can make speeches of a positive nature, and they will be widely printed.

Public relations has become a significant factor in the evolution of international policy. Many Americans do not realize that, although a speech by the President may be broadcast over television and radio and be given considerable space in the newspapers within the United States, it may get only a brief mention abroad—even in countries friendly to the United States. The reason is that what happens locally or in neighboring areas takes up most of the space in the news media.

When an emissary as prominent as the Vice President of the United States, however, visits a foreign country, it becomes a local story of magnitude. Crowds assemble to hear him speak, and the newspapers give front-page treatment to the event. Many an issue that has been repeatedly explained at home by the President is clarified for the first time in other lands when it is given publicity on the occasion of a Vice-Presidential visit.

It is, therefore, sensible tactics for the Vice President to go around the world making speeches, especially during critical times when the Communist propaganda machine

March 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1133

generation. Our magazines and educators and ministers tell us there is a driving force within the youth of today that demands use. The American teenage generation has drive, it has initiative, it has power. There is a stirring unrest within the very heart and the very soul of every teenage human being across this country. I am a teenager. I have this unrest. I cannot deny it because I personally know it exists.

What can teenagers do to constructively use this energy? They can gather together and simply sit down in a mass protest demonstration; or they can march carrying signs proclaiming everything from religious beliefs to obscene words. "A government in which the supreme power is in the hands of the people who exercise it, either directly, or through their chosen representatives." Action and restraint. The substitution of conscience for emotion and intelligent thought for irrational thought. American teenagers do possess the right to sit down. They do possess the right to march, but they also possess the moral obligation to their country and to themselves to seriously ask themselves, each one individually, "What will I do with my energy? I have drive. I have initiative, I have power. I feel it, I recognize it, but I must control it. Am I willing to inquire and learn what is going on in the world today. Once I have a basic knowledge of the facts, will I freely discuss them with my friends, encouraging them to think? Will I discuss political and social matters with my parents, making them examine themselves and their relationship to their country? In short, will I be a mature human being?"

A strong democracy is built upon intelligent thought. It does not begin at the national level, it does not even begin at the local level. Democracy begins within the heart of the individual citizen. It is not a few thousand words written in a history book, but a dynamic force for daily use. Democracy is not something tangible that can be held in the hand, but a driving spirit for freedom. As young men and young women, we will not let it die—we must not let it die.

An Idaho Hand at the Throttle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has contributed many men of extremely high caliber to important positions in the Federal Government. One such man is Commissioner Abe McGregor Goff of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I submit for the RECORD an essay on this dedicated public servant, by Dwight Wm. Jansen, writing in the Idaho Observer of February 24, 1966, and published in Boise, Idaho:

AN IDAHO HAND AT THE THROTTLE

(By Dwight William Jansen)

For 24 years, ending in 1954, a man from Moscow, Idaho, named Bill Lee served on the Interstate Commerce Commission. When Lee left office President Eisenhower looked around and plucked from the Post Office Department its General Counsel, a man named Abe McGregor Goff, who also happened to hail from Moscow, Idaho.

It was late in the 19th century and early in this one that regulatory Commissions came to power in the U.S. Government; during the depression they bloomed to full flower. Now Idaho is furnishing three important members of those important regulatory Commissions.

Rosel Hyde of the Federal Communications Commission is the senior of all U.S. regulatory Commissioners in time of service.

Hamer Budge of the Securities and Exchange Commission is one of the newer Commissioners, but is coming to be one of the more respected.

And Abe McGregor Goff is one of the more experienced, one of the more colorful, one of the more gregarious.

He enjoys people, likes being with old friends, and meeting new acquaintances. And he loves to talk about his colorful and purposeful life.

Goff had served in Congress from Idaho's First District before going to work for the Post Office Department. Before that he had been in the Army, in both World War II theaters. His service included work on the staff of General MacArthur, work that brought him into contact with General Eisenhower, and work in the war crimes trials in the Far Eastern theater.

But his fame in Idaho preceded his work in politics, government, and the military. The first time Oregon State played Idaho at Boise—1923—Goff was a lineman of the Idaho team that won, 7 to 0. Playing with him were Sib Klefner, Skippy Stivers, John Vessar, Larry Quinn, Bob Fitzke, Ray Stephens, Charlie Housen, and Dusty Kline, among others. Later he became a football coach, a prosecuting attorney, a State senator, and president of the Idaho State Bar Association.

In World War I, Goff served as a private in the Army. He entered the second war as a major and rose to the rank of colonel, winning the Legion of Merit and nine other decorations. Among the many unusual facts about this man is the fact that he is admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of the Philippines.

He has held national offices in the American Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, the Federal Bar Association, the Federal Bar Foundation, and the Judge Advocates Association.

Goff was born December 21, 1899, at Colfax, Wash.; he was married in 1927 to Florence Richardson, then a faculty member at the University of Idaho. They have two children, both now grown. He is an Episcopalian.

Goff was with the British in North Africa during Rommel's 1942 drive across the sands; later he became a military envoy to the Emperor Haile Selassie, and for a time served as military escort to Madam Chiang Kai-shek. He organized the International Prosecution Section for the Supreme Commander in Tokyo before the war crimes trials there. And the Secretary of War once assigned him to make a special review of the court-martial of Billy Mitchell—Gen. William Mitchell.

The appointment of the ICC was not the first time Goff had succeeded William E. Lee; in 1926, when Lee left Moscow to become a member of the Idaho Supreme Court, Goff took over his place as the law partner of C. J. Orland. Goff had been a junior attorney in the firm for 2 years.

The Chairman of the ICC is selected from among the members on a rotating basis; Goff rotated into the top spot during 1964. He found himself chiefly concerned with big railroad mergers then being proposed, the giant of all being the New York Central with the Pennsylvania. Goff's decisions and views then might be felt for years to come in the economic and transportation systems of America.

Like most Commissioners, Goff cares not to talk about specific cases. But he will re-

mark upon the general place of his Commission and all regulatory Commissions in the American system.

Goff disagrees with any tendencies to call the regulatory Commissions "a fourth branch of Government." Actually, says he, they combine elements of all three branches—the judicial, the executive, the legislative. But if they must be classified under one branch, that one branch, Goff thinks, must be the legislative.

"We are an agent of the Congress. Now, it's true that we are known as quasi-judicial agencies because we hold hearings and issue decisions. And we also exercise some of the functions of the executive—we have enforcement people who see to it that our policies are carried out.

"Basically, though, we are an instrument of Congress. Now, the Congress could sit down and it could write out safety regulations and freight rates and weight specifications and all the rest of that.

"But it is so complicated, so complicated, that Congress would find time to do nothing else. And so we handle that work under authority set out by Congress. The Congress can change anything we do. It can limit us or restrict us. We don't have the power of a fourth branch of Government."

Wars Lost in Home Capitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history does repeat itself, or we might well say that the present administration is caught in its own web of confusion in its continued failure to provide leadership in the Vietnam war. The Chicago Tribune editorially brought home in very effective fashion this morning the lack of progress based on the lack of a practical policy:

WARS LOST IN HOME CAPITALS

President Johnson is back where he was a year ago on the war in Vietnam. On April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University, he offered the Communists "unconditional discussions" to end the war, throwing in the promise of a billion dollars for reconstruction as a sweetener. North Vietnam responded that he could go roll his hoop.

Yesterday Mr. Johnson seized the fifth anniversary of the Peace Corps as occasion to renew his plea that the Communist regime in Hanoi negotiate peace and let war stand aside while elections are held. He said the United States would abide by the outcome of the balloting, presumably even if the Communists were to win a big or controlling voice in the Government of South Vietnam.

Along with this was the familiar tender of "a massive effort of reconstruction and development open to all including North Vietnam."

It is the same old Johns Hopkins formula. It didn't work then and it won't work now. As we remarked on that previous occasion, we are not aware that history offers a single instance that the Johnson formula of a purchased peace has ever bought off an invader.

George Washington did not join the Hessians in Christmas dinner at Trenton. He whipped them. When the Ottoman Turks turned up at the gates of Vienna, they were not turned back by a promise from the defenders, "Go home and we will reward you with a shipload of shish kebab." Nor did

March 3, 1966

is so active in sneering at or denouncing American policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY visited South Korea, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Thailand, and Laos, and, of course, spent some time in South Vietnam. All of these countries were given a clear statement not only of America's firmness and resoluteness in handling the Vietnam war but of the sincere desire of the United States to achieve an honorable peace.

Mr. Johnson, while Vice President, also made trips to Asia, Africa, and Europe, and in the preceding administration, Vice President Nixon went to countries on every continent, including a visit to the Soviet Union. The use of a Vice President for foreign trips is even more necessary today than it was a decade or two ago, because the international situations that have since developed are frequently subject to misunderstanding, particularly as the Communists are busily engaged in fomenting friction by means of repeated distortions.

When the Constitution was written, it was agreed that a Vice President should be designated to succeed the President in the event of the latter's death or disability, but nowhere else in the document were any duties of a Vice President specified in relation to the executive branch of the Government. Some Presidents have altogether ignored their No. 2 man. In the last 30 years, however, it has become customary for the Vice President to attend Cabinet meetings and to be given the confidential background of many important developments in national and international policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY happens to be a very vocal, healthy, exuberant person who delivers effective speeches. He has a congenial personality and makes a good impression abroad. Most important of all, he follows carefully the instructions given him by the President and the Secretary of State back home. So the role of the Vice President as a roving ambassador is indeed unique.

Certainly, in bygone days, when it was often said that a Vice President really had nothing to do, few people envisaged the important position that the No. 2 man occupies today in the American Government and throughout the world.

Those Who Place Themselves Above the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include an editorial from the "Stars and Stripes-National Tribune" issue of February 17, 1966. This thoughtful editorial gets to the crux of the matter by stating: "We abhor the ever-growing doctrine that, if in an individual's judgment a law is a bad one, then he is not bound to conform with it."

The expression of this doctrine by Professor Lynd and the draft board sits-ins by students at the University of Michigan is special cause for concern because it comes from educated people who should have more appreciation of the consequences of their acts. The end result of this doctrine is anarchy and I join with the "Stars and Stripes-National

Tribune" in expressing the hope that action will be taken to curb such activities.

IS LYND UNTOUCHABLE?

Like millions of other Americans, we are deeply concerned with the actions of Staughton Lynd, Yale professor who has so flagrantly flouted the laws of our Nation.

Lynd, on two occasions has taken unto himself the prerogatives of defying the U.S. Government and the laws of that Government. He traveled to North Vietnam, meeting there with high Communist officials without U.S. authorization and actually in defiance of statutes which prohibit travel to foreign countries by U.S. citizens unless lawfully permitted.

More recently the Yale professor left the United States and appeared on a television broadcast in London, England, again without express permission from Government officials.

We abhor the ever-growing doctrine that, if in an individual's judgment a law is a bad one, then he is not bound to conform with it. This was first promulgated in aggressive civil rights demonstrations.

By far the overwhelming percentage of law-abiding American citizens do not look with favor upon Lynd's defiance of a Government edict. Not only is he an American citizen duty bound to obey the laws of his country, but his consorting with enemy leaders in enemy country gives the impression that our law-enforcement agencies for some reason do not want to take such perpetrators to task.

When American boys are dying daily in South Vietnam no unauthorized American citizen should abrogate to himself the functions of proper Government officials. We believe that it is time to curb the travel tendencies of Staughton Lynd and any other Americans who entertain similar views.

When Marines Wage Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to visit South Vietnam last fall and spend a week in the field with the 3d Marine Division. I served with this division in World War II, when it was bent on recovering territory seized by the Japanese.

Today, in Vietnam, the 3d Marine Division is determined to rid Asia of a new aggressor—the North Vietnamese Vietcong. All of us are very much aware of the military efforts of the marines in Vietnam, but there are many who do not realize that the United States and the marines are waging an equally important battle in southeast Asia—a battle against hunger, disease, and fear.

When American marines go into Vietnamese villages, they often carry the tools of peace, as well as the implements of war. Food, clothing, medicine, and friendliness are winning hearts while weapons provide security.

In the United States, marine reservists are raising CARE funds for these same villages, and other organizations are joining in this vital campaign.

The Christian Science Monitor, on February 24, published an excellent article detailing some of the marine ac-

tivities in this other war. At this time, I insert this article in the RECORD in the hope you will share my pride in the Marine Corps and its Commandant, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr.:

WHEN MARINES WAGE PEACE IN VIETNAM (By David K. Willis)

WASHINGTON.—As the first marines walked warily into the hamlet, children watched silently from doorways. Adults stayed inside.

The sun beat down; fear and hostility hung in the air.

The villagers knew the Americans were fighting the Vietcong, but they were afraid of both sides. They just wanted to get back to their rice fields and to be left alone.

The marines started to patrol. As they fanned out, someone noticed a pump was broken. Without a word, it was fixed.

VILLAGERS TRAINED

The next day, a group of villagers walked over to the Marine headquarters, smiling gratefully. Soon they were staunch allies.

A new cistern was built with sand and cement bought by the marines from their own pockets. After a Vietcong attack, Marine doctors treated several villagers, then opened a center and helped up to 150 patients a day, 6 days a week.

"For Vietnam's 15 to 16 million people, there are only 900 doctors," a senior officer in the Agency for International Development (AID) told this newspaper, "but 600 of them are in the armed forces."

Others with medical training are either elderly or saddled with political or other responsibilities, and can work only part time in the health field.

Air Force Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys is AID's man in charge of the medical effort. He is making radical changes in the program. He is encouraging U.S. medical units to train as many Vietnamese as possible. These workers are trained in rudimentary hygiene and health care.

Town health centers, safe from the Vietcong, are replacing vulnerable village stations.

Women are being encouraged to take up nursing. This has been a challenge, because, traditionally, nurses—like schoolteachers—have been men.

"We've broken the tradition, we think," said one official. "Now 70 percent of new nurses are female. Two years ago, it was 20 percent."

From time to time, AID officials tour the United States looking for volunteer nurses to serve in Vietnam. Recruiting drives have been held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. Housing and other facilities are limited in Saigon, but officials accept as many volunteers as they can.

FUND DRIVES SET

The war has also put a new focus on quick courses—6 weeks to 3 months—for lower echelon Vietnamese, to turn them into health workers for rural areas.

The Vietcong killed 30 of these health officers last year, and the Government pay is low—less than \$1 a day. So the Vietnamese are not rushing to volunteer.

The Vietcong tells villagers that Americans will steal, kill, and torture. At the village of Le My, 7 miles north of Da Nang, more than one marine was killed by sniper fire as they began handing out extra rice.

But the people saw that the rice kept coming, that their children were freely helped by military doctors, that the "terrible" Americans smiled under their helmets.

A sergeant in Da Nang bought a small horse to give children rides. Others gave dolls to orphanages.

Then last September, the Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., decided to organize this "civic action" on a wide scale.

March 3, 1966

RESTAURANTS CHIP IN

He authorized the 122,000 Marine reservists in the United States to launch fundraising drives to give the South Vietnamese more clothes, tools, blankets, food, and lumber.

The entire operation is carried on through CARE, a nonprofit organization. CARE receives the money, buys goods in Vietnam, and channels it to the villages.

Reserve units show films, put up advertisements, stir enthusiasm. They do not handle money themselves. They hand out yellow-and-gold envelopes, which donors send to CARE, Inc., on Connecticut Avenue in Washington.

Then CARE forwards the money to Da Nang.

The reservists' aim is \$200,000 by March 1. Several State Governors and mayors, including George Romney, of Michigan; William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania; Edward T. Breathitt, Jr., of Kentucky; Richard J. Daley, of Chicago; Jerome Cavanagh, of Detroit; and Joseph Barr, of Pittsburgh, have opened drives in their areas.

In Seattle, 15 restaurants donated their Christmas Eve takings to the fund. Donations have been pouring in at the rate of \$2,000 a day.

In a narrow, green-painted office in the Marine Headquarters Building in Washington, a spokesman explained:

"The drive was launched just as communities were searching for ways to offset last year's wave of anti-Vietnam demonstrations. 'People couldn't help us fast enough. CARE, a fine group to work with, is providing all kinds of material—school kits, tools, soap, cloth, needles and thread, and so on.'"

PEOPLE'S SUPPORT HELD NEED

Another Marine spokesman continued: "General Greene is a strong advocate of civic action. Without the support of the people, we can't hope to really defeat the Vietcong or find out what he's up to."

The money is going to the four northern Provinces of South Vietnam, where the Marine 3d Amphibious Force is stationed; Thua Thien Quang Nam, Quang Tin, and Quang Ngai. (These include the cities of Hue and Da Nang.)

The drive illustrates how private American institutions are also helping fight the other war.

The National Association of the Junior Chambers of Commerce, for instance, has been active in raising money.

And CARE—which delivered its first food packages in France on May 11, 1946—is typical of the person-to-person aid agencies working in Vietnam.

So far in its history, CARE has delivered \$610 million worth of supplies in four continents. A joint organization of 26 service agencies, it works in Vietnam with several other American organizations, including the Catholic Relief Service, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the International Volunteer Service.

The Marines also have joint United States-South Vietnamese military teams acting as military-civic cadres in the northern Provinces.

One of them, working near Hue, consists of four Marine units and eight Vietnamese units of provincial troops, under a Marine lieutenant.

It hunts down the Vietcong in a village, then stays to set the villagers on their feet.

VILLAGERS LEND AID

The Marines are proud of their civic-action programs, limited as they are. They medically treated 134,119 Vietnamese between March and December last year, handed out 131,916 pounds of food, 120,767 pounds of clothes, and 40,946 pounds of soap, fed 33,387 refugees, evacuated 4,331 ill civilians, conducted 40 English classes, and provided \$2,053 out of marine pockets.

Marines are satisfied that civic action—backed up with an efficient military operation—is the best weapon they have.

In Le My last year, a Vietcong patrol forced a village woman to guide it through an area newly occupied by the Marines.

She guided them straight to a Marine outpost. She turned them in.

Another time, a Vietcong straggler stopped five village women on a sampan and asked help to find his patrol.

The women welcomed him aboard, took him downstream—and pushed him into the water in front of a startled Marine sentry, shouting "Vietcong. Vietcong."

Marines had rebuilt Le My's bridges and schools, and reopened its marketplace. They were reaping the reward of kindness.

Kindness. That's what the "other" war is all about.

Economic Growth in Southwestern Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Regional Industrial Development Corp., of southwestern Pennsylvania, known in the Pittsburgh area as RIDC, is a nonprofit development corporation established under the laws of Pennsylvania. It is concerned with the economic development and industrial growth of a nine-county area in southwestern Pennsylvania in which more than 3 million people reside. The principal objectives of RIDC are to strengthen and create new employment opportunities, to broaden and diversify the industrial base of the region, to provide new land, buildings and financing, for existing and new companies, to upgrade the labor force in fields where new skills are called for, and to make the region a unified economic entity working for the growth of the whole region.

As a measure of the success of this energetic, imaginative organization, I ask that "Highlights of the Past Year" from the 1965 RIDC annual report, be included at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PAST YEAR

Employment in the region is the highest in a decade.

Unemployment is lowest recorded since data compilation was begun, and rate is now below those of United States and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

New highs were recorded in capital investment for plant and equipment.

More than 75 major industrial expansions were announced or begun during the past year.

Five new plants are in operation or under construction in the RIDC-Allegheny County Industrial Park, representing an employment of 1,500 persons.

The RIDC Industrial Development Fund commitments now exceed \$6,000,000 to 61 companies employing approximately 3,000 people.

Retraining programs have been undertaken which have retrained 3,500 people in more than 175 separate courses and 50 different subjects.

RIDC-sponsored Pennsylvania Industrial

Development Authority projects now total \$14,000,000 (\$5,900,000 in the past year).

The Pittsburgh region has established itself as the leading oxygen steelmaking center in the world.

The regions' diversification continues with the further growth of its research and development facilities and with Pittsburgh strengthening its position as a major administrative, management, and corporate center.

Profit in Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., writing in Our Sunday Visitor, the National Catholic ecumenical weekly, stated:

We used to be able to count on our Government to protect us from salacious literature, but not any longer. Its sense of values has been perverted. The Government protects us from drugs that harm the body, but when it comes to salacious literature or seductive films that harm our morals, the Government does not seem to care.

I strongly believe the legislative branch of our Government does care, as evidenced by the fact the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed my bill last year to halt the unsolicited flow of obscenity through the mails. This legislation is now before the other body and I am hopeful of early consideration. Passage of this legislation, H.R. 980, will show the American people we do care.

Cardinal Spellman said recently:

Our youth today is under assault from a powerhouse of perversion.

Father Lyons may have been appealing to the Congress of the United States when he added:

For God's sake, do something about it.

I would commend Father Lyons' column to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

THE RIGHT TO DESTROY

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Tell me what you read and I will tell you what you are. Americans spend \$2 billion a year on pornographic literature. If the merchants of filth traded only with adults, it would be bad enough, but three-fourths of the pornography in the United States falls into the hands of young boys and girls in their early teens.

Are you as an individual helping to preserve the values on which our Nation was founded, and on which it must rely in order to survive? Or are you, through your broad-mindedness and indifference, letting the youth around you become corrupted? To say that "there is nothing I can do about it" is just taking the easy way out.

We used to be able to count on our Government to protect us from salacious literature, but not any longer. Its sense of values has been perverted. The Government protects us from drugs that harm the body, but when it comes to salacious literature, or seductive films that corrupt our morals, the Government does not seem to care.

Morals do not seem to be of much importance. Just do not harm the body. The courts themselves seem bent on abolishing

March 3, 1966

standard, unacceptable by education or other practical criteria.

Furthermore, the cutback in appropriations for this program does not produce any appreciable savings. Any reduction, at the expense of our schoolchildren, particularly those who are underprivileged and improperly nourished, can only be viewed as a penny-wise and pound-foolish program.

Many children, especially those from low-income families, the ones who need the milk most, will drop out of the program. I can think of no better investment of our national resources than in this milk program which strengthens the bodies and health habits of our young people. Since the Government is already buying milk, I question whether there are really alternate uses for this milk that are more economic and important than the milk school program.

Mr. Speaker, the school milk program has proven over the years to be most effective. I see no need to reduce this program which has cost relatively little and done so much.

INTEREST RATE INCREASE ON VOLUNTARY CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to increase the interest rate paid by the civil service retirement fund on voluntary contributions of employees from 3 to 4 1/4 percent. The 3-percent rate was first fixed when the system of voluntary contributions by employees under the civil service retirement system was established by the act of August 4, 1939—Public Law 263, 76th Congress—and is continued today at the same old-fashioned, outdated rate.

We are continually being reminded that the annuities payable under the civil service retirement system are wholly inadequate and afford little more than a minimum standard of subsistence for our elder civil service retirees. Just last year our committee was instrumental in obtaining legislation, Public Law 89-205, to increase the annuities for the retirees, all at the expense of the Government.

The voluntary contribution system would permit Federal employees to contribute additional amounts to the retirement fund in order to provide a sufficient annuity which will meet their needs when they retire. It is these voluntary contributions on which the Government today is only paying 3 percent.

I believe the Government should provide an incentive to the employees and encourage the system of voluntary contributions to a much greater extent than can now be expected when the Government pays an outdated and fantastically low interest rate of 3 percent.

In addition to providing additional encouragement for the employee to plan an adequate annuity for his future requirements, an increase in the rates of interest on these contributions will become one of the Nation's additional

weapons in averting inflation and thus coincide with the President's program just recently announced to increase the rate on savings bonds.

Savings bonds yielded 2.9 percent interest in 1941 at the time the voluntary contributions were earning 3 percent. The savings bond rate was increased to 3 percent in 1952, to 3.52 percent in 1957, to 3.75 percent in 1959, and now has been increased to 4.15 percent. Certainly, we should expect to pay at least this much on the voluntary contributions by our employees to the civil service retirement fund.

It is perfectly ridiculous when the 3-percent rate is compared to the minimum 4 1/2-percent rate now being paid by savings and loan associations, or the 5 1/4 to 5 1/2 percent that the Federal Housing Administration now permits to be charged on FHA mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly are not being fair to our employees by permitting the 3-percent rate to continue. I believe we should encourage the employees to contribute greater amounts as voluntary contributions and thus assist the President in his program to avert inflation under the current economic situation. I will urge for immediate consideration of this legislation before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

VIETNAM—FACTS ARE NEEDED RATHER THAN FANCY

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

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate over national policy in Vietnam almost everybody claims to be an expert. The position of some of the self-styled experts only goes to prove how essential it is to have the facts before rushing into print, or onto the airwaves.

Some of those in a position to present their views to the public do have the facts, while others are in the main moved by fancy. It is for this reason that I call to the attention of my colleagues the following two articles by writers in possession of the facts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1966]

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP: 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 675,000 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 aren't 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 doesn't answer "here" is put on the deserter list.

This is where we find a departure from the practice 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 deserter 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 675,000 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 13 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.

HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for even greater highway safety research and development on all of our Nation's roads than now exist. During the entire operation of the Federal-aid highway program from its inception in 1916 to the present date the question of safety has been one of the outstanding factors in the operation of the program. The Committee on Public Works which reported out the great Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and which has handled the operation of this program during the ensuing years has been acutely aware of the need for writing into any legislation authorizing highway construction the proper controls for safety measures including needed research. In our legislation we have consistently sought to bring out highway design factors which would contribute the maximum possible safe operation of the roads for the users thereof. This includes such items as wide bridges, firm shoulders with gentle slope, elimination of roadside obstructions and few intersections.

The legislation that I have introduced today will further implement this course of highway safety we have followed in the committee through the entire operation of the Federal-aid highway program. There is need to cut back the appalling loss of life and injuries that are suffered day in and day out on the various roads of our Nation. The committee was acutely aware of this last year and last year it adopted the so-called Baldwin amendment which provides that after December 31, 1967, each State should have an adequate highway safety program as approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

We will continue in the Committee on Public Works in the future to pay the most careful attention to safety factors in highway construction and do all within our legislative power to see that the day will come when the drivers on our Nation's roads will be able to travel from one section of our Nation to the other in the safest and most practical manner.

I would like to include at this time a brief digest of the highway safety responsibilities of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce under the applicable Federal-aid highway laws reported by the Committee on Public Works:

COMMENTS CONCERNING HIGHWAY SAFETY RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS

Highway safety is a predominant and inherent factor throughout the whole Federal-aid highway program since its inception under the Federal Highway Act of 1916.

Some of the statutory references to safety appearing in title 23 of the United States Code (which has codified all of the Federal highway laws enacted throughout the years) are as follows:

Section 109(a), which provides that plans and specifications for projects shall only be approved if they will adequately meet the existing and probable future needs and conditions in a manner conducive to safety. This provision stems from section 8 of the 1921 act.

Section 109(d) relates to official traffic signs and signals which will promote the safe and efficient utilization of highways.

Section 307(a) expressly authorizes the Secretary to engage in research on all phases of safety.

Section 307(c) expressly provides that the States may use up to 1½ percent of their apportioned Federal-aid funds for various types of planning surveys and investigations, including safety studies.

Section 145 (Baldwin amendment), which was enacted on August 28, 1965, provides that after December 31, 1967, each State should have an adequate highway safety program as approved by the Secretary, and places the responsibility on the Secretary to establish uniform standards for such program.

Section 314 of title 23 directs the Secretary to assist in carrying out the action program of the President on highway safety.

The act approved on July 14, 1960, provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall establish and maintain a driver register service—in the interest of safety.

Pursuant to section 117 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the Secretary of Commerce was directed to make a comprehensive investigation and study on the whole subject of highway safety. This study reflects the magnitude and complexity of the highway safety program and the various responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads in such regard. Copy of this report is enclosed.

The Bureau is now engaged in a highway safety improvement projects program. The status of this program is reflected in the enclosed statements.

On December 7, 1961, the Office of Highway Safety was established in the Bureau as a major unit, headed by a Director. At present, this office has a complement of 51 personnel on board, with an authorized complement of 68 in order to meet personnel requirements incident to developing standards under the Baldwin amendment. The current budget for this present fiscal year is \$1.2 million.

The Bureau's budget for highway safety research for 1966 is \$2.3 million, and for 1967 is \$6.6 million.

It is estimated that upon completion of the interstate there will be a total savings of 8,000 lives annually due to highway accidents.

In conclusion, it should be said that highway safety is interwoven in all phases of the Federal-aid highway program.

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

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

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish a permanent special milk program for children.

Although milk and dairy products have been made available for school lunch programs since 1955, conditions arose recently which threaten to cut off this supply. The school milk program is scheduled to be terminated on June 30, 1967. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture had notified all school districts that after February 1, 1966, allocations for the special milk program would be reduced by 10 percent. For fiscal 1967, beginning July 1, the administration plans to cut spending on school milk from \$103 to \$21 million.

Originally set up as only a school program, this special milk program was later expanded to include summer camps, nursery centers, and other child-care institutions. It is estimated that between 24 to 26 million children daily in 92,000 to 93,000 schools throughout our Nation received around 3 billion half pints of milk through this program in 1965. Although the program is not compulsory, it encourages children to drink more milk by making it available at a price that most children can afford, generally 3 to 4 cents on the average for a half pint, and at no cost to those children who are unable to pay for the milk.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Government is spending millions of dollars to rehabilitate school dropouts, is enlarging the food stamp program and carrying on a war against poverty, it is inconsistent to curtail a program that adds to the health, energy and vitality of children who are in school. The school milk program is of vital importance for our youngsters because milk contains nutrients essential for good health. Milk is an important factor in building proper diet habits. Furthermore, we know that a well-nourished child learns better than an undernourished child.

The proposal to distribute milk on the basis of economic need is unreasonable in view of the way the program works within our schools. At present it is possible to take a milk break at midmorning. All students are able to stop for a moment in their studies and enjoy the wholesome benefits of milk. Not only does this provide them immediate nourishment and enhance their ability to continue their studies, it also establishes good health habits. Instead of running to the coke machine, they are finding that milk provides more of their needs and contributes more to the building of healthy and sound bodies.

If the proposal to limit the program to the needy is enforced, school administrators are going to be asked to segregate those students whose parents have a low level of income from those who can afford to buy the milk. Not only is this requesting something our schools are not geared to do, but it also is likely to create an artificial barrier between students.

As a result many students are likely to forgo accepting milk rather than accept the stigma of being labeled poor and unable to pay for a glass of milk. It would be in my judgment a grave mistake to replace the broad and vastly popular milk program with one geared to some poverty

March 3, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4679

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1966]

THE UNTOLD STORY: VICTORY?

(By Joseph Alsop)

Instead of gabbling interminably about escalation, this town would do well to begin talking about the possibility of winning the Vietnamese war.

The antiescalators are either ignorant or dishonest; for they never mention the key fact, that it is the enemy who has been doing the escalating. If the enemy is in the process of putting in another eight divisions, as explained in the last report in this space, the President has only two possible choices. He can retreat and surrender, or he can match the enemy's increase of force.

But this escalation by the enemy is like a medal with two sides. On one side, it demands a greater American effort. But on the other side, it gives a stronger promise of American success. For it is really like a last high raise in poker, which exhausts the raiser's resources, but by no means exhausts his opponent's resources.

To see why this is so, one must first turn to the Mao Tse-tung-Vo Nguyen Giap book of rules of guerrilla warfare. In phase I of such a war, says the book, the guerrilla movement is organized. In phase II, classical guerrilla war is carried on, with ever-increasing ferocity but always in small units, guerrilla-style combats, until the other side is hanging on the ropes. And when—but only when—this point is reached, phase III begins with the organization of larger units, of at least regimental strength, to finish off the other side in large conventional battles.

The rule book is particularly strict about continuing phase II until victory in phase III is absolutely certain. When General de Latre de Tassigny took over the command in the French war, General Giap entered phase II prematurely. After only one really major setback, Giap at once returned to phase II, and he patiently remained in phase II until Dienbienphu, over 3 years later.

According to the rule book, a similar return to phase II should have been the enemy's response when he was taken by surprise by the large-scale American intervention last summer. There are good reasons to believe there was an argument about this, no doubt among the North Vietnamese leaders, and also between Hanoi and Peiping.

Lin Piao's famous, outwardly ferocious paper on "People's War" contains clear evidence of this argument; for it includes an interminable recitation of rules from the book, all of which are now being broken by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. In Communist discourse, in circumstances of this sort, such things are not said accidentally.

Why, then, is phase III being obstinately continued? The answer almost certainly is that no other choice was open, because of the impairment of the Vietcong infrastructure by the effort to enter phase III.

This was a very big and very costly effort. In 1964-65, the Vietcong recruited, trained and put in the field no less than 18 main force regiments, bringing their own force of regulars up to the equivalent of 8 divisions. The northern divisions also came south. By the spring of 1965, therefore, the Vietcong infrastructure was carrying the heavy burden of a regular army of 10 divisions, additional to the local and guerrilla forces.

For this purpose, every promise to the village people had to be broken. Very heavy taxes were levied. Universal, press gang-style conscription was enforced. Thus expansion to enter phase III both alienated the villages, and diluted the Vietcong military units, at every level from guerrilla band up to main force regiment, with great numbers of raw, unwilling conscripts.

Apparently therefore, it was considered too dangerous to respond to the arrival of the Americans by contraction to phase II, with all its bitter overtone of hope long deferred and the struggle long continued. The course now being followed, however, is also acutely dangerous.

The main danger is the added strain on the Vietcong infrastructure. If the intelligence is correct, the infrastructure's 1965 burden of a regular army of 10 divisions will grow, by the end of 1966, to the burden of an army of 20 divisions.

This army's weapons and ammunition will of course come from the north. But everything else must be found in the south—countless recruits to fill gaps in the ranks; manpower for greatly expanded porter battalions; food and many other supplies, and so on and on.

This will be no light burden. In fact, it is so clearly excessive that Hanoi's current reinforcement of the Vietcong is just as clearly a one-shot proposition—a last high raise in the game, in fact. And those who make a last high raise can always be beaten by those with the resources and the guts to call and raise again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for week of March 7, 1966, on account of official business in his congressional district.

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. AYRES, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the cost estimated by the Public Printer to be \$468.

Mr. FINO in three instances.
Mr. MICHEL in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McMILLAN and to include a speech.
Mr. PHILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU to revise and extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include a concurrent resolution.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU in one instance to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record in two instances and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MORTON to extend his remarks following the remarks by Mr. FINDLEY during debate on H.R. 12322 today.

Mr. HAGEN of California in four instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mr. McGRATH) to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. PATMAN during his special order today.

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

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. KING of New York in five instances.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. MATHIAS in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

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

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in six instances.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. TUTEN in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances.

Mr. FARNSLEY.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. MINISH in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. BURKE.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. VANK in two instances.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN in three instances.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana in three instances.

Mr. NEDZI in four instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported 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. 12653. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 7, 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:

2131. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial state-

ments, fiscal year 1964, Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 401); to the Committee on Government Operation and ordered to be printed.

H.R. 13252. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assure to our Nation's children access to this country's abundance of food, to improve the nutrition level for children and thus to serve their health and well-being and their incentive to learn through cooperative Federal-State efforts in a nationwide child nutrition program, and to provide for the conduct of this comprehensive effort by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a part of its basic food and nutrition responsibilities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13253. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for salaries and expenses for the fiscal year 1966, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 13254. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings to be realized by providing Government quarters in lieu of payment of quarters allowances to U.S. military personnel in Taiwan, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13255. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of self-employment tax payment and collection practices, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 13256. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(e) (2) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13257. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of copies of orders suspending deportation, as well as a list of persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13258. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; 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. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13222. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational pur-

poses; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURLINSON:

H.R. 13254. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13255. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 13256. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13257. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 13258. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the rates of postage for parcel post mailings to and from members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas shall be chargeable at the first parcel post zone rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 13259. 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. CLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 13260. 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. PIRNIE:

H.R. 13261. 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 the purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13262. A bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 13263. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 13264. A bill to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to participate in programs to encourage qualified persons to follow health service careers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 13265. A bill to name the authorized lock and dam No. 18 of the Verdigris River in Oklahoma and the lake created thereby for Newt Graham; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 13266. A bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 13267. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national

leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13268. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13269. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13270. A bill to amend section 212(a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to waive the labor certification requirement with respect to nonpreference immigrant aliens from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13271. A bill to amend section 201(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that quota numbers transferred to the immigration pool shall be available for issuance of visas to nonpreference immigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13272. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for increased grants for construction of treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13273. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 13274. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in rural community areas designated by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 13275. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13276. A bill to amend the cropland adjustment program established pursuant to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to provide for priority participation by persons inducted or recalled into active duty with the Armed Forces by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 13277. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13278. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13279. A bill to provide incentives to planned metropolitan development and to otherwise assist urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13280. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage insurance and authorize direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to help finance the cost of constructing and equip-