

were completely in error, or there has been a remarkable change in their point of view since President Johnson decided to move further in the direction taken under President Eisenhower back in the 1950's.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Sales Participation Act of 1966, following the remarks on that subject.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 22, 1966, to file a privileged report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. RUMSFELD reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 66 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

NAVY DID A SPACE AGE JOB WITH STONE AGE TOOLS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Navy spent some 80 days to recover the H-bomb lost off the coast of Spain this January. The Navy also spent hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on this job. It was an expensive lesson, and if the Navy's undersea technology had been able to keep pace with our phenomenal progress in space technology that bomb could have been recovered immediately and at considerable savings.

In less than 10 years, outer space exploration has produced space vehicles which know no horizon. However, the Navy does not yet produce deep-diving vehicles of the same degree of sophistication found in the space program vehicles.

The H-bomb recovery shows that the Navy was doing a space age job with stone age tools.

For the past 50 years the Navy has sporadically considered diving technology, starting in 1915 with its first lost submarine, and including the *Thresher* disaster in April 1963. Each incident showed that the Navy was unprepared to conduct deep-sea recovery operations. The H-bomb incident demonstrates that more progress is needed. At the present time, Navy programs plan development of undersea vehicles over a 5-year period on a basis amounting to roughly 10 percent of the NASA budget for 1 year alone.

It is clear that insufficient emphasis is being given within the Defense Department to the problem of developing Navy undersea exploration vehicles sufficient to maintain this Nation's defense posture. This situation must be corrected immediately.

GET BACK TO FUNDAMENTALS

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, an article which appears in the current, April 25, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, being the full text of an address by the Honorable Charles E. Whittaker, of Kansas City, who in 1962 retired as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Previously, I have expressed regret that Justice Whittaker retired from the Supreme Court, at a time when there is a need for men of his caliber to serve. The advice given by Justice Whittaker when he points out the need to "get back to fundamentals—the Ten Commandments and old-fashioned respect for truth and honesty—before it is too late" is a warning that needs to be heeded. It is a real tragedy that more members of our High Court do not embrace the philosophy of Justice Whittaker, who in the address referred to, points out that "defiance of law, falsifying such terms as 'liberal,' 'conservative,' 'civil rights,' 'civil disobedience,' and so forth, are some of the things that are threatening America." Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we stop, look, and think, while there is still time to "return to simple honesty." Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, if you have not read the address delivered by Justice Whittaker on April 12 at the University of Kansas, you should read it in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, beginning on page 58.

FREE ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. VIVIAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent agreement of the South Vietnamese Government and the Buddhist leaders to hold elections in August promises the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to deal with their country's problems by peaceful political means. The prospective elections provide an occasion for the establishment of a representative government in South Vietnam. From the beginning, the American commitment has been designed to assure the people of South Vietnam precisely this kind of opportunity. As the history of North Vietnam shows, without an American presence, the people of South Vietnam probably could not have found such means for self-expression. As President Johnson and Secretary Rusk have repeatedly stated, the conflict in Vietnam is both political and military. Therefore political as well as military means are required for its solution.

Now basic American ideals, and the stated aims of our policy in South Vietnam require that U.S. policy in the coming months be directed toward assuring that these elections be conducted in the most free and open manner possible. Our activities in South Vietnam in the coming months should, therefore, be designed to assure the widest possible participation in the entire election process by all elements of the population.

This is an essential precondition for any settlement of the conflict that reflects the interests of all the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States should actively encourage and facilitate this process in every possible way.

THE BOSTON CELTICS MAKE CIVIL RIGHTS AS WELL AS BASKETBALL HISTORY

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to congratulate the world's champion Boston Celtics, who for 8 years have been the world's champions in basketball, for their activities in respect to civil rights. In 1950 the Boston Celtics were the first professional team in the National Basketball League ever to hire a Negro. In the year 1966 they were the first professional team that ever fielded as a starting lineup a complete Negro team.

Mr. Speaker, as of Monday this week the Boston Celtics appointed as their coach their superstar big Bill Russell, the first Negro who has ever been appointed as manager and coach of a major basketball team, or of any major sporting team.

The Boston Celtics have acted the part of real champions in the way they have conducted themselves. I hope the pattern will be an example for all other sporting organizations.

My congratulations go to the Boston Celtics, the team, the players, and the management.

"Red" Auerbach is not only the world's greatest coach, but also its greatest sportsman.

BALLYHOO FOR THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of April the new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Latin America, Mr. Gordon, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in ballyhooing the foreign aid program.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I asked the gentleman to provide me with one example of a project which had been sponsored in Latin America, which had been successful. In fact, I said, not to limit it too much, "if you cannot find one in Latin America, find one anywhere in the world and tell me where it is; I would like to go look at it."

He assured me that he would not only find one, but would find one right away. Fifteen days have passed, and I have not heard from the gentleman. I would have thought that if he had a successful project he could have found out about it by this time.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 66 yesterday I was recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "no". I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FINO OPPOSES GOVERNMENTWIDE LOAN POOLS

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

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the President's message today calling for a governmentwide loan pooling and refinancing program to be run through Fannie Mae represents an unparalleled power grab which strikes at the very root of our congressional process.

If we permit and allow Government agencies to circumvent full congressional scrutiny by refinancing their paper for funds, we will be creating not only a menace to the Congress but a serious threat to private credit. We will be creating an economic and political monster.

Let us make no mistake about it. Socialized lending is the inevitable end-product of a full-scale pooling program. Socialized credit will grow and grow with the pools until most bankers become civil servants in title or fact.

Expansion of Government loan programs beyond complete congressional scrutiny is very attractive to a free-wheeling administration, because it presents a marvelous opportunity for budget gimmickry.

Under this program, the administration can sidestep any budget deficit by a

white elephant sale of assets at an attractive rate. Agencies can go to Fannie Mae as indigents go to pawnbrokers and hockshops. Budget deficits can be overcome—on paper—by the sale of a few billion dollars worth of loan participations. The program proposed in this message can be used to make many a budget safe for waste and extravagance which could not otherwise survive the spotlight of a deficit budget.

I believe that this program is a fiscal and monetary monster. It could only have been unleashed by an administration dedicated to economic ruin.

This program is a cruel paradox. It will cost the taxpayers most in high refinancing costs in just those years were inflationary budget deficits have stimulated participation sales budget gimmickry. It will inflate the volume of Government loans in just those budget deficit years where the Government is already spending too much on too many programs. The costs of refinancing in this program will add to the taxpayer's burden so that the Government may, through deceit, spend more tax dollars than otherwise.

This program makes no economic sense because it is a political program. No economist would seek it—only a power-hungry administration.

This message is the message of a would-be economic Caesar. Only a blank-check Congress in every sense of the word would betray future Congresses and generations of citizens and taxpayers by passing it.

I have heard arguments that refinancing of this sort is the private enterprise approach because it brings in private funds. This is hypocrisy, pure and simple. Many of the loans proposed to be pooled in the fiscal 1967 budget were originally made in unfair competition with private credit. The time to bring in private credit was before the Government loan was made, not at some later date as a budget trick. For example, the 1967 budget proposed Farmers' Home Administration loans for pooling and a January 1966 report of the General Accounting Office said that many such loans were made in competition with private credit.

If this program is enacted, Congress will be crippled, the economy will be twisted and the budget will be warped out of recognition. This program also sows the seeds of socialized banking. All this will be laid at the feet of an economic Caesar in the White House.

FEDERAL HOCKSHOP CAN FINANCE FOREIGN AID

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under the administration's proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966, the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—is to become a financing agency for other Government lending agencies. The budget for fiscal year 1967 special analyses states:

Legislation is being proposed to authorize a Government-wide program for sale of participations in outstanding direct loans.

In fact, this will make FNMA a Federal hockshop.

The budget estimates that at the close of June 30, 1966, there will be outstanding \$33.1 billion direct loans under various Federal credit programs. The largest and most rapidly growing—from the standpoint of dollar volume—of the Federal loan programs is that of the Department of State through its Agency for International Development. At the close of fiscal year 1965 the volume of direct loans outstanding made by this Agency was \$9 billion. At the close of fiscal year 1966 the estimated outstanding volume is \$10.5 billion. At the close of fiscal year 1967 the estimated outstanding volume is \$12 billion.

FNMA in its new role of Federal hockshop could sell participations in a pool of such loans. It makes no difference that these AID direct loans bear interest in some instances as low as three-fourths percent per year or that in some cases they have maturities as long as 40 years. The legislation proposed authorizes appropriations for any agency pooling its loans with FNMA in an amount sufficient to make up any deficiency between income received on the loans, and interest paid on participations sold on the pooling of such loans. FNMA thus will not suffer any loss so it is painless financing for FNMA.

Obviously these AID loans are non-saleable and participations in a pool of such loans likewise would be non-saleable if FNMA did not guarantee the payment of principal and interest on the participations sold and if that guarantee was not backed up by the unlimited draw of FNMA on the U.S. Treasury for any funds that might be needed to pay such principal and interest.

Clearly, FNMA is selling U.S. Government credit. It is pure fiction that FNMA is indirectly selling foreign aid loans.

Let us explore the budgetary possibilities of such a transaction. As noted above, AID holdings of foreign aid loans are expanding at a rate of \$1.5 billion per year. Under the present system, that is a \$1.5 billion charge per year against the administrative budget. Under the participation sales device, the only charge against the administrative budget would be the appropriation to make up the deficiency between the income received on the loans pooled and the interest cost of the participations sold. Assume such loss differential to be 3 percent, the budget charge then would be 3 percent of \$1.5 billion or only \$45 million per year. Financing foreign aid becomes almost painless insofar as the budgetary impact is concerned.

Can the Congress perpetrate such a hoax on itself and the public?

SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-NINE DOLLARS A MONTH TAX FREE FROM TWO FEDERAL POVERTY PROGRAMS

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

Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grelgg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollifield
Holland
Howard
Hull
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Leggett

Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Phillips
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Rees
Resnick

Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schauer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Siekles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Stratton
Sullivan
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Roncallo.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Fuqua with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Weltner.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with House Resolution 756.
The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

WHY WE SHOULD ENACT LEGISLATION TO POOL LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American economy benefits immensely from the fruitful partnership between public and private initiative. Nowhere is this more evident than in the varied Federal programs to assist and stimulate the flow of private credit.

The home mortgage insurance and guarantee programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, the many programs of agricultural credit assistance, the lending assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration, and more recently the credit aids embodied in the college housing program and the student loan program—all these bear witness to our Nation's success in blending public and private efforts to achieve common goals.

Frequently, in this partnership, we start out with a program that is relatively dependent on Federal lending. Then in time, the program evolves into a form in which the private sector gradually takes up more of the burden.

Over the years, we have devised means to use the great resources of the private credit market to accomplish the same necessary and highly desirable social purposes which we originally set out to accomplish through direct Government lending. When private capital takes up part or all of the burden of a lending program, the resources of the public sector are freed to turn to other equally worthwhile purposes.

Broadly speaking, this process has been operating ever since we turned to guaranteed and insured loans in place of some of the direct lending programs. We might single out home ownership, which is not only almost a universal individual American aspiration but also one of our most widely accepted social goals. We could never have achieved our high degree of home ownership without using the resources of the private market under guaranty and insurance arrangements. This is true for at least three reasons:

- First. The capital resources of the private market are far greater than those of the Government;
- Second. We could not have increased

the Federal budget and, indeed, few if any of us would have wanted to increase the Federal budget to the degree required to provide the necessary funds through Government loans; and,

Third. While Government assistance was required to get the necessary programs underway, we needed the flexibility and ingenuity of the private market to carry them out successfully.

Federal credit programs, working through the private market, help to make the market stronger, more competitive, and better able to serve the economy's needs over the long term.

The substitution of private for public credit has received great impetus since the mid-1950's under a program of asset sales. This consists of selling loans—selling the loan paper—which is generated under various Federal lending programs.

The policy of asset sales, begun under the administration of President Eisenhower, has been endorsed by the distinguished private Commission on Money and Credit, of which Secretary of the Treasury Fowler was a member and which issued its authoritative report in 1961, and President Kennedy's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, of which former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was Chairman.

Despite major efforts to draw on private credit, the volume of direct Federal loans outstanding has increased in recent years. The total outstanding was \$25.1 billion on June 30, 1961, and \$33.1 billion June 30, 1965.

These loans have direct consequences on the Federal budget—and, thus, on the policies followed by any administration. Money for lending programs must be budgeted, even though it will be repaid with little or no ultimate net costs to the Federal Treasury.

This means that it must be matched by tax revenue or by additional Treasury debt—or else that it must take the place of some other program, which then must be postponed or dropped. It should not require much soul searching to decide which is preferable—higher taxes, a larger deficit, postponement or elimination of some other Government activity, or greater involvement of private capital in the public lending programs.

Therefore, I strongly favor the enactment this year of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 which President Johnson has proposed, to broaden and make available on a Government-wide basis the authority for the sale of participations in pools of financial assets now owned by Federal credit agencies.

ARE THERE DEFICIENCIES IN CLOTHING AND MILITARY SUPPLIES IN VIETNAM?

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for all the sudden prominence given the bomb shortage, it would seem excusable for the Pentagon to attempt to cover up any such matter of military significance. What is not clear is how the Nation's supply of ammunition was allowed to deteriorate while U.S. forces were being

NOT VOTING—49
Abbutt
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Ayres
Battin
Burleson
Casey
Colmer
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edwards, Calif.
Felghan
Flynt
Fuqua
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
King, Calif.
Laird
Mathias
Matthews
Multer
Murray
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Roncallo
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Udall
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Weltner
White, Idaho
Williams
Willis

So the resolution was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:
Mr. Flynt for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. King of California against.
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Delaney against.
Mr. Abbutt for, with Mrs. Kelly against.
Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Multer against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Felghan against.
Mr. Watson for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.
Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Walker of Mississippi for, with Mr. Ashley against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Toll against.
Until further notice:
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Burleson.

April 20, 1966

plunged deeper and deeper into military involvement and conflict, but this and other related matters will hopefully be resolved as soon as possible if only to preclude recurrences of this serious nature.

If there is justification for withholding information on lack of ammunition necessary to lend full support to the military effort, similar restrictions would hardly hold true so far as any deficiencies in clothing or other material affecting the comfort of U.S. fighting personnel are concerned. On the contrary, shortages of such equipment should be publicized as widely as possible if only to give all America an opportunity to join in overcoming the deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, if full gear is not available to all servicemen stationed in combat areas, manufacturing capacity not now engaged in military production should be turned forthwith to getting out whatever is needed on the frontlines. Letters to parents in Pennsylvania's 22d District from men in Vietnam appeal for such items as combat boots and fatigue clothes. While these cases may be isolated and not indicative of the Defense Department's general supply situation, it is a national duty to assure full equipment to every serviceman. If the Pentagon lacks the necessary gear, our people should be so informed immediately so that all hands can turn to in every way we know how to meet the demand.

Another matter which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues comes from a hospital corpsman who urged that his family provide him with a pistol as soon as possible. A Navy man assigned to the Marines, he makes frequent rescue missions into territory infested with Vietcong and is in need of a weapon small enough to be accessible on a moment's notice in the event of enemy attack. Thus far he has not been able to obtain a pistol of any sort from military officials, and there is suspicion that not enough are available for all the men who must expose themselves to jungle sorties. His parents purchased one for his use, however, the Post Office Department has refused to mail it. If there are not enough side arms for men who need them, then I see no reason why the postal rules cannot be relaxed to provide our military men in the front lines with adequate equipment.

For weeks it was an open secret that Defense Department agents were scouring Europe in search of bombs at whatever price they could get them, yet the shortage was continually denied here at home.

If indeed firearms essential to the protection of our fighting men are in short supply, I am confident that a call to manufacturers, dealers, and individuals would quickly close the gap—even without having to pay premium prices.

Everyone wants to help in every way possible to make certain that combat forces have the finest equipment possible, but maximum effort will not be attained unless we are given the full truth about the supply story.

WELCOMES INVESTIGATION OF LEFTIST STUDENT GROUP

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, I introduced a House resolution calling for an investigation of the Students for a Democratic Society, a motley collection of unbathed leftwing students, heavily infiltrated and guided by Communist elements.

I was pleased to read in yesterday's New York Times that the national secretary of the society is squirming in protest over probes into their activities by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I welcome the FBI into the picture for I have every confidence in that agency. I have equal confidence that they will find that this collection of human garbage calling themselves a "society" is made up of more than just SWINE, as Cartoonist Al Capp calls them, but of blood-red Communist provocateurs. It is one thing to be a SWINE, students wildly indignant about nearly everything; it is another to be a dupe of Communist agents and their tool in their efforts to undermine our opposition to the hammer and sickle in Vietnam and elsewhere.

Freedom of speech is not at stake here, despite what the ivory tower professors would have us believe. Again, freedom of speech and association are one thing; giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war is quite another. No one has that right, not while American servicemen are dying on battlefields to preserve that right of free speech and association.

This investigation is long overdue and I hope there will be no foot dragging until it is concluded.

The Times story makes interesting reading and I insert it here in the RECORD for all to see.

FBI SAID TO BE INVESTIGATING STUDENT GROUP OPPOSED TO WAR—ORGANIZATION SAYS CHAPTERS AT YALE AND WESLEYAN ARE UNDER SCRUTINY

(By Peter Kihss)

The national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society asserted yesterday that there "seems to be a national investigation" of his group by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Paul Booth, the 22-year-old secretary, said the 4-year-old organization had attacked the U.S. role in the Vietnam war and had sold 15,000 copies since September of a guide on how to claim conscientious objector status in the draft.

The only places Mr. Booth would identify as areas in which inquiries had been made were Wesleyan College in Middletown, Conn., and Yale University. He said the organization, with a "democratic radical program," had 175 to 200 chapters and 5,000 members, up from 3,000 last fall. Most of the members are college students, he said, but some are in high schools and young adult groups.

At Wesleyan, Stanley Idzerda, dean of the college, said an FBI agent had asked him about 2 weeks ago for names of all students in the college's Students for a Democratic Society chapter, and had been refused such data.

Mr. Idzerda said the college kept no such lists, and "we consider the student's activity his own affair."

DANGERS CITED

"It's unfortunate," he added, "that a climate of suspicion can be created by such activities that might lead some students to be more circumspect than the situation requires. Things like this can be a danger to a free and open community if men change their behavior because of it."

The college's semiweekly newspaper, the Wesleyan Argus, headlined the incident last Friday, and Mr. Idzerda said he then received another FBI visit Saturday. That time, he said, an agent contended there had been a "misunderstanding," and asserted there was no investigation of the society, but rather an inquiry into "possible infiltration of the SDS chapter by Communist influence."

A spokesman for the FBI office at New Haven said last night that the Bureau "makes inquiries every day on campuses throughout the country—we investigate 175 types of violations, security as well as criminal."

The spokesman said FBI files were "confidential," but, he added, "with respect to the statement that we questioned roommates of SDS members at Yale, this is not true."

METHODS ASSAILED

Eight members of the society's Wesleyan chapter had decried such alleged questioning at Yale in an article in the Argus. The article asserted that if the FBI wished information about member's beliefs, "it should have its agents directly question the individuals concerned."

Reached at the society's national office in Chicago, Mr. Booth, who has been the organization's full-time secretary since Nicolas deB. Katzenbach had told a Chicago news conference last October that the society was among groups figuring in a Justice Department inquiry into the antidraft movement.

Mr. Booth asserted, however, that his group's activity had been legal—"counseling and giving information on conscientious objection"—and there was apparently no investigation at that time.

He suggested that the FBI inquiries began last month partly because of some "totally false statements" about the society. Also, he said, individual chapters took part in demonstrations against the Vietnam war last month, including fasts at Wesleyan and other places.

Sarah Murphy, 20-year-old coordinator of the society's New York region, said last night that she knew of no member or school official involved with 28 to 30 chapters who had been directly contacted by the FBI about society activities.

CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY PRAISES REPRESENTATIVE MOSS

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution by the California State Legislature regarding Mr. JOHN E. MOSS, of California.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the California State Assembly recently adopted a resolution, coauthored by 57 assemblymen, commending our colleague, JOHN MOSS, for his "continuous battle to keep open the channels of information for free access by the public and the press."

The resolution, which was approved unanimously, states that JOHN MOSS is "regarded nationwide by members of the press corps as the country's most active

[From Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 19, 1966]
CAMPAIGN DINNER SPEECH TONIGHT NOT A BIT
POLITICAL, MACY SAYS
(By Joseph Young)

A lot of eyebrows are being raised over the fact that Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy is going to be the principal speaker tonight at the \$50 a plate campaign fund-raising dinner for Representative CLARENCE LONG, Democrat of Maryland.

It is the first time in memory that a member of the Civil Service Commission, which is supposed to stay completely out of political matters, has spoken at a political fund-raising affair. Maryland's two Democratic Senators—DANIEL BREWSTER and JOSEPH TYDINGS—will also attend, BREWSTER as the toastmaster and TYDINGS as official greeter.

Macy says his speech will be completely nonpolitical, that it will deal with the Government's manpower problems. He says that LONG is a longtime friend and was one of his teachers at Wesleyan University.

"There is nothing in my speech that can be interpreted in any way as a political endorsement," Macy said.

However, the speech recalls the uproar among Republicans in Congress last year when Macy acted as a congressional liaison man for President Johnson in trying to line up support for several key administration bills not in the least connected with civil service.

MORE ABOUT NATO

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand somewhat on my earlier remarks of April 6 relative to the evolving NATO dilemma.

While I am not privy to the inner deliberations of our Government, and so must depend upon traditional news sources and transcripts, these do not in truth give me much confidence that the United States is handling this problem maturely and realistically.

Certainly, along with most Americans, I profoundly regret the recent decisions of the French nation, our historic ally. In my view her withdrawal from the NATO command structure, as distinct from the alliance, is not in the best military and political interests of either France or the other allies.

Much of the soul searching which is now going on, however helpful in restoring some emotional balance, is irrelevant. To be sure, we are not blameless; American attitudes and policies have in several instances crystallized De Gaulle's suspicions of American motives, and thus have emboldened him. Perhaps this was inevitable, given the realization that our diplomatic instincts on the world scene, as a global power, are necessarily different from and maybe irreconcilable with those of General de Gaulle. The French decisions may have come regardless of any past American endeavors to attune our policy more closely with French interests.

However, what concerns me most is our official approach to this unalterable fact of French disengagement. Are the 14 members, spurred on by the United States, to adopt an attitude of complete intransigence? Are we to consume our mental faculties in a restless search for

wordy, meaningless communiques in order to cement a wall against French policy? Does our interest lie in an attempt, however unrewarding and illusive, to punish the mutineer? To isolate him through outraged opinion?

Such posturing, self-defeating and narrow in terms of long-range American interests, is being espoused by well-meaning but embittered people. Struggling daily with unseemly events they cannot control, aggravated by the widening gap between their dreams and unpleasant facts, many of our Atlanticists, in and out of the State Department, are propelling policy in a deliberate anti-French direction. High officials of our Government imply that the United States simply cannot accept the immoral, childish behavior of this ungrateful upstart, tearing agreements to pieces, placing demands, disrupting what are thought to be essential security arrangements.

The tenor of the American response thus far indicates that we may be prepared to totally ignore France in recasting the NATO structure. It would be a serious error, in reshaping the organization, if the 14 allies resurrected their military relationship in such a way that the French Government could not give some practical application to the mutual defense pledge.

Instead, there seems to be an inclination on the part of the United States to handle the French Government as if it were a renegade.

Recent pronouncements and actions by our Government give cause for the greatest anxiety. We have engaged in hasty attempts to mobilize European opinion against French policy, showing an utter lack of diplomatic tact and perspective. In addition to giving voice to hurt feelings, we have reiterated in dreary fashion our traditional belief in integration, amounting to a sort of Monday morning rehash of spent ideas, unimpressive because it all comes too late.

The bankruptcy of this initial position may succeed eventually in dividing Europe against itself. Indeed, we have already contributed measurably toward undermining that crucial Franco-German rapprochement which is elementary to the future peace of Europe.

As far as France is concerned, we are assured that in wartime the French forces will necessarily be united with our own in any common conflict. The Foreign Minister has reaffirmed the NATO pledge, to the effect that if any member is subject to an unprovoked attack, then all the members are bound to go to its defense. He has denied, publicly, that France will in the future withdraw from the alliance. Furthermore, I believe the French Government is receptive to discussing with its allies the assumption of some prearrangements which are essential to give effect to the NATO commitment.

French policy distinguishes between the integrated organization and the alliance as such. And second, it rejects the possibility of a European ground war without recourse to nuclear weapons, which remain under national control. Hence the British, the Russians, and the

Americans have a unilateral option here, and it may come into play on French soil without French say-so.

If, as the French believe, any European conflict is to be resolved on the basis of nuclear weaponry, under other than French control, then I would admit that France lacks leverage over her own ultimate preservation. Objectively, this is not disadvantageous to France; our nuclear umbrella is credible; but this dependence, which causes the French Government discomfort, should be comprehensible if not wholly valid.

It is possible that President de Gaulle wishes to open the way toward a singular political rapprochement with Soviet Russia, thereby freeing the French Government to play in central Europe a predominant role in the settlement of all outstanding continental problems. These relate not only to Germany but to the involvement of the East European satellites. At the same time, this prescription would effectively remove French fears that America could itself deal bilaterally with Russia, without consultation with France on issues which affect her status and security in Europe.

While not discounting this eventuality, it is incumbent upon the United States to move tactfully and calmly at this point to reformulate this NATO organization as I suggested on April 6. It must be done in a fashion which suits our allies and accommodates the special relationship which France insists upon for herself. Differences have already emerged among the allies as to how this alliance is to be sustained. The United States could lose everything by enforcing the adoption of unpopular methods, or by simply redressing tired and doctrinaire policies.

I hope very much that we will have the good sense to cast hypocrisy and pretense aside, and mutually effect a system which is both practicable and takes account of the existing realities.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. POOL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NOW WE ARE APOLOGIZING FOR FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, as the doves and the chickens have continued to flutter around Washington urging on the President a policy of retreat, negotiation, and appeasement in Vietnam, it seems to me that the administration has had to spend unnecessary time assuring the people of this country and the enemy as well, that we are in Vietnam to stay and to win.

If anyone within the administration has any wonder why the people are uncertain of our intentions, confused about our aims or unconvinced about our de-

termination, they need look no further than the front page of the Washington Post. In a story in yesterday's Post, the headline stated that "U.S. Denies Escalating Vietnam War." An unidentified Pentagon spokesman went to great pains to apologize for our strikes against two antiaircraft missile sites on the outskirts of Hanoi and to assure everyone, friend and enemy alike, that these strikes were defensive in nature only.

Instead of speaking positively and firmly about our efforts to win that dreadful war, we are now apologizing for our strikes.

What a ludicrous position this puts us in. On the one hand, we are trying to convince the Communists that we are not going to turn tail from our commitment and on the other we go out of the way to assure the doves and the appeasers that we are not really escalating or going all out.

As dreadful as it is, it is apparent to me that statements such as this are the source of the juice the administration has to stew in when they wonder why the people are not convinced that ours is a dedicated effort.

The story from the Post, as appalling as it is, needs to be read by every Member and I would like to insert it here in the Record.

UNITED STATES DENIES ESCALATING VIETNAM WAR

(By John G. Norris)

Pentagon spokesmen denied yesterday that American bomb strikes against two antiaircraft missile sites on the outskirts of Hanoi represented any planned escalation of the war, as claimed by North Vietnam.

The U.S. officials said the destruction of the missile bases 15 and 17 miles from Hanoi—closer to the North Vietnam capital than U.S. aircraft ever had struck previously—was defensive in nature.

The SAM surface-to-air missile sites were not on Sunday's target list, it was said, and their destruction did not represent any change in longstanding Washington restrictions on bombing in the north.

Rather, the Air Force F-100 and F-105 fighter bombers which blasted the missile bases were flying "CAP"—combat air patrol—over other U.S. planes attacking a targeted strategic bridge 33 miles south of Hanoi, when they sighted the SAM sites. One fired at the U.S. planes and the American fighters then attacked them.

American pilots have standing orders to attack any North Vietnam missile site they sight, if it could interfere with their mission.

But while this particular attack does not represent any deliberate escalation of the war ordered by Washington, there is growing belief at the Pentagon that such orders may come soon.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended that American planes knock out North Vietnam's major petroleum reserves, located in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, as a more effective means of slowing down the movement of troops and supplies to the Vietcong from North Vietnam via the Ho Chi Minh trail.

The bridge 33 miles south of Hanoi hit by American planes Sunday was described here as "knocked out of service" but as none of the spans were actually severed it may be soon repaired.

Sunday's attack also put out of action a highway bridge at Haiduong, on the main road between Hanoi and Haiphong, about 21 miles from Hanoi. It was bombed last fall but repaired since then.

U.S. Navy carrier pilots also reported the probable destruction of another missile site 160 miles south of Hanoi. The attacks bring to seven the total of SAM installations reported destroyed since July 27. Eight or nine others have been damaged.

Aircraft from the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* also struck Sunday at other points around Vinh, the major junction on the Communist supply line south. The Associated Press in Saigon said the Navy planes apparently hit liquid fuel used in the SAM missiles and most likely destroyed the site.

Russia is believed to have shipped 88 SAM installations—some mobile and some fixed—to North Vietnam. Some 160 missiles have been fired at U.S. planes, downing 10 planes.

American spokesmen in Saigon said no American plane was lost in the attacks near Hanoi. But five aircraft were knocked down by antiaircraft guns Saturday through Monday. Two airmen are listed as missing, the others were rescued.

There were few reports of ground action yesterday. However, a Vietcong suicide squad attacked U.S. Marine positions 375 miles north of Saigon Monday behind a barrage of Communist mortar shells. The marines lowered the barrels of their 155-millimeter, self-propelled guns and blasted the mortars. Then as the Vietcong attacked, the marines hit them with small arms fire. The action was 7 miles from Da Nang.

News services reported from Saigon that Vietcong terror continued against pro-government officials. A marine patrol found the mutilated body of a village chief of Kyxuum island, near Chulai. It was reported that two young Vietnamese girls had lured the young man into a house where he was killed by Vietcong agents.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I support the Participation Sales Act of 1966 because I am sure it is sound legislation, it is in the interests of the people of the United States, and it will contribute to the more realistic sensible financing of Federal Government programs.

This legislation is nothing more than a proposal to authorize the pooling of certain Government loans for sale on the private market. This pooling technique has been proved highly effective in the last several years. It was pioneered by the Export-Import Bank and since then other agencies including the Veterans' Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association have used this technique with excellent results.

All this legislation proposes to do is to extend this technique to other Federal credit programs, such as those of the Office of Education, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Small Business Administration.

Substituting private for public credit is not a new idea—in fact, it has been a cardinal principal of Federal financing for more than 10 years.

It carries the wholehearted endorsement of such groups as the Commission on Money and Credit—a blue-ribbon panel of economic and financial experts set up by the Committee on Economic Development to study our national needs; the Committee on Federal Credit Programs—set up by President Kennedy to examine principles of Federal financing

and many other outstanding groups and individuals on both sides of the political fence.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, was a member of the Commission on Money and Credit. He supports the policy of substituting private for public credit today as he did in 1961 when the Commission handed in its report. In that report the Commission said, and I quote:

Where it can be effective, a loan guarantee type of program should take preference over the direct lending type of program.

President Kennedy's Committee was headed by then Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and among the members were David Bell, Walter Heller, and William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. That Committee had this to say about the substitution of private for public credit and I quote:

The Committee believes that Federal credit programs should, in the main and whenever consistent with essential program goals, encourage and supplement, rather than displace private credit.

Let me give you one final sample of the bipartisan support which this important policy has had in the past and which it deserves now. I quote from a minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee report on legislation to provide temporary increases in the public debt limit. This report, delivered in May 1963 had this to say on the subject:

The administration also can always reduce its borrowing requirements by additional sales of marketable Government assets.

The point I am trying to make is simple. The point is that this is a sound measure for Government finance, that the policy under which it was framed has the clear and unequivocal support of both parties, of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, and many, many others who have had an opportunity to deal at first hand with the realities of Federal finance.

The proposed legislation in no way dilutes the authority or control of the Congress over Federal spending or lending programs.

For all these reasons, I am proud to number myself among the many distinguished leaders who have supported this policy. On that basis, I now support this legislation.

A CITIZEN'S EFFORT CHANGES BOSTON RENEWAL PROJECT

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1965, I related to this Chamber the efforts by the Boston Redevelopment Authority to oust low- and moderate-income families from their homes to make way for a high-rise, high-income apartment project which nobody except the developers apparently wanted. A month later, on September 21, I spoke to this body on the North Harvard Street project, as it is called, indicating that the

Units from a number of other States, including New York, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee have been invited to attend, and we look forward to having members of those ceremonial units in our State to enjoy the famous hospitality of our low-country area.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, for it is another of the fine attractions for which South Carolina has become well known throughout the Nation. We welcome the citizens of many States and many lands to our historic and scenic areas, and I hope that many will come to Sullivan's Island for this event.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two articles about the forthcoming reenactment from the Charleston News & Courier, distinguished daily newspaper of Charleston, S.C.

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

PLANS MADE TO REENACT BATTLE OF FORT SULLIVAN

(By M. Kathy Dix)

"It'll definitely be a fixed fight," commented Charleston author J. Percival Petit yesterday, referring to the coming reenactment of the 1776 battle of Fort Sullivan.

Officials of Historic Charleston Reenactment, Inc., local sponsoring group, announced that "battle plans" will begin to form this weekend with the visit of seven "governor-generals" and other officials of the Colonial and British Armies of America, Inc.

But, added Petit, who is writing the script, "there is no question how the battle will come out."

Gen. Mark W. Clark, president emeritus of The Citadel, is honorary chairman of the event, scheduled for June 11, commemorating the decisive battle of June 28, 1776, when the 2d South Carolina Regiment drove a British fleet out of the harbor.

Simultaneous, attempted British landing and crossing of what is now Breach Inlet, foiled when waters proved too deep to cross, will also be reenacted.

Visiting officials will gather for a 9 a.m. breakfast at the Hotel Fort Sumter followed by a trip to Fort Moultrie. There they will outline on maps and on the ground just what various troops will be doing. Participating units, representing a number of States, can then practice maneuvers on their home ground, said J. Francis Brenner, executive director of the sponsoring group.

Headquartered in Orangeburg, the Colonial and British Armies of America, Inc., promotes Revolutionary War reenactments throughout the country.

Preliminary plans indicate that between 500 and 1,000 members of the organization will participate in the approximately 2-hour reenactment here. They are expected to arrive June 10 and stay on the Isle of Palms, Brenner said.

He added that spectator stands will be built on top of Fort Moultrie and Battery Jasper and that the Sullivan's Island Township Commission will make ample parking space available for the event.

SULLIVAN'S ISLAND BATTLE TO BE REENACTED JUNE 11

A full-dress reenactment of the Revolutionary War battle of Fort Sullivan will be held on Sullivan's Island June 11, it was announced here yesterday.

Boom of cannon, rattle of Colonial musketry, regiments of uniformed British and Continental Army soldiers, the sound of fife and drums—all these will be a part of the pageantry.

The reenactment will be held almost 190 years after the actual engagement off the island and its palmetto log fort, at that time known as Fort Sullivan, on June 28, 1776.

It will be sponsored by a local organization, Historic Charleston Reenactment, Inc., with endorsement of the Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce and the National Park Service, custodians of the present Fort Moultrie, located near where the original palmetto log fort stood.

Several hundred members of the Colonial and British Armies of America, Inc., will arrive here from New York, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee to stage the reenactment. They will be housed while here at a trailer camp on the Isle of Palms.

The organization, which has Orangeburg headquarters, promotes reenactments in various parts of the country of Revolutionary War battles and skirmishes. It gives as its purpose the fostering of patriotism, a renewed appreciation of the American Revolution and the broad concept of freedom.

It was in June 1776, that the British sent a fleet of 14 ships under command of Sir Peter Parker into Charleston harbor with intention of seizing the port and opening a troop beachhead for a southern front.

The half-finished palmetto log Fort Sullivan, under command of Col. William Moultrie, had 31 guns against the 270 pieces aboard the British ship. But the British rounds sank for the most part harmlessly into the soft palmetto logs and sand. Three British ships ran aground on sandbars and were raked by the fort's guns along with several of the remaining 11 ships.

Later, trying to put a landing force across what is now Breach Inlet, the British once again were stopped when their troops stepped into deep holes in the inlet.

After the battle, the British withdrew with 64 dead and 131 wounded while the South Carolinians suffered only 17 dead.

For the reenactment, a palmetto log fort will be built on Sullivan's Island beach front between Fort Moultrie and Battery Jasper.

The event has been endorsed by the State Development Board and the Sullivan's Island Township Commission chairman Dr. George G. Durst who is a former president of the Charleston chamber.

Dr. Durst expressed hope the reenactment might become an annual event and be expanded.

Assisting in planning are George Campsen, Charleston lawyer, and J. Francis Breender, local businessman. They have called a meeting for 9 a.m. next Wednesday at the Trident chamber office for organizing the historic corporation as an eleemosynary group.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO COL. RALPH McMAHON

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, each year the Valley Forge Freedoms Foundation has presented awards to those citizens or groups which have, by their words or actions, made a contribution to explaining, understanding, and perpetuating the American way of life. These awards are presented to schools, organizations, and individuals who believe in the American system and who devote some of their efforts and talents to promoting their beliefs.

An Honor Certificate Award, which is given in the National and School Award category, was presented to Col. Ralph "Mac" McMahon, U.S. Army, retired, for his comments on the meaning of being an American. Colonel Mac was at one time a division commander at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, not far from

my home in Maryland. I feel that his words have a meaning for all of us because they are a clear expression of heartfelt patriotism.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Colonel McMahon's award-winning address in the RECORD.

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

I am an American. What a golden opportunity is enjoyed by anyone who can say that. About 85 percent of the earth's population cannot. I wonder if each American fully and truly appreciates his privileged position—unique among the nations. Because of his privilege I wonder, too, if he recognizes and accepts his responsibilities. They are many but are less by far than the privileges of the privileged. Does each of us fully appreciate the almost measureless bounty that this Nation, under God, enjoys? Or are we too busy with our own minute problems to raise our heads and view the glories above us? As an American I am free to breathe the unfettered air.

I am free to travel the length and breadth of an unbordered land.

I am free within my limit of skill to work where I please. I am free to speak of my beliefs without concern for fear or favor.

I am free to help my brother, to regard him as the inscription reads on the statue's base in Boys Town: "He ain't heavy, Father, he's m' brother."

I am free to be a man, dependable and foursquare.

I am free to govern, if my talents allow.

I am free to be governed by the laws of those I've chosen for the task.

I am free to espouse the right and to defend it against attack.

I am free to raise my children with faith and trust in those truths our Nation holds sacred.

I am free to be free, to be steadfast in my strength for freedom.

I am free to be humble as Junius said "Stay with me God. The night is dark. The night is cold. My little spark of courage dies. The night is long; be with me, God, and make me strong." For proudest of my proudest boasts—I am an American.

SENATOR MANSFIELD'S EXCELLENT SUGGESTION CONCERNING VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the excellent suggestion made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the effect that those representing the opposing forces in Vietnam should sit around a conference table as soon as possible. If that conference table is not to be under U.N. or Geneva power auspices, then by all means let it be in Asia and under Asian auspices.

That is where the fire is. Perhaps the fire, being hotter there, may more quickly produce a conference there than elsewhere.

Moreover, conditions are certainly in flux in Vietnam. I realize that all sorts of conditions and contingency plans are being considered. But, if conditions should arise that a government comes to power which asks us to leave, let us have the good sense to follow that advice. I hope that we would not have the poor sense to prop up a government, or organize a counter coup in order to avoid just such a contingency.

society, and hence on its destruction. And we now see that virtually all of such "demonstrations" are being infiltrated by rabble-rousers and radicals and, not infrequently, break into open violence.

Even though those results may not have been contemplated, and surely weren't wished, by those Americans who advocated disobedience of our laws, nevertheless they did advocate that philosophy and they did put its processes into action, and cannot now escape responsibility for the results.

Seeing the appeasements and successes of that process in racial strife, other would-be leaders have now adopted and spread it into many other areas. It has now spread into the campuses of most of our great universities where, as in Berkeley, it has been used to commit assault, kidnappings, imprisonment of police officers, and commandeering of public-address systems; and their use in spewing over the campus the most filthy four-letter words, and for general breakdown of law and order.

The process is also now progressively employed by radical leftists and those who would give aid and comfort to our enemies, to hinder and impede our Nation's efforts to conscript military personnel, as witness the recent rash of draft card business, and to move and supply its troops and generally to weaken its ability to execute its military efforts in this time of war.

The process has now been extended even to efforts to thwart governmental, legislative, and executive action. Indeed, it would be hard to name a field that has escaped or is not vulnerable to the process.

These are but recent examples of history's teachings that the toleration of some crime encourages all crime, and that it can hardly be denied that our toleration of these crimes of trespass has been at least a contributing factor to the recent spread of common violence which Mr. J. Edgar Hoover says makes it impossible "for the citizens of this country to * * * walk the streets of our cities without (danger of) being mugged, raped, and robbed." He continued: "We can't do that today." And he added: "All through the country, almost without exception, this condition prevails."

HOW MINORITIES HURT THEMSELVES IN PREACHING DEFIANCE OF LAW

The great pity is that these minority groups, in preaching and practicing defiance of the law, are in fact eroding our legal structure, which alone can ever assure to them due process of law and the equal protection of the laws, and that can, thus, protect them from discriminations and abuses by majorities.

We have all been often told, and many of us have preached, that crime does not pay. But the recent rash and spread of law defiance—and the successes, however tenuous and temporary, of that philosophy in attaining goals—seems to compel a reappraisal of that concept. For, from what we see currently happening, one could reasonably believe that certain types of crimes are being permitted to pay.

Indeed, official encouragement often has been given, even at times in some high places, to conduct these "demonstrations" which have led to the commission of these criminal trespasses, and it can hardly be denied that they have been rather widely tolerated. It is undoubtedly true, as recited in the theme of the Presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, that "a citizen's first duty is to uphold the law," but it is also the first duty of government to enforce the law.

As said in an article in the April 10, 1965 issue of the magazine *America*, "[Government] has no right to turn the cheek of its citizens. Instead it is gravely obligated by

the very purpose of its existence to see to their protection."

Surely the great majority of Americans agree with the May 1965, public statement of Mr. Lewis F. Powell, then president of the American Bar Association, that "America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected and due process followed."

I would like to conclude, as I began, with a plea for a return to simple honesty, responsibility and forthrightness in our public speakings and writings, that they may honestly inform and not misinform the people, and for a return to an orderly society by requiring respect for and obedience to our laws by the prompt, impartial, even handed, certain and substantial punishment of all persons whose willful conduct violates these laws, and that we do so promptly, and I would hope, before mass crime gets, as it surely can, so far out of hand as to be beyond the curbing capacities of our peacekeeping agencies and authorities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1966]

TIME TO DRAW THE LINE

John Doar's credentials as a battler for the legitimate civil rights of Negroes are impeccable. Consequently, he should be listened to when he says the time has come to "draw the line" against those who think they have an unlimited right to protest, at any time or place, in any way, and in any numbers.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the civil rights division was making a distinction between lawful and peaceful demonstrations and such things as the Watts riots and other so-called demonstrations which are neither peaceful nor lawful.

With respect to the latter, we think the time is long overdue for drawing the line. And, while it is helpful to have a man in Mr. Doar's position urge public officials to speak out against unlawful activities which masquerade as civil rights demonstrations, this, of itself, is hardly enough.

There should also be some soul searching by those who, wittingly or otherwise, have encouraged violence and who have stimulated expectations which cannot possibly be satisfied except over an extended period of time.

The list is long. It includes many Negro civil rights leaders who are reaping the harvest of their own recklessness, and who are at a loss to know how to tame the tiger which has been released in the streets. It includes vote-seeking politicians who have fed the fires, and who now face the prospect that their hoped-for political gains may be consumed in the flames. It also includes some of our courts, and especially the Supreme Court. The dissents were biting when five of the justices in 1964 overturned the convictions of thousands of persons who had been found guilty of illegal sit-ins on the specious ground that the 1964 Civil Rights Act was intended to have a retroactive effect. The dissents were equally biting in a 5-to-4 ruling last February which upset other sit-in convictions. Justice Black summed it up when he denounced encouragement of civil rights demonstrators who think "they will be automatically turned loose so long as whatever they do has something to do with race."

Yes, it is indeed time to draw the line—a line which should have been drawn long before the inciters were forced to realize that, in preaching disrespect for law and order, they were undermining the one force which could protect the civil rights of all.

TORNADO DAMAGE IN KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Last evening a tornado struck in Johnson County, Kans., destroying 15 or more homes and demolishing a part of the Kathryn Carpenter School which is within the Valley View School District No. 49. The damage is estimated to exceed \$1 million, but a greater tragedy could have resulted had it not been for the wise, prompt and courageous actions of the authorities in charge.

Under a well-conceived program devised by Dr. Jack Bell, superintendent of the district, and carried out by Mr. Henry Morse, principal of the Kathryn Carpenter School, the lives of many children were saved. It was Mr. Henry Morse who called back the kindergarten class and other students who would have been released early so that they might be led to safety in the basement of the school.

Although a factual account of what actually happened may not be available at this time I understand that the actions taken and the precautions followed with the utmost cooperation of the school teachers, custodians and other persons were carried out without adequate tornado warning.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Dr. Jack Bell and Mr. Henry Morse and all those other unnamed but courageous people should understand that their contribution to the Johnson County community, by example and by deed, is known and appreciated by all. I add my small words to what must be a rising chorus of approbation for the wise things done by these good people.

REENACTMENT OF THE BATTLE OF FORT SULLIVAN, S.C.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, may I call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a significant historical celebration which will take place in Charleston County, S.C., on June 11.

A full-dress reenactment of the Revolutionary War Battle of Fort Sullivan will be held on Sullivan's Island in Charleston County on that date.

I am confident that it will be a colorful spectacle, one worthy of the historical area in which it will occur.

South Carolina is proud of her history, and particularly the heroic part which her citizens played in the Revolutionary War. I am pleased that the people of Charleston County will join hands with others throughout our State and other States to commemorate this famous struggle which occurred within the borders of our State.

The reenactment occurs nearly 190 years after the actual engagement off the installation known, in 1776, as Fort Sullivan.

The celebration will be sponsored by Historical Charleston Reenactment, Inc., with the endorsement of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, and the National Park Service.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY OUR MOST EFFECTIVE SPOKESMAN

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Vice President is always one of the most effective spokesmen in the Nation for any point of view which he favors. This is certainly true for his speeches on behalf of our position on the Vietnam war, which have driven his critics to look for grounds on which to attack him, whether true or not. Recently, they have been charging that he is a turncoat against his earlier views, and that the President is standing behind him twisting his arm when he argues so persuasively for the rightness of our actions in Vietnam.

It is with much pleasure, therefore, that I have recently seen the result of a good research job completed by the Minneapolis Tribune, and printed under the byline of one of their staff correspondents, Charles W. Bailey, in the issue for Sunday, April 10. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the article reveals clearly that HUBERT HUMPHREY was one of the Nation's leaders who recognized very early both the importance of Vietnam, and the dangers for the United States—and indeed all of the free world—if we failed to meet the Communist challenge there.

As early as 1950, he was speaking frequently of the crucial nature of southeast Asia in the struggle for world peace, and he has continued to sound the same theme for the 16 years which have intervened since that date. In 1956, he reminded us that it was one of Lenin's maxims that—

For world communism the road to Paris lies through Peking and Calcutta.

In 1955, Vice President HUMPHREY said:

If free Vietnam falls, or if the Communist elements take over, then every country in the corridor of southeast Asia will be in more difficulty, and we shall not be able to stop it.

There is much more evidence of the Vice President's wisdom and prescience in this article, Mr. President, that is worth reading, quite aside from providing an answer to his critics. As is often the case, he is being attacked in this fashion because his opponents cannot answer the arguments he makes, nor match his eloquence in presenting them.

We are in Vietnam because the struggle going on there is of great importance to the American people, and cannot be just ignored, or swept under the rug, as some people would have us do.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Apr. 10, 1966]

IS HUMPHREY CONSISTENT ON ASIA? A LOOK AT THE RECORD INDICATES HE IS

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—HUBERT HUMPHREY, once the darling of Democratic liberals, has

in recent weeks come under heavy and sometimes bitter attack from some of his oldest political allies.

The criticism is aimed almost entirely at his support of Johnson administration policies in Vietnam—support which was given wide publicity during and after his mid-winter tour of southeast Asia and the Pacific.

The liberal unhappiness has produced some startling, if perhaps transitory, turnabouts. At a February convention of the California Democratic Clubs—the State party's ultra-liberal wing—HUMPHREY was roundly denounced while Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, once a CDC archfoe won ringing praise for his support of a Vietnam "coalition government" that would include Communist elements.

Throughout the liberal complaints about HUMPHREY runs one consistent theme: that the Vice President has "changed his views," has "compromised principle," to get in line with President Johnson's policy.

To test this proposition, the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau checked back through HUMPHREY's comments on Asia as far back as 1950, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the years in which he served—and spoke with great frequency—on the Senate floor.

The results suggest that HUMPHREY's new critics have overlooked or forgotten what he has been saying for the past 16 years about Asia and Asian communism.

An observer is also led to suspect that part of HUMPHREY's current problem with his old liberal pals lies in the very qualities which have in the past endeared him to them: his enthusiasm, his vivid rhetoric, his ability to deal with the subject at hand as though it were all that mattered in the world.

It was these personal qualities that gave so much bite to HUMPHREY's comments from Asia and after his return, rather than the newness of his ideas or his convictions.

Those who criticized his backing for the stay-and-fight policies of the President in Vietnam, for example, probably did not remember that it was HUMPHREY who said—in January of 1950—that "if we lose the south part of Asia * * * we shall have lost every hope that we ever had of being able to maintain free institutions in any part of the Eastern World."

And those who were displeased with his exhortation of Asian and Pacific governments to take the lead in opposing Red Chinese expansionism might not have recalled a Senate speech in September 1950 when HUMPHREY said:

"Our only hope is to work with the free powers, to give them the chance to remain free and the opportunity to stand with us as participating partners in the great area of the world where conflict between the forces of freedom and slavery is now in its crucial stage.

"If we fail in this effort, we shall have lost everything for which we have worked."

In 1954, he told the Senate that "There is no hope whatsoever of the United States doing the job alone in any area of the world such as Asia * * * the only possible hope of peace and stability in southeast Asia is for the Asiatics themselves to lead the great movement for stability and security in their own area, with our support and with the full support and under the auspices of the United Nations."

HUMPHREY also drew a good deal of scolding when he came home this winter and lectured Americans—including some prominent Senators and foreign-affairs scholars—for failing to recognize the importance of Asia.

To observe who traveled with him, there was no doubt that HUMPHREY had succumbed to one of his old weaknesses—the capacity to be so exhilarated by direct personal exposure

to a subject that he tends to forget that others may well have discovered it sooner.

But again a search of the record suggests that intellectually, at least, his position has not changed a great deal.

"The peace of the world will be decided in the Far East, where we are least prepared, where we are the least understood, where we are the most unwelcome," he said—in 1950.

In 1953, he told the Senate: "The threat of international Communist aggression is most acute in southeast Asia." In 1955, again speaking of Asia, he said: "If the rest of the world becomes a Communist satellite area, our gold standard will not be worth anything * * * we had better make up our minds that we are playing for keeps."

The theme was heard again in 1956, when he made a speech saying that "The danger to American objectives and interests is as great today in Asia as it was in Europe in 1947," and reminding listeners of Lenin's maxim that "For world communism the road to Paris lies through Peking and Calcutta."

HUMPHREY in 1955 argued that "if we abandon free Vietnam we shall have abandoned all of southeast Asia. Half of Vietnam is already gone; it is very possible that free Vietnam may not be able to be saved, even with our help.

"But surely we ought not to add to the difficulty * * * if free Vietnam falls, or if the Communist elements take over, then every country in the corridor of southeast Asia will be in more difficulty, and we shall not be able to stop it."

And by 1960, the HUMPHREY tone was still more ominous: "I happen to believe that the most dangerous, aggressive force in the world today is Communist China * * * it is from the Chinese Communists that the free world faces danger."

It must be said that the record is not one of total consistency on every point. Thus in March of 1962, HUMPHREY told the Senate that "it is to be hoped that American participation in this area (Vietnam) can be limited to military assistance, to supplies, and to military training, and it is my view, I state so there will be no doubt about it, that it should be so limited."

But in the next sentence, he added: "In all of this activity, there is a grave risk; but I say most sincerely that the greatest risk is Communist aggression, Communist conquest, and Communist advance. That we cannot permit, if it is humanly possible to stop it."

There are many more statements in the 16-year record, both before and after that 1962 speech. But the sum and substance of them, whether the immediate focus was Formosa or Korea or India or Vietnam, is the same as HUMPHREY's 1966 arguments: that Communist aggression in Asia is "the greatest risk" of all.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT—TRIBUTE TO HELENE C. MONBERG

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, those of us from Western States, and especially those who serve on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, are well acquainted with the reportorial zeal of Miss Helene C. Monberg, who represents a number of western papers in Washington.

We also know that when another reporter uses his own valuable column space to pay tribute to a member of the competition, that is high praise, indeed.

The Washington correspondent for the Phoenix, Ariz., Republic, Mr. Ben Cole, is a veteran observer of the Congress and a newsman of competence and integrity. In his column of Sunday, April 10, Mr.

April 20, 1966

Cole paid handsome tribute to his colleague and competitor in the press corps, and I believe other Members of the Senate may find it of interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, Apr. 10, 1966]

NEWSWOMAN ATTACKS DIGEST FOR ANTIRECLAMATION STAND

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Make room for a new western heroine whose deadeye aim with a blazing epithet matches Annie Oakley's legendary skill with rifle or six-shooter.

She is Helene C. Monberg, a hard-toiling blond newspaperwoman from Colorado who tramps through Federal offices here calling the bureaucrats honey or unabbreviated SOB's as the occasion requires.

Recently she turned her wrathful scorn on the Reader's Digest in consequence of its tawdry circulation promotion on the rim of the Grand Canyon. If the smug old Digest thinks it can shrug off the fair Helene, it would be well advised to reconsider.

The Digest has Miss Monberg's fuse sputtering even before it hauled a planeload of newspaper types to the south rim for its antireclamation workshop and the publicity attendant thereon.

It seems the computers that crank out the Digest's interminable "reminders" got a quaint idea that Helene owed an unpaid \$5.

Since Miss Monberg avoids debt with the same devotion that she shuns rattlesnakes and liars, she was well primed to explode over the Grand Canyon gambit.

Injustice is something that causes Miss Monberg to roar with ladylike anger matching the vehemence of the thunder that rolls across her Rocky Mountain homeland.

And Miss Monberg decided that the Digest article on the central Arizona project dams, together with the posh junket to the canyon, was a matter of injustice.

So she delivered a review of her opinion to DeWitt Wallace, who runs the Reader's Digest, in a letter that is cherished by all so fortunate as to acquire copies.

Not only did Miss Monberg cancel her own, she also stopped the subscriptions she gave all her relatives.

"If you think that you can crucify the western reclamation program with my own money, you are nuttier than a fruitcake," said Helene on her sizzling typewriter. "You'll do it over my dead body."

She went on. "I know who my Republican relatives and Republican friends are to whom I sent the Digest; and you don't have to tell me.

"And believe me, they will gulp when I tell them that the Reader's Digest, that great monument to God, motherhood, and the free enterprise system, is publishing an article about the Government building steam plants to replace its hydroelectric dams in reclamation projects. What a cesspool of socialism you at the Digest have become. Next month you might embrace sin at this rate."

Miss Monberg noted in her inimitable style that the Digest, of course, never prints answers to its diatribes since it regards itself as the gospel. Then she capped the whole job with a paragraph that deserves a place in American letters along with Sheridan's ride and the winning of Barbara Worth.

She said, "And, finally, I have a prediction to make to you. A hundred years from now the name of CARL HAYDEN will be emblazoned throughout the west and honored by every school child as a mighty western buldler—and the Reader's Digest will be as extinct as the dodo."

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] has prepared an able and thoughtful address which he will deliver tonight to the Chamber of Commerce of Myrtle Beach, S.C., concerning the grave and ominous events that have unfolded in recent days in South Vietnam.

The Senator from South Carolina is deeply disturbed, as is every Member of this body, over the civil strife and turmoil that has wracked South Vietnam and threatened to engulf that unhappy land in a civil war. The Senator raises the critical and unavoidable question about the effect this turmoil could have on the safety and welfare of the 200,000 American men who are there attempting to help the South Vietnamese resist Communist enslavement.

As the Senator points out, we are not attempting to intervene in the internal political affairs of South Vietnam and we are not attempting to dictate their government. But we do ask, as the Senator so ably puts it:

That whatever government they have share with us a wholehearted determination to fight this war to win.

Senator RUSSELL concludes his remarks with this significant statement:

If the leaders of Vietnam will place patriotism above personal ambition—if they join wholeheartedly together with us to bring this war promptly to a successful end with the proper use of the forces we both have on land, on sea and in the air employing our ample arsenal of power upon the enemy—freedom may be made secure for the people of South Vietnam. Then Saigon, like Berlin, could become a symbol of courage and resolution both for Vietnam and for America.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from South Carolina has voiced the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country in his excellent address, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR DONALD RUSSELL, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MYRTLE BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MYRTLE BEACH, S.C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1966

We are in a period of unexcelled prosperity. Our gross national product is breaking all records. National income is pushing to new heights. More prosperity is promised the farmer. So great is this economic surge that the danger appears to be inflation and not deflation. The great task is to cool the steam of economic activity in this country, not to stimulate a sluggish economy.

And we can take pride in the fact that South Carolina has participated fully in this surge forward. Between 1962 and 1965 personal income in South Carolina jumped over 26 percent, from \$3,745 million to \$4,731 million, practically a billion dollars in 3 years. Between these dates too, there was an increase of about 12½ percent in non-agricultural employment, while realized net income per farm was snowballing forward 33 percent, from \$2,338 per year to \$3,126. In the last 3 years, well over \$1 billion have been invested in new and expanded industry in South Carolina.

South Carolina is catching up, it is surging forward economically, bringing new opportunities for all our people. Contrary to the statistics in many other fields, we are moving forward economically faster than the national averages. A few weeks ago Business Week published comparative income figures for the Nation, expressed by States. Personal income for the Nation increased by 8.3 percent in 1965. But in this same year of 1965, personal income in South Carolina increased approximately 13 percent. Our rate of increase—and this is the encouraging fact—exceeded that of any other Southern State and was the fifth highest in the Nation.

This increase in personal income was matched by the increase in our industrial output. For the year ending June 30, 1965, more than 2,400 manufacturing establishments in this State produced goods with combined value approximating \$5 billion, an increase of about \$425 million.

Nor have we overlooked the value to the economy of South Carolina of its great tourist and recreational facilities such as your magnificent strand here at Myrtle Beach, the finest on the Atlantic and rapidly becoming recognized as such throughout this continent. I was pleased that, while I was Governor, our State development board, with the enthusiastic backing of your splendid legislative delegation, sought and obtained greater financial support for a program stimulating tourism in this State. I believe that everywhere in our State the value of increased tourism is recognized and Myrtle Beach is more and more appreciated as one of our greatest natural assets, one that contributes to our economic growth and one that offers to us, readily accessible, the finest recreation area in the East.

It is always like a tonic to come to Myrtle Beach, to be stimulated by the spirit of growth and development, to feel the confidence of its people and to be amazed by the growth that takes place each year. Nor can I fail to compliment you upon the appearance of your city. Your vitality and vigor as a progressive community is well expressed in the bright colors and in the paint and polish of your hotels, motels, and business establishments. You well reflect the new spirit of optimism that is rapidly becoming the hallmark of the South Carolina of the sixties. For this your chamber of commerce can take its due share of credit.

Heartening as this progress of our own State and of your area has been, it cannot erase from our minds or shield from our hearts at this moment the bitter anxiety about momentous events 10,000 miles from our shores. There, 235,000 American fighting men are committed in a war to safeguard the freedom of the embattled people of South Vietnam.

I think it is a tribute to the unselfish patriotism of the American people that today we—you and I—are more troubled about the safety of those distant soldiers of ours than we are about any proposals here at home. They are our sons and our husbands, fighting under our flag and under our command. We are not merely willing but anxious to make any sacrifice to see that they have everything they need to do their job and to do it as quickly as possible. I think it may be said with confidence and with pride that when we ask our finest young men to risk their lives on the field of combat under their country's flag 10,000 miles from home, we—the American people—all demand that these men be supplied with the best weapons and materiel that money and technology can supply. We will accept no excuses for any failure to discharge this duty to our fighting forces. For this reason, I am supporting enthusiastically the work of Senator STENNIS and his subcommittee in its searching inquiry into the adequacy of the planning both in supplies and in man-

April 20, 1966

power of the Department of Defense. We do not intend that one single American life shall be needlessly sacrificed because of want of adequate supplies or the best of equipment. And we expect such equipment and supplies to be used where they will bring an end to this war as promptly as possible, whether in South or in North Vietnam.

Furthermore, the American people generally will not countenance, and I shall certainly not support, any new domestic programs that may interfere with the priority of this war or its most effective prosecution. There can be no proposal for new domestic programs as important as the safety and well-being of the 235,000 Americans fighting under our flag in Vietnam. I question, as I know you do, whether we can expand Government at home and finance the war in Vietnam at the same time. Under such circumstances, the choice is simple: Our first responsibility, as I have said, must be the war. And, as long as we are in it, we must fight it with the best we have and without stinting—with the best in weapons, hitting where it will hurt the enemy the most, and seeking vigorously the earliest possible end to the war.

I am not sure, though, that it is quite that simple. I am not sure that will and resolve on our part alone are enough. There is much about this war in Vietnam that is beyond our control and that cannot be resolved by any show of will or force on our part.

It must be remembered that this war is not primarily our war. We are in South Vietnam to support the people of that nation in maintaining their freedom against the attacks of the Communists from without and, to some extent, from within. It is their war and we are there to back them up, to give them the necessary military and economic support in their effort to maintain their freedom.

Of course, we have a stake in their war. Unquestionably it is in the national interest to stem the advance of communism in Asia as well as in Europe. But in this war, we are fighting on the soil of South Vietnam, at the invitation of the Government of that nation, and in direct support of its own military effort to uphold its freedom from communism.

Within recent days, the Government of South Vietnam has been riven apart by a power struggle which has to a disturbing extent immobilized the fighting forces of that nation. Petty personal rivalries and factionalism have taken priority over the war. Civil war has been threatened and has been prevented only with great difficulty and considerable skill. Even more serious for us, several of the street demonstrations organized during this period of internal unrest have had unmistakable anti-American overtones. In some areas Americans have been threatened and even attacked. One Buddhist leader a few days ago voiced the demand for a civilian government "which cannot be controlled from Washington."

All of this—disheartening as it is—imperils the war effort but, more importantly for us, it imperils the lives of our soldiers, those very soldiers who, thousands of miles from home and family, are there, fighting, sacrificing, and in some instances, giving their lives in the cause of South Vietnamese freedom. It is an intolerable situation for the future freedom of South Vietnam; it is intolerable for our brave and courageous fighting men.

Further, all this unrest among the South Vietnamese comes when we are beginning to make progress in the war, when we are beginning to strike at the vitals of North Vietnam, when we are using our air power to strike at the missile bases and the military installations about both Hanoi and Haiphong. The demand of the American people to fight to win is seemingly ready to be answered. At least, that was and is our hope and our wish.

But all this is now jeopardized by the action of those we seek to protect and to aid. The South Vietnamese cannot leave the burden of the bitter fighting to us, while they squabble to no point among themselves.

Wars cannot be fought successfully this way. They permit of no half-hearted efforts. They are not "on-again and off-again" affairs. If fought, they must be fought to win and they must be fought without cease. That must be our resolve and it must be the resolve of the South Vietnamese.

We cannot, though, support effectively and successfully people who prize their own liberty so little that they are unwilling to subordinate petty political ambitions to the demands of a war with an implacable enemy. It occurs to me that the time as arrived when the generals, the monks, the priests, and the people generally of South Vietnam must recognize that they must close ranks, abandon their jealousies and jockeying for personal power, and give priority to the war itself.

This does not mean any weakening in our commitment to aid the South Vietnamese in maintaining their freedom. We respect that commitment. But it carries with it a correlative obligation on the part of the responsible leaders of South Vietnam to be equally committed and as resolutely dedicated to the common cause. We cannot carry on this fight for them and for their freedom alone.

Nor does this mean that we seek to intervene in their own government or to tell them who must head or compose their government. They may resolve their differences as they determine. We seek neither a military nor a civilian government. We ask merely that whatever government they have share with us a wholehearted determination to fight this war to win.

We can be encouraged that no responsible leader in South Vietnam has suggested abandoning the war or treating with the Vietcong. I believe they recognize that communism can bring them only tyranny. But factionalism among them, which impairs their own war effort, is no way to fight communism or to uphold their liberty. And they must be made to realize that such dissension among them simply aids the Communists and makes increasingly difficult, if not untenable, our own position in Vietnam.

I know there is a tendency, not merely in Vietnam, but throughout the free world, to adopt the slogan, "Let Uncle Sam do it." This goes for both economic and military aid. But there is a limit to the resources, both of material and of manpower, of our Nation. However anxious we may be to help, we cannot shoulder singlehandedly the economic and military burdens of the world. After all, we have only 6 percent of the world's population. Already, we have substantial forces committed in Western Europe, in Japan, in Korea, in Santo Domingo, and now in Vietnam. Never in history has any nation undertaken such massive programs of aid to other nations. We cannot carry such burdens indefinitely. Certainly, we cannot do it if the nations we are supporting do not do their own full part in helping themselves—do not cooperate fully with our fighting forces who hazard their lives in a cause that should be as real to them as it is to us.

It is my hope that the leaders of South Vietnam will quickly recognize this. It would be a tragedy for South Vietnam and for freedom in southeast Asia if we should be forced to undertake, as the distinguished and respected chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL has called it, an "agonizing reappraisal" of our involvement in South Vietnam.

If the leaders of Vietnam will place patriotism above personal ambition—if they join wholeheartedly together with us to bring this war promptly to a successful end

with the proper use of the forces we both have on land, on sea and in the air employing our ample arsenal of power upon the enemy—freedom may be made secure for the people of South Vietnam. Then Saigon, like Berlin, could become a symbol of courage and resolution both for South Vietnam and for America.

THE SUGARBEET INDUSTRY IN KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, over the past few years sugarbeet production and processing has become a significant industry in Kansas. The growth of the sugarbeet industry has made major contributions to the economy of the State of Kansas and has been particularly valuable in serving to broaden the economic base of western Kansas.

Mr. President, two major factors threaten the present economic position of that industry as well as its future growth.

One of these adverse factors is the Department of Labor's severe restriction on the Mexican bracero program. In 1965 Kansas sugarbeet growers suffered considerable economic loss because of the elimination of Mexican nationals. Western Kansas beet growers need about 1,500 workers from May to August. Far removed from any major center of surplus labor, Kansas beet growers have been unable to secure an adequate supply of domestic labor.

In order to protect the present economic position of the sugarbeet industry, it is absolutely essential that the mutually beneficial bracero program be renewed. Gov. William H. Avery, of Kansas, acting on behalf of the Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee, has informed the Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, of this necessity in a letter of April 5, 1966. I have strongly endorsed this request by Governor Avery in a letter to Secretary Wirtz of April 20, 1966.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be inserted into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the other adverse factor to which I refer is the current policy of the Department of Agriculture prohibiting the transfer of unused beet acreage allotments across State lines. Our sugar production area is unique in that it embraces acreages and economic units on both sides of the Colorado-Kansas State line. Western Kansas and eastern Colorado constitute an integrated beet producing area and the imaginary State line can be an adverse factor. In recent years a considerable quantity of acreage allotments in Colorado have gone unused. Kansas farmers are anxious and willing to expand their production and believe that it would be wholly reasonable and proper that unused allotments in Colorado be transferred to Kansas rather than to see this production lost through default.

Governor Avery, again acting on behalf of the Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee, has requested, in a letter to the Honorable Orville Freeman of April 5, 1966, that the Department reconsider its policy on this matter. In a

letter to Secretary Freeman of April 20, 1966, I have expressed the belief that this is an entirely reasonable and fair request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Topeka, April 5, 1966.

HON. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Members of the Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee at their meeting in Topeka on March 24 voted unanimously to ask my assistance in appealing to you to relax the bracero embargo. Kansas sugarbeet producers are asking that Mexican citizens again be permitted to enter the United States for temporary work in the beet fields, as well as fruit and vegetable harvests.

It is the opinion of these growers that domestic workers are not available in sufficient quantity to handle the seasonal farm jobs. It is also pointed out that the needs of domestic workers and the needs of sugarbeet growers are completely incompatible. American citizens need year-round employment that will provide sufficient money for a high standard of living. The growers, however, need labor only for a short time each year, and then massive quantities of it. In western Kansas there is a need for 1,500 workers from the middle of May to the first of August. Domestic workers cannot afford to develop the skills and the stamina for a mere 10 weeks of work.

To the sugarbeet grower, foreign labor is an intelligent answer to the problem. Under the former bracero program the growers got a skilled, dependable supply of labor that matched the seasonal needs of the crop.

The 1965 sugarbeet crop in Kansas was victim of the labor shortage brought about by elimination of Mexican nationals. Productivity of workers was reduced; costs were increased and Kansas found itself in stiff competition for field labor. The Kansas beet-growers express the opinion that raising the cost of field labor is inflationary. Labor costs increase, production costs increase while actual production decreases. If there is, in fact, sincere effort to stem the rising costs of food, then western farmers should be permitted to use braceros.

Farmers in western Kansas will continue to face this dilemma as long as the stalemate exists in Washington with agriculture claiming that temporary foreign labor is necessary, and the Department of Labor maintaining that domestic labor is sufficient for the growers needs.

The Kansas sugarbeet growers have attempted to cooperate with the Department of Labor. Yet they have lost heavily through no fault of their own. The committee asks that I relay this report with the conclusion that the program to use domestic labor in field work has proved to be a dismal failure.

I would like to add that approximately 100 Kansas businessmen embarked on a trade mission to Mexico City last November. After the agenda of the trade mission had been completed, I joined a number of other Governors as guests of President Ordaz for a tour of the beautiful country of Mexico. I had the privilege of visiting several states and personally meeting the Governors of these states. In every instance disappointment was expressed by the Governors because of the termination of the very successful and mutually beneficial bracero program. They reported that this had a perceptible adverse

effect on the Mexican economy, and they hoped that it could be restored at an early date.

During a period such as this when the resources of the United States are being strained and the friendship of Mexico becomes more important than ever, it would seem to me that a renewal of the bracero program would be definitely in the national interest of the United States, and a favorable factor in improving relations between the United States and Mexico.

May I hear from you in this regard.

Yours very truly,

WM. H. AVERY,
Governor.

APRIL 20, 1966.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A letter to you of April 5 from Gov. William H. Avery of Kansas requested, on behalf of the "Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee," that Mexican citizens again be permitted to enter the United States for temporary work in the beet fields, as well as fruit and vegetable harvest.

I strongly endorse this request.

As Governor Avery explains, Kansas sugarbeet growers suffered economic losses in 1965 because of the labor shortage brought about by the elimination of Mexican nationals. Because of this and in view of the very low rate of unemployment now existing in this country, and because of the fact that Kansas beet growers are far removed in distance from any significant labor surplus area, it would seem more desirable that the mutually beneficial bracero program be renewed. Indeed, I believe that its renewal is imperative in order to prevent a major economic loss to Kansas sugarbeet growers.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator.

THE STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Topeka, April 5, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Members of the Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee at their meeting on March 24 discussed at length the need for an increase in sugarbeet acreage in Kansas.

Although the committee entertains little hope that Congress will provide legislation favorable to the growth of the beet sugar industry, there is, in the opinion of the committee, another method in which Kansas acreage can be gradually expanded. This will involve a change in philosophy and administrative procedure on the part of the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture permits the transfer of unused beet acreage from one area to another. However, the Department has been quite adamant in their refusal to permit such transfers to cross State lines.

Our sugar production area is unique in that it embraces acreage on either side of the Colorado-Kansas State line, all of which is far removed from other beet-producing areas. Many of our farms include fields in both States.

Under the existing Department policy, beet acreage allotments unused in Colorado cannot be transferred across the State line. In many instances the allotment to a factory has been lost from production because of this ruling. Colorado growers did not plant the acreage; Kansas farmers were not permitted to use the allotment on their side of this imaginary line.

The Kansas farmers are just as willing, able, and desirous of growing beets as their

fine neighbors on the Colorado side of the line. They feel that a change in Department policy should be requested enabling a factory district acreage allotment to be used on either side of the State line, rather than see this production lost through default.

The Governor's Sugarbeet Advisory Committee is convinced that the importance of State lines should not be emphasized or dramatized to the extent that it interferes, unfavorably, with the proper growth and development of rural communities.

Instead of the Department having the final jurisdiction in this regard, it might be prudent to allow the sugar factories some judgment in the use of acreage allotments assigned to them.

Yours very truly,

WM. H. AVERY,
Governor.

APRIL 20, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A letter to you of April 5 from Gov. William H. Avery of Kansas requested that provisions be made whereby sugarbeet acreage allotments could be transferred across State lines. It would seem to me that this is an extremely reasonable and fair request and I strongly endorse it.

Could you advise me as to why acreage allotment transfers under conditions that prevail in eastern Colorado and western Kansas cannot be made? Is this prohibited by administration ruling or by legislative authority? Also I would like to know what steps if any have been taken relative to Governor Avery's request.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. PEARSON,
U.S. Senator.

THE IRISH AND THE JEWS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, America is a nation of immigrants. And the sons and grandsons of immigrants have not forgotten the nation from which they came. We are rightly proud of all the "old countries"—and proud that our Nation can help them achieve goals of freedom and justice we all share.

Still, from time to time, there are those who say that Polish-Americans should be unconcerned with Poland, or that Irish-Americans should be unconcerned with Ireland, or Jewish-Americans unconcerned with Israel. Harry Golden, the editor of the *Carolina Israelite*, has answered one such contention in an excellent article. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THE IRISH AND THE JEWS: ISRAEL—
THE IRISH FREE STATE
(By Harry Golden)

Up in Montreal, City Councillor Frank Hanley created quite a stir in a speech before the Balfour Lodge of B'nai B'rith.

A transcript of Councillor Hanley's remarks includes this statement: "I am Irish, ladies and gentlemen, yet I have never sent a dollar to help build that impoverished country." Mr. Hanley's main point was that it is wrong for Canadian (American) Jews to send money to Israel (United Jewish Appeal, Bonds for Israel, etc.). Said the Councillor, "I would much rather use that dollar to improve the lot of a needy person in Montreal."

The only important question impresses itself at once. Do individual members of

Contractors: Blount Bros. Construction Co., John F. Casey Co., Curtin & Johnson, Inc., Diamond Construction Co.

Project notes

The Francis Case Memorial Bridge, a part of the Interstate Highway System, crosses the Washington Channel in the vicinity of Maine Avenue and East Potomac Park. It carries Virginia traffic to and from the District via the Potomac River Bridges at 14th Street. The bridge, 1,312 feet long, is 6 lanes wide and supported on 39 piers and 4 abutments. It provides a connection to the 12th Street Expressway and to the Southwest Freeway and to the Southwest Freeway. Motorists using this structure are afforded a magnificent view of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and the skyline of the Southwest section of the city, with the Washington Monument in the background.

Construction began on July 6, 1959, and the bridge was completed on July 31, 1962. This facility, costing \$9.2 million, was conceived and built by the Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads.

Public Law 89-203, approved September 25, 1965, officially named this bridge in honor of the late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota in recognition of his long and distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate, and for his remarkable dedication to duty that helped bring about major highway and bridge construction in the District of Columbia.

VIETNAMESE PRIESTS CALL FOR PEACE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, amidst Vietnam's political confusion it is perhaps impossible to say that the Vietnamese people are of any one mind, but there can be no denying the widespread yearning for peace. A letter from 11 Vietnamese Catholic priests, published in the April 1 Commonweal, is witness to this fact.

The priests wrote:

In their march toward victory by force of arms, both the north and the south are progressively giving up more and more of our country's autonomy, thereby leading the Vietnamese problem into more and more of an impasse, where its solution is no longer the free decision of the Vietnamese people.

In these time when peace seems so far off, it is still worthwhile to remember how this yearning for peace leaps ideological barriers. It is with this in mind that I draw attention to this letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STOP THE KILLING—AN OPEN LETTER FROM 11 VIETNAMESE PRIESTS

(NOTE.—This appeal to end the war in Vietnam is translated from the French. It appeared in the February 2, 1966, issue of Informations Catholiques Internationales.)

Confronted by the present situation in our country, and following upon the increasingly urgent appeals of Pope Paul VI, we Catholic priests, motivated by neither political nor religious partisanship, desire to express the profound anguish of men who refuse to betray their fellow-men, of Vietnamese who share the sufferings of their compatriots as well as the anguish of servants of Jesus Christ, Who died to bring to all men love and salvation.

The blood of men has already flowed too abundantly over this Vietnamese land; this fratricidal war is in a paroxysm of its cruelty.

In their march toward victory by force of arms, both the north and south are progressively giving up more and more of our country's autonomy, thereby leading the Vietnamese problem into more and more of an impasse, where its solution is no longer the free decision of the Vietnamese people.

The disorder created by the war, the presence of foreign soldiers, forces upon the masses of people economic, social and moral conditions which are an affront to human dignity.

With all men of good will, we wish to be mindful of man's sacred destiny, his dignity, his right to freedom, and the fraternity of each and every one of these men, our brothers, who in the north as in the south are today victims of the ravages of bombardment, the oppression of ideologies, misery, suffering, the degrading corruption of money, divided and torn by prejudice, self-interest and politics.

In the name of these men, we wish to proclaim from the housetops the aspirations of all those who suffer so much and who hardly have a voice anymore: we seek peace through the freedom of the human person and the justice of society, for the well-being of all.

We cannot tolerate this absurd drama of brothers of the same country, sharing the same sincere love for their country and their people, the same determination to dedicate themselves to a great cause, the same thirst for peace, attacking and killing each other in hatred.

We cannot accept the fact that the objective of unifying the country, or of building some better future, can serve as a pretext for continuing this fratricidal war.

That is why we urgently implore the authorities of the north and south to take all appropriate steps to bring the war to an end immediately.

Let them not wait for some sort of guarantee before deciding in all sincerity to respect the life and liberty of the Vietnamese of the north and south and the brotherhood that binds them together.

Let these authorities renounce the claim that they seek through armed victory a guarantee for negotiations and the ending of hostilities—let them also renounce their ambitions of implanting or suppressing ideologies through subversion and bombardment, for that can only lead to genocide and prolong the tragedy of underdevelopment and the country's alienation.

May the authorities on both sides undertake negotiations in justice and honesty to arrive at peace, for only genuine peace will enable them both to devote themselves to the creation of the material and moral conditions necessary for the Vietnamese people's free and democratic choice of their future.

May the great powers respect the autonomy and self-determination of the people and not contribute to making the war in Vietnam more and more murderous, creating in this way such an impasse that the only outcome can be a world war.

Since effectively the north and the south, as well as the great powers that support them, have demonstrated that they cannot by themselves bring the war to an end through the illusory attempt to obtain victory for one side and capitulation by the other, virtually the only way that leads to the cessation of hostilities, to negotiations and to peace (which would at least stop the shedding of more blood) is to acknowledge both the mediation and arbitration of the United Nations, to have recourse to, and to collaborate sincerely with, that organization.

With all our hearts we invite men of good will of both the north and the south to surmount every form of oppression, and to ex-

press openly and bravely the will of the Vietnamese people for peace. By such action the responsible authorities can no longer pretend to ignore that will or to enjoy clear consciences, not until they have engaged in negotiations toward peace and utilized every means of negotiation, not until they have seized every occasion for doing so.

But peace can come and be maintained only insofar as the Vietnamese masses become aware of the peril that threatens both man and country, and the well-being of the community and the survival of the people are set above the interests of individuals and groups.

The survival of the country, the interests of the people and of peace itself, have nothing to fear from the diversities of ideologies and of beliefs. On the contrary, truly to be feared are those who, in the name of one side or the other, go so far as to no longer respect free choice and its exercise on the part of their fellow citizens. Also to be feared are those who in actuality have no other ideology or religion than themselves, their money, their passions, and their own interests.

The moment has come to mobilize all that remains of the faith and spiritual energy of the people—not to intensify hatred but to extinguish so many discords, so much jealousy, to restore the bonds of unity which, from this moment, before it is too late, will permit the imparting from all hearts, all families, all groups to the structures of society: truth, justice, liberty, and love as solid foundations for authentic peace and happiness. In this experience, little by little, man will no longer need to oppose his brother for the right to subsist and to think, etc., but all in common will put forth their efforts to exploit the resources of nature, sharing equitably the conditions and means of material and spiritual progress necessary for personal and community achievement.

Up to this point, we have been echoing in the name of man the voices of those who are about to have voices no longer. In concluding, it is also in the name of man that we speak out for those who have decided not to be subjugated in misery, for those who do not accept defeatism, for those who demand victory but not victory through arms and through exploitation and hatred, a victory in which men continue to suppress men and men continue to be held inferior to other men. We demand a victory of truth, justice, liberty, and love, the unique victory which can bring peace for the true honor of man.

Do Xuan Que, Nguyen Noc Lan, Tran Viet Tho, Truong Dinh Hoa, Vu Van Thien, Ho Dinh, Nguyen Thanh Cao, Truong Ba Can, Hoang Kim, Dinh Khac Tieu, Huyen The My.

THE F-5 FREEDOM FIGHTER

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the March issue of Popular Science monthly contains a well documented story on the F-5 Freedom Fighter, high performance, low-cost jet airplane evaluated in Vietnam combat by the U.S. Air Force and now permanently assigned in South Vietnam to fly strike missions against the Vietcong.

I feel the article points out many important facts about this versatile new airplane that should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

suggested as an excellent ski development. It would provide a paved scenic loop route of approximately 65 miles which would be attractive to tourists. The report points out that the total tourist visits to the Salmon National Forest in 1965—approximately 250,000—were mainly concentrated on the paved sections of highway.

The road development would provide transportation routes to 15 known major ore deposits with estimated potential jobs for 1,050 men, with the possibility of many more in small mining operations which might start up as a result of the better transportation.

In cattle grazing, the additional and improved roads would improve the administration of areas allotted for 1,100 cattle.

And the new roads would improve the ability of the Forest Service to administer and protect the entire Salmon National Forest.

Lemhi County needs this kind of a job done in the area. And it is not an appeal for aid. It is simply an appeal to National Government to take a good look at its responsibility in the economic development of an area which can only occur as the owner of the land—and that is the Nation—undertakes to do its share. When that is done, at least some of the economy of the Salmon River Area will be a long way on the road to the rapid rise that is evident in the rest of the Nation.

And that's the way it seems to me today. Join us at this same time next Sunday when we will have some more ideas to discuss as it seems to me. This is Dave Ainsworth, wishing you a very good afternoon on a fine Easter Sunday in America's beauty spot—the Salmon River area.

DEDICATION OF THE FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. McGOVERN, South Dakotans gathered this morning, Mr. President, near the end of the Washington Channel Bridge on Hains Point to dedicate that structure as a memorial to the late Senator Francis Case, my predecessor in the Senate. Senator Case made great contributions to this Nation as a Congressman, a Senator, chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, and as ranking member for several years of the Senate Public Works Committee.

The dedication this morning was an impressive ceremonial attended by the Senator's gracious widow, his daughter Jane, his brother Leland, and his sisters Mrs. Joyce Wilson and Mrs. Carol Goddard of Hot Springs, S. Dak., and Mrs. Esther Sunderman of Le Sueur, Minn., as well as such old family friends as Mr. and Mrs. Harold Dudley.

The dedication was arranged by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in compliance with Public Law 89-203, approved September 25, 1965—a resolution which I first introduced in the Senate in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my dedicatory remarks and the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 20, 1966

Ladies and gentlemen, we meet in our Nation's Capital today in the shadow of the Nation's most meaningful shrines—the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln, and

Jefferson Memorials—to honor a distinguished American and South Dakotan the late, beloved Francis Case.

Francis Case was a South Dakotan, a newspaperman, a rancher, a Congressman, a U.S. Senator, an American patriot—but most important of all, he was a good man. He was a man of quick intelligence, a man of public spirit and he was a man with that rarest of qualities—absolute personal integrity.

Another distinguished American, the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, EVERETT DRUKSEN, once said of Francis Case: "He was a hewer of wood and a carrier of water." I have always thought this was a particularly appropriate description of the man who quietly did so much for our country in the fields of water resources, highway construction, and conservation.

South Dakotans know of the admirable work which Francis Case did in the wise development of the Missouri River and our State's water resources.

He was a pioneer in the promising new field of weather modification. I owe my own original interest in this important field to Senator Case—a field in which he began work 15 years ago.

Although members of different political parties, Senator Case and I had much in common. We both grew up in Methodist parsonages. We both did our undergraduate college work at Dakota Wesleyan University in Mitchell, S. Dak. And we both did graduate work at Northwestern University.

At the time of his death in 1963, Francis Case had completed nearly 26 years of service in South Dakota in the U.S. Congress—at that time the longest congressional service ever achieved by a South Dakotan. Since then, Senator MURNER has set a new record in compiling the greatest congressional seniority of any South Dakotan—nearly 28 years. Knowing that a sparsely populated State such as South Dakota has the same strength in the U.S. Senate as large States such as New York or California, Senator Case used his valuable seniority wisely and untriflingly on behalf of the citizens of the United States as well as his South Dakota constituents. He was admired by both Republicans and Democrats with whom he worked in the Congress.

As the author of the joint resolution of the Congress which provided for the designation of this important Washington Channel Bridge as the Francis Case Memorial Bridge, I am especially pleased by today's ceremony. I first offered this legislation in 1963 and it was signed into law by President Johnson on September 25 of last year. Its enactment was due in large part to the efforts and the cooperation of the South Dakota congressional delegation.

It is fitting that Francis Case should be honored in the District of Columbia. It may truly be said that he had two constituencies: South Dakota and the Nation's Capital. During his many years in the Congress our late colleague worked unstintingly on behalf of Washington and its residents. To quote from the joint congressional resolution, he was " * * * one of the District's most dedicated and resourceful friends * * * and helped fashion firm policies that will guide the District for decades."

One of my colleagues in the Senate who has also given unselfishly of himself on behalf of our Nation's Capital and its residents—Senator MORSE—said in a memorial address: " * * * the District of Columbia is a better city in which to live because Francis Case lived."

During seven terms in U.S. House of Representatives, he was one of the original architects of the 23d amendment to the Constitution which gave the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote in 1964 for the first time for President and Vice President.

For many years our late friend championed the cause of self-government for those living

in the District. If that dream becomes a reality, it will serve as yet another memorial to this distinguished South Dakotan.

Francis was the two terms a constructive and diligent Senator who performed his duties as a U.S. Senator with great zeal. He was known as a legislative craftsman of unique skill. As a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, he sponsored many measures for improvements in our Capital City. He joined the committee originally in 1951, served as chairman in 1953-54, and returned voluntarily to the committee in 1959 and 1960.

One of the Senator's significant contributions was his leadership in the enactment of the District of Columbia public works program of 1954, bringing about a major expansion of highway and bridge construction. He paralleled this work for the District with his efforts as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee to bring about the enactment of the Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1962, which made possible this magnificent bridge across the Potomac, located as it is on Interstate 95 as it enters the city of Washington.

Francis Case was a strong advocate of economic development throughout the Nation. In addition to highways, he pushed for a better inland waterway system and improved western reclamation efforts. He was an untiring student of the measures before his committees, sincere and modest about the contributions he made to District, regional, State, and National advancement.

The gracious widow of Senator Case who is here today, pointed out to me how uniquely appropriate it is to name this bridge over the Potomac in honor of his memory. For this bridge links the city to which he contributed so much with the Interstate Highway System that he aided so significantly.

I can think of no finer memorial for this distinguished Senator than this key link in our national transportation system, crossing navigable waters, and lying within the traffic pattern of Washington National Airport—all parts of the transportation system which bind our Nation together and to which my distinguished predecessor dedicated so much of his energy and abilities.

It is, therefore, a high honor for me now to dedicate this magnificent bridge as the Francis Case Memorial Bridge.

DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE

(Sponsored by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia, April 20, 1966)

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies: Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Music by the U.S. Army Band, Lt. Col. Samuel Loboda, leader and commanding officer.

Armed Forces joint color team.
National anthem.

Invocation: The Reverend Dr. Edward G. Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial, the National Methodist Church.

Greeting by master of ceremonies.

Introduction of distinguished guests.

Remarks:

The Honorable E. Y. BERRY, U.S. House of Representatives (South Dakota).

The Honorable BENJAMIN REIFEL, U.S. House of Representatives (South Dakota).

Address: The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senate, South Dakota.

Musical selections: U.S. Army band, Sp. Michael Ryan, vocalist.

Dedicatory address: The Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senate, South Dakota.

Unveiling of plaque.

Consulting engineer: Sverdrup & Parcel, St. Louis, Mo.

OUR BANTAM SUPERSONIC JET—NEGLECTED BY THE AIR FORCE FOR YEARS, THE RUGGED FREEDOM FIGHTER HAS FINALLY GOTTEN ITS CHANCE AT COMBAT

(By Herbert O. Johansen)

Our newest tactical guerrilla warfare weapon is a pint-size, supersonic, twin-jet fighter-bomber that was born more than 10 years ago—and prophetically named the Freedom Fighter.

It's the Northrop F-5—a tough little scrapper with extraordinary combat performance: high rate of climb, quick acceleration to supersonic speed, extreme maneuverability at altitudes to 40,000 feet, and bantam weight. The basic reason for its prowess is its twin powerplants—GE J-85 turbojets. Each produces 4,080 pounds of thrust, yet weighs only 585 pounds—a prodigious thrust-to-weight ratio of 7 to 1.

Low in weight, high in performance, the Freedom Fighter is also low in cost. The F-105 Thunderchief, for instance, costs \$2,067,000. The F-5 is off the shelf at \$669,175. On electronic equipment, the difference is even more amazing. On the F-105, it costs \$233,143; on the Freedom Fighter, only \$12,000.

The F-5 was designed as a supersonic tactical aircraft to replace obsolescent F-84's and F-86's in the aerial arsenals of selected allied countries under our military assistance program; nine nations are getting them.

In the United States, however, the F-5 was considered an underdog. We already had in Vietnam such supersophisticated fighter-bombers as the multimillion-dollar F-105 Thunderchief, the F-104 Starfighter, the F-100 Super Sabrejet, the F-4 Phantom,

THE UNDERDOG HAS ITS DAY

While scorning the F-5 for combat, the Air Force did order tandem versions as supersonic trainers. More than 800 of these T-38 Talons have trained thousands of pilots to fly in a combat-plane environment. This kept the F-5 design alive. More important, it ironed out the mechanical, electronic, and maintenance bugs that plague most new planes when they first go into combat.

Then, about a year ago, the Air Force decided to try out the F-5 in Vietnam and organized a squadron of 12 planes to train for combat at Williams Air Force Base, Ariz.

Proud of the small size of their planes, they named their squadron the Skoshi Tigers—Skoshi is the phonetic spelling of the Japanese word "sukoshi," meaning "little."

In October of last year, the Skoshi squadron took off for combat. Although they have a range of only about 1,500 miles, the pilots flew their F-5's to their destination target, 8,500 miles away, stopping at Hawaii and Guam. They were accompanied by KC-135 jet tankers—and en route each plane took more than a dozen gulps of fuel from the mother planes.

Within 6 hours after touchdown at Bien Hoa Air Base, near Saigon, on October 23, two F-5's were off on a combat mission. They bombed and strafed suspected battalion-size Vietcong jungle concentrations. Since then, they have run up an impressive record of hundreds of "missions accomplished."

"When we parked our F-5's alongside some of their bigger brothers at Bien Hoa," said one Skoshi pilot, "they looked like toys. We ground maneuvered like Volkswagens."

The F-5's built-in ease of maintenance already has proved a boon in its trial operations. "Aside from its versatility," says Col. Edward Johnson, head of a team of experts that is evaluating the trim little fighter's combat performance, "what the armers like most about the plane is its simplicity."

"That's the beauty of it. The F-5 is so simply constructed that it takes 50 percent less maintenance than some of the big jet fighter-bombers. Two men can lift off the

tail. Three men have removed an engine in 20 minutes."

KEEPING REPAIRS AT GROUND LEVEL

This ease of maintenance is due largely to Northrop design foresight. Parts needing frequent replacement or repair were put low to the ground and made readily available through access doors.

One great advantage of the F-5 has as an antiguerrilla air weapon is that it can really give ground support to troops by following them into combat. It needs no prepared runways—it can take off from sod fields in forward areas.

For their combat missions in Vietnam, the F-5's were camouflaged—painted a mottled green and brown on the top and sides, a pale blue on the bottom. This is to blend in with the jungle when seen from above by enemy aircraft, with the sky when flying low and vulnerable to ground fire.

In aerial combat, the 1,000-mile-an-hour F-5 is able to outfight aircraft of greater speed. That is what its pilots proudly say they learned during their training at Williams Air Force Base, prior to being shipped to Vietnam to prove it.

LOADED FOR BEAR

The fighting package of the F-5 is also outstanding for a midget that weighs only 12,000 pounds in its "bare feet." In addition to two 20 millimeter rapid-firing cannons in the nose (and their ammo), the Freedom Fighter can carry 6,200 pounds of armament externally, slung under its belly and wings. In various combinations it can mount: supersonic aid-to-air missiles, air-to-ground rockets, anti-radar missiles, general-purpose bombs, and phosphorous and napalm incendiaries.

For extra range, fuel-tip tanks can be carried, although this naturally cuts down the armament load. For aerial reconnaissance, the F-5 can be fitted with a camera nose—at the factory or in combat areas with a kit that replaces the nose cone.

Still another advantage of the tactical Freedom Fighter is its exceptional single-engine performance. If an F-5 pilot runs low on fuel while he is still needed to hang around in support of ground troops, he simply shuts off one engine and extends his loiter time.

F-5 men readily admit that it is unsophisticated. It does not have the capability of blind radar bombing. It does not have the all-weather capability provided by the radar equipment of its big brothers. It has a simple gunsight instead of a complex electronic one.

Fully armed and fueled, takeoff weight of the F-5 is about 20,000 pounds; of the F-105, more than 50,000 pounds. This, in guerrilla warfare, means the difference between long, paved runways and sod-field operation in forward areas.

THE CHALLENGE

The question is, can the F-5 do close-in support and air-fighting jobs as well, or better, in jungle warfare than its bigger, costlier, more complex brothers? The answer will come when the F-5's have completed their combat trial in Vietnam, and the evaluation team of experts reports to the Department of Defense.

THE PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have just received along with a message from the President the Participation Sales Act of 1966. This proposed legislation would authorize the head of any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to set aside a part of all of any financial assets

held by him, subject them to a trust or trusts, and to guarantee to the trustee timely payment of principal and interest on the assets so set aside.

Under the trust instrument, FNMA would act as trustee and the title to the obligations would be deemed to have passed to FNMA in trust. FNMA would have authority to issue participation certificates based on these obligations for sale on the private money market.

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the bill gives a blank check to the Treasury to pick up the deficiencies that may occur in the payment on the obligations. Indefinite appropriations would be established on the books of the Treasury in the amounts necessary to enable the executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to effect timely payment to the FNMA of any insufficiencies on account of outstanding participations.

Just over a month ago, the subject of discussion in this Chamber was a bill to permit the sale of Small Business Administration loan participation certificates through the facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association. I made the point at that time, that it was not just a one-shot affair, but that we should consider the principle of the proposed legislation and the precedent that it would set. I suggested that we consider the long run instead of an isolated single agency.

At the time I said that, it was no secret that the administration was drafting legislation that would extend the same principle to several other agencies. The President in his budget message indicated that an attempt would be made to secure legislation that would permit the sale of a total of \$3.3 billion of direct Government loans and participations in these loans.

The budget statement requested legislation to expand this authority to the Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration, which it is estimated would market \$600 million worth of participation certificates in the next fiscal year; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, which would sell \$100 million worth; the Federal National Mortgage Association, which it is estimated could sell an additional \$400 million; college housing loans which would add \$80 million, and SBA loans estimated at \$850 million in participation certificates in fiscal 1967.

These listed programs added a total of \$2.8 billion to the sales of Federal loans and participations in the next fiscal year.

It should be made clear just what the purpose of such sales is. It was claimed when the SBA bill was before us that it would permit a significant increase in the ability of the SBA to make loans. Perhaps this screen caused many to vote for the procedure. The fact is that it did not increase the authorized program of the SBA by a single dollar. What it did do was to make it possible for the SBA to sell off, in effect, some of its obligations and, thus, increase funds in its revolving fund. There is a legislative limit on the amounts that can be outstanding

April 20, 1966

in SBA programs and the bill which we passed did not have any effect on that limit.

It did make it possible for the SBA to make loans up to that limit without seeking appropriations for such loans above the amount already appropriated for. In other words, the appropriations process was bypassed.

It did make it possible for the money received from the sale of participations that could not be used for increasing SBA loans, to be returned to the Treasury. And, this is the real purpose of these legislative proposals.

What we are really being asked to do is to circumvent the ordinary budgetary channels in Federal spending. The procedure is one which makes it possible to conceal the cost of operating the Federal Government by providing funds outside of the appropriations process.

It can appropriately be questioned as to whether this new fiscal scheme perverts the basic elements of honesty in the cost of Government and imposes on the financial structures of the country a concealed burden of public debt.

We hear much about the tendency for the power to gravitate away from congressional bodies or other bodies elected by the people and toward a central bureaucracy. This legislation is a large step in that direction.

The agencies, departments, or Federal instrumentalities are not even listed. This proposal includes them all. I ask unanimous consent that a list of such agencies provided for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

Collateral held by banks for cooperatives.
Collateral held by Bureau of Reclamation on project and system loans.

Collateral held by Farm Credit Administration functions.

Collateral held by Farmers Home Administration.

Collateral held by Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (policies).

Collateral held by Federal intermediate credit banks (farm loans).

Collateral held by Federal land banks.

Collateral held by Rural Electrification Administration.

Collateral held by Federal Credit Unions.

Collateral held by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Collateral held by Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Collateral held by U.S. Post Office Department.

Collateral held by ARA.

Collateral held by Civil Aeronautics Board.
Collateral held by Defense Department (loan guarantee program).

Collateral held by District of Columbia Fiscal Service (public works loans).

Collateral held by General Services Administration (surplus property sales).

Collateral held by Interstate Commerce Commission (railroad loan guarantee).

Collateral held by Maritime Administration (ship loan and mortgage insurance).

Collateral held by Office of Defense Lending (production loans).

Collateral held by Under Secretary for Transportation (aircraft loans).

Collateral held by Small Business Administration.

Collateral held by Office of Education (Cuban loans) (loans to institutions) (non-profit school loans) (student loans).

Collateral held by Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (upgrade loans) (shipbuilding).

Collateral held by Public Health Service (Hill-Burton loans).

Collateral held by Housing community facilities (college housing) (elderly) (public works) (public facility).

Collateral held by Federal Home Loan Bank System.

Collateral held by Federal Housing Administration (insurance program).

Collateral held by HHFA (voluntary home mortgage credit) (mass transportation) (low-income demonstrations).

Collateral held by Public Housing Administration (public housing).

Collateral held by Urban Renewal Administration (urban renewal).

Collateral held by Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Collateral held by Agency for International Development (dollar development) (local currency loans).

Collateral held by Export-Import Bank.

Collateral held by Inter-American Development Bank.

Collateral held by International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Collateral held by international development program.

Collateral held by International Finance Corporation.

Collateral held by International Monetary Fund.

Collateral held by International Affairs.

Collateral held by Office of Territories (Micronesian trade loans).

Collateral held by Pan American Sanitary Bureau (advance purchases).

Collateral held by Office of Minerals Exploration.

Collateral held by Veterans' Administration (home, farm, business).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it has been argued that this type of financing is replacing Federal funds with private funds. Quoting from the Budget Bureau statement accompanying the bill, we find:

The basic purpose of the proposed legislation, as indicated, is to encourage the substitution of private for public credit in various major Federal credit programs.

It continues:

Given the desirability of drawing in greater private participation in the Federal credit programs, the sale of interests in pools of assets is the most satisfactory and economical means that has been devised to meet this end. The program of asset sales also facilitates the efficient use of budgetary funds.

I suppose that if one uses the assumptions that he desires, one could come to most any conclusion to support his own ends. I do not agree that this measure will in any way increase the amount of money coming from private sources.

It is a fact that any money now used in these programs totaling more than \$33 billion originally came from the private money market either in the form of taxes or in the form of debt securities purchased from the Federal Government by private individuals, business corporations, and financial institutions. These are the same individuals, businesses, and financial institutions which will purchase the participations which the Federal Government now desires to sell in order to avoid showing the \$33 billion as part of the Federal debt.

In addition to the other reasons for op-

posing the sale of participations, it is a much more expensive method of financing. The Treasury can borrow funds at a rate lower than these participation certificates demand on the market.

It has been estimated that the additional cost of the proposed sales of participations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 would amount to more than \$380 million. This is the premium that the administration is willing to pay to avoid showing \$3 billion as an increase in Federal expenditures or as part of the Federal debt.

According to the Budget Bureau, there are over \$33 billion worth of loans outstanding, and this bill would allow not only the sale of participations in the programs listed in the message presented in January which totaled \$3.3 billion in 1966 and \$4.7 billion in 1967, but it would open the way for the sale of the whole \$33 billion of Federal assets. Based on the SBA figures submitted, sale of participations on this whole amount could result in an additional cost of between \$1.5 and \$2 billion to the Federal Government.

Quoting from the Treasury Department statement accompanying the bill:

Participation certificates carry somewhat higher rates than Treasury obligations of comparable maturity. But this is a small price for the advantage of attracting private investors to Federal credit programs, and avoiding the large budgetary drain that would result if means were not developed to move Federal financial assets back into the private sector.

What is wrong with showing Federal programs and expenditures as a budgetary drain? This is exactly what they should be shown as.

This is the whole nub of this proposal. The administration desires to avoid the showing of these Federal loan programs as part of the Federal budget. It is a budgetary measure to avoid indicating to the general public the increase in public programs and increase in Federal debt.

It seems to me that it is much to be preferred that the Federal Government take the responsibility for its actions. If the lending programs are supported by the citizenry of this Nation, they should be willing to fund them through the ordinary Treasury channels of either tax increases or Federal borrowing. If it is necessary to use subterfuge to increase Federal spending, I think it is about time that Members of Congress take it upon themselves to be sure that their constituency at least know what the total cost of Federal programs is.

HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS UNFAIR TO THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, early last month, the Secretary of Commerce invoked the drastic provisions of the Export Control Act for the purpose of imposing strict limitations on the export of hides to foreign markets.

The action was taken hurriedly, without an opportunity for the full consultation that might ordinarily be expected before such an important action. No public hearings were held prior to the issuance of those orders. Now, to his

finest community in the world in which to live, work, and raise our families." Do you see the unconscious emphasis the grammar they have used gives that sentence? They want Washington to be a fine place for them to live in. But the vast majority of our citizens would wish the board of trade wanted to make the Nation's Capital the finest community in the world in which all of its citizens could live, work, and raise their families. It is not now, and that is the chief reason for the demand for home rule.

We, the citizens of the District of Columbia, want home rule because it is our right but we want it yet more in order that we may help the downtrodden and neglected. We are not afraid that such a government will be Negro. We know it will be, and we are glad. Those who will be elected to office will undoubtedly have been identified with the civil rights movement. What is their standard of morality? If you fear for the government of the Nation's Capital under Negro leadership, ask yourself this question: How do the morals of the civil rights movement compare with those of municipal government in our American cities under white leadership?

III

But here I am slipping inevitably into the arguments for and against home rule itself. You can recite them all and there is no need for me to repeat them now. Let us rather return to the board of trade and its altogether remarkable view of the facts in the case.

The board of trade says in the third place that it has no particular power or influence in the matter of home rule. This view is not only contrary to the one that prevails in the city generally, it seems also to be contrary to the board's own view of itself. In its statement to the House District Committee, the board said:

"Most business and professional civic leaders of Washington since 1889 have been members of the board of trade. A large number of community leaders in the Federal City today are members, and have served as chairmen of its committees. Our board of directors and officers, a list of which is attached, is certainly composed of men of proven ability and judgment, as well as men whom you will recognize as having been leaders in many important civic enterprises * * * the presidents, directors, and leaders in the board of trade have always been men whose lives have been intimately identified with this community. A large majority of the men who have served as presidents of the board of trade have been natives of Washington. We believe this is important in that it demonstrates that the board of trade may speak from a leadership experience which is preeminent in this city."

What this statement describes is what is known in most communities as the power structure. In the District of Columbia it is compounded by an intimate association with Congressmen on the House District Committee. The Congressional Quarterly, which thoroughly reviewed the matter last October, said:

"Several supporters of home rule said that the board's real reason for opposing home rule was the fact that the board 'presently has control of the city' through its influence and working relations with the House District Committee, and did not wish to lose it." If this were just an idle opinion, the Congressional Quarterly would not have bothered to state it.

Gentlemen of the board of trade, yours is the power. Yours can be the glory. It may be possible to get home rule without you. With you, we know we shall. Then we can tackle our social problems in the District together, full scale, beginning with the schools; tackle together the social ills all of us want to see cured. Our problems are

grave but they are not insoluble. The right to govern ourselves is also the opportunity to do what you and all of us want to do—make the Nation's Capital a showplace: make this city the finest in the land, in which all of our citizens may live and raise our families. But home rule is the key, and you are the key to home rule.

IV

No small part of the problem is the attitude of sneering superiority and human insensitivity taken by the House District Committee. Nearly 7 years ago, on July 28, 1959, they scheduled a hearing on home rule. Nothing daunted by the summer heat, and the fact that many people were away on vacation, more than 800 residents of the District of Columbia turned out. The meeting was scheduled for a tiny room in the House of Representatives that held perhaps 60 people. As the crowd increased in size, Congressman DAVIS, of Georgia, chairman of the committee holding the hearings, was asked to move the session to the nearby House caucus room which was not in use at the time. The request was peremptorily refused and for no reason whatever.

As soon as the little room was full, the doors were barred. The remainder of the crowd packed the hallway, hoping in vain to get in, or that traditional southern courtesy might prevail. But it did not. It was quite forgotten on that occasion, as it often has been on this issue, and the crowd remained outside in the corridors, sweltering in the summer's heat. This went on for several days. It was an inexcusable indignity visited upon a group of American citizens by a high officeholder in the National Government—a man who had given his oath to serve with honor the Government of a free people.

It was this attitude of the Congress, expressed through the House District Committee, that converted me to home rule. I came to this city a devout believer in its appointive system of government under Congress. First-hand contact with municipal affairs in the city of Boston persuaded me that any system of government was better than that. As a citizen of the United States, I was proud of the broad tree-lined streets, the parks, and beautiful white landscaped buildings of the capital of my country. I attributed these to congressional control of the city.

But living here, I soon discovered that there was another Washington I had not seen on my previous visits—one for which the Congress was far more directly responsible. That Washington was a city ridden by poverty, disease, crime, and cultural deprivation, all bound up in a self-perpetuating downward vortex, growing larger every year. A part of that Washington, I soon discovered, was creeping up to the back door of this church. Its existence and character was well documented by the League of Women Voters in their pamphlet, "A Tale of Two Cities," issued in 1962. Few if any members of the board of trade live there, and neither they nor their children are penalized by its squalor.

This other Washington exists by reason of a number of factors, but living and working here has convinced me as it has convinced thousands upon thousands of others, that chief among them is the white power structure linked to the House District Committee under Chairman JOHN L. McMILLAN, of South Carolina. It became clear to me very early that the reforms needed to break the downward vortex centering primarily in the Negro community in this city could not come without home rule, which was blocked by the board of trade, and stopped at the door of the Congress.

The board of trade boasts that it has not changed its position on home rule in 50 years. It is true: they have not, and that is the problem. When the board of trade took its position on home rule, Washington was a small town. It was known as a Southern

city because its pattern of life was much more like that of the South than the North. Today it is neither a small town nor southern. It is one of the Nation's fastest growing cities and will soon be among the largest.

But most important of all, in those intervening years, the conscience of America has been stabbed awake. Now we know the economic and social subjugation under which the Negro has lived, and increasingly the people of this country are resolved to set him free and make him a part of the body politic at last.

Gentlemen of the board of trade, the 19th century has passed. Two-thirds of the 20th century is already behind us. We fought the Civil War and freed the slaves a hundred years ago. We are now in the second phase of that war. Our purpose is to give the Negro full-fledged citizenship and full-fledged economic, social, and political acceptance as an American. We carried on the first phase of this struggle by force of arms. The second, so far, has been carried on by moral force; not by an appeal to the sword, but by an appeal to the conscience. The day when the good Negro was an obsequious mental is dead. The day has come when the good Negro is a man who meets his white brother eye to eye and hand to hand, as equals are accustomed to meet each other.

How much longer will the white power structure seek to hold back the tide of history? How soon will its members learn that any attempt to do so will produce riots far greater than that at Watts? How soon will they learn that the day they dream of is dead: that a new day has come, a day that holds within it a dream far lovelier than theirs? The new dream is of democracy that ranks Negro and white Americans together. It is a dream that replaces Negro subservience with Negro self-respect. It is a dream that moves from white supremacy through white chagrin, shame, and remorse to white acceptance of the ideal of brotherhood across racial lines.

The real problem is ignorance. Does the white community really know what it has been doing to the Negro? Let me put this question in the classic language of George Bernard Shaw. In his play, "St. Joan," the priest who led in the demand for Joan of Arc's death comes on the stage after she has been burned at the stake.

"I meant no harm," he cries piteously, recognizing his own guilt for the first time. "I did not know what it would be like. If I had known."

Then he turns upon his fellow accomplices, who had not seen the execution, shouting hysterically, "You don't know. You haven't seen. It is so easy to talk when you don't know. But when it is brought home to you: when you have seen the thing you have done, stifling your nostrils, tearing your heart, then O God, take this sight from me."

A large part of well-to-do America stands with that priest today. They have not seen: they do not know what the power structure to which they belong does to other men. They must be made to know. They can turn away no longer. And when they see, if they are men of conscience, they too will cry "O God, take away this sight from me." Then they will move to mend the wrong they have done, for unlike the priest in the play, they have in their hands the power to undo it. In this long, long process, self-government for the District of Columbia is a step we must take.

Prayer: O God, uncover our eyes that we may see ourselves as we are.

VIETNAM POLICY ANALYSIS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am one who supports the administration's policy in Vietnam, but I also support, with equal firmness, the concept that there is no policy which a democratic nation can adopt which should not be analyzed in

⁴ op. cit. p. 4.

HOME RULE AND THE POWER STRUCTURE
(A sermon by the Reverend Duncan Howlett,
D.D., All Souls Church (Unitarian), Wash-
ington, D.C., Sunday, Jan. 23, 1966)

Last Monday a group of District of Columbia clergymen picketed the Board of Trade Building on K Street during the noon hour. On Tuesday, precinct workers of the Democratic Central Committee paraded; Wednesday, civil rights workers were in the line; Thursday, the churchmen (lay groups) demonstrated; Friday, civil and social groups. Asked to join the line I demurred: not because I have any doubt about the need for home rule here in the District and not because I have any doubt about the citizens' right to demonstrate against social wrong, but because I had never talked with the board of trade people, and always prefer talking before acting. The Coalition of Conscience which arranged the picketing had talked with the board of trade however, and had gotten nowhere. But we all thought it was worth another try. My sermon this morning is a result of that effort.

My conversation with the executive head of the organization, Col. William Press, was very enlightening. He received me with the utmost courtesy and answered all my questions without hesitation. The point of view he expressed will not surprise you. He and his organization are opposed to home rule for the District of Columbia and always have been. They favored the 23d amendment, which enables us to vote for the President and Vice President. They now favor our having representatives in Congress, but not local self-government. They are quite sure their position has nothing to do with race since they were opposed to home rule when Negroes were in the minority in this city. They believe that they have special competence to speak on these matters since most of their leaders are long-time residents of the area, though not necessarily of the city itself. They are also its business leaders. They have concluded that most of the civic leaders of the community stand with them in opposing home rule. Lastly, they do not feel that they have any more power in these matters than anyone else.

In the light of what we commonly hear about the board of trade, this is a very remarkable set of views. In the more than 7 years I have lived in this city, I have heard such opinions expressed by almost no one else. Indeed, from the beginning, I have heard nothing but the opposite.

Let us examine these opinions and discover if we can why the board of trade stands almost alone in holding them. First, as to the question of who supports and who opposes local self-government for the District of Columbia with full recognition of its status as the Nation's Capital—in short, on the question of who favors and who opposes President Johnson's bill as adopted by the Senate last summer. Last November the board of trade sent a letter to 28 of the leading newspapers in the country containing an attack on the proposal for local self-government in the District of Columbia. In it appeared this statement: "the fact is that a great many Washingtonians—including the overwhelming majority of local, civic, professional, and business leaders—are opposed to pending home rule legislation."

This statement is false. According to the Congressional Quarterly,¹ only three groups in the city are on record as opposed to home rule: the board of trade, the Federation of Citizens Associations, and the District of Columbia branch of the Federation of Women's Clubs. Standing against them, in favor of home rule, are 17 national organizations,

such as the AFL-CIO; American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO); Americans for Democratic Action; League of Women Voters; National Association of College Women; National Association of Social Workers; National Council of Jewish Women; Unitarian Universalist Association.

The number of local organizations that support home rule is far larger, numbering more than 50. To gain some notion of their size and status, let me list a few of the more outstanding: Catholic Archdiocese of Washington; Council of Churches of Greater Washington; District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce; District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers; District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations; Greater Washington Association of Unitarian Universalist Churches; Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington.

There is a weasel word in that statement that might be supposed to get the board off the hook. The word is "pending." Of course, all sorts of home rule legislation is pending, including that sponsored by the board of trade itself. Obviously, the board does not mean that legislation. It means the 1965 administration bill. Now, they may think what they like, but I deny their right to state it as a fact that "the overwhelming majority of local, civic, professional, and business leaders oppose home rule."

The damage done by such a letter is incalculable, because the issue of home rule, will be decided in the communities where the letter is being printed on the editorial page of the newspapers, not here in the District of Columbia. Most observers agree that the basic reason the House failed to pass the administration bill, was lack of interest and information across the country. Most people might favor home rule theoretically, but they really do not care enough one way or the other to influence their Congressman's vote. The purpose of the board of trade's letter is to influence the vote where it counts—among the constituency of the Congress in the country as a whole.

The letter concluded: "Congress will bear a heavy responsibility if it should ever succumb to pressures to turn the reins of this community over to any group not responsive to the larger interests of the Nation's Federal City. This statement too is false, but by what it implies rather than what it actually says. No one who favors home rule advocates a form of government "not responsive to the larger interests of the Nation's Federal City." The administration bill takes this need fully into account. In his message accompanying the bill, President Johnson said:

"There is a fundamental Federal interest in the National Capital. The Constitution wisely delegates to the Congress supreme legislative power over 'the seat of the Government of the United States.' The Congress can, however, delegate to a municipal legislature all the powers necessary for local self-government, and at the same time preserve fully its ultimate power and the interests of the Federal Government."

Asked to repudiate these statements, the board of trade has steadfastly refused. They have, however, provided us with a list of the papers to which their letters were sent and replies are now in the process of preparation.

That is why the board of trade is being picketed. That is why churchmen have joined with civic and community leaders from all walks of life—to show the Nation by their physical presence, as well as their verbal protests, that the board of trade has misrepresented the attitude of people here on home rule. There are varying opinions on the wisdom of the picketing effort. There always are. Certainly it is true that the oftener such demonstrations are staged, the less effective they become. But there can be no doubt of the need to set the record

straight. I myself asked them this question: In the light of the number of organizations on record favoring home rule, how can you state it as a fact that the overwhelming majority of civic leaders oppose it?

"That is what we believe," was the only answer I, or anyone else, has been able to get to that question. In the face of the picketing carried on through a cold January wind this week, they still say they believe it. That takes some believing. It sounds more like religious faith.

The board of trade letter closes by inviting "those desiring additional information regarding District home rule legislation to contact the Metropolitan Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., for copies of the board's statement to the House District Committee."

In my mind, this invitation is as damaging as any part of the letter. I have read with great care the board of trade's statement to the House District Committee. It does not contain information so much as argument. The information it does contain is only to back up their argument which in turn is surprisingly flimsy. As an example, in support of their belief that the District of Columbia will run out of funds under home rule, the opinion of an Arizona Congressman is cited. He said: "I doubt very much whether the Congress would be inclined to pay annually to the District of Columbia \$22 million, \$25 million or \$30 million or whatever figure it might be, any more than it would be inclined to pay the city of New York, for instance, payments in lieu of property taxes for the Federal installations."

If the Washington Board of Trade, as myopic as the Arizona Congressman, can see no difference between a Federal payment to the Nation's Capital and one to New York City, then we have the blind leading the blind, when the board of trade advises the rest of the country on home rule in the District of Columbia.

II

Secondly, the board of trade says piously that its position on home rule has nothing to do with race, nothing to do with the fear that we shall have a Negro government in the city of Washington. I hope this is true. But, the Congressional Quarterly in its roundup of opinion, says: "

"A number of Negro organizations and many others charged that much of the opposition to home rule in Congress and among some citizens of the District was based on fears 'that it might result in the domination of the city government by Negroes,' as District of Columbia Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner put it in testimony in March before the Senate District Committee. Tobriner, testifying for the home rule proposals, said the fear of Negro domination, while unexpressed, was among the major reasons for opposition to home rule on the part of its critics."

I wholly agree. It is to this complex of opinion that the board of trade belongs.

Here let me cite U.S. News & World Report,² an excellent authority on this issue since it continually makes so much of the rising Negro population in Washington. It is generally recognized that one of the major obstacles to congressional passage of home rule is the large number of Negroes in Washington and the expectation that they would give the Nation's Capital a Negro government." The meaning of this statement is clear: that under home rule, these people do not expect Negroes to govern the city for its own benefit and that of the Nation. They expect such a government to be of, by, and for Negroes.

Perhaps the most revealing comment in the board of trade statement to our House District Committee is this: "Our basic objective is to make of the Nation's Capital the

¹ Congressional Quarterly Fact Sheet; Oct. 28, 1965, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³ Jan. 18, 1965, p. 44.

April 20, 1966

thoughtful debate, in the forums of elected representatives of the people and among the people generally.

One American who has been a leader in the current debate on Vietnam is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. While I disagree in many aspects with his analysis of this situation in that war-torn land, I believe he has acted responsibly in putting forward alternative opinions and suggestions to our present foreign relations policies.

In the current issue of *Look* magazine, appears an excellent article on my good friend from Arkansas by the noted correspondent, Eric Sevareid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From *Look* magazine, May 3, 1966]

WHY OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS FAILING—AN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR FULBRIGHT

(By Eric Sevareid)

"The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable * * * for they determine whether we use power or power uses us."—President JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Late in the afternoon of a Friday in February, several million Americans snapped off their television sets and rubbed their eyes. It was the end of several days of a public inquiry into the Vietnam war conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, which has the constitutional right and duty of advising the President as well as consenting to his foreign actions. Throughout the 16 years of America's involvement with Vietnam, the Senate had automatically consented. Now, very late in the day, with their country enmeshed in a major war, leading Senators were advising the administration.

Their advice did not consist of concrete and acceptable plans for winning the war or settling the war—a legislative body cannot make a peace any more than it can wage a war. Their advice amounted to this: "Be careful. Our people do not understand this cruel war. They are divided and confused. Persuade us that this war does involve America's vital interests, does involve the freedom of mankind and the peace of the world. Give us better reasons to believe it will not lead to war with Communist China. Give us some hope that a negotiated peace that we can live with, that South Vietnam can live with, is possible, and that you are really trying to get it."

It was an astonishing phenomenon. It has only minor precedents in American history, chiefly, the Mexican War of 1846. Some 300,000 young Americans were fighting in and around the scallop of Asia called Vietnam, a place most Americans had never heard of until recently; scores were dying every week; the financial cost was leaping into the billions by geometric progression; Communist China was rousing its people, by daily demonstrations, to believe that the United States was about to attack it. And at this stage of the business, many American legislators were asking, in effect: "How and why did we get into this? Is it worth it?" Whatever one's views about the ultimate justification of it, this is an appalling way for a great and peaceable nation to go to war.

The most articulately appalled of all is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee, the generally soft-spoken ex-Rhodes scholar, the gentleman from Arkansas, JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. The late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy once called him "Mr. Halfbright." Former President Harry S. Truman, in a flash of anger, once called him "that over-educated * * *." His former history don at Oxford, thinking of the Fulbright scholarships that have made him a world figure, said to him once, "You are responsible for the largest and most significant movement of scholars across the face of the earth since the fall of Constantinople in 1453."

On that Friday afternoon, a few moments before they snapped off their television sets, those several million fascinated Americans had heard Senator FULBRIGHT digging persistently at the Secretary of State. FULBRIGHT was still trying to persuade Dean Rusk that peace negotiations with Hanoi are possible. The audience saw the Senator lean forward in his chair, peer through his dark glasses and say, "There must be something wrong with our diplomacy."

They saw Rusk, his monumental patience nearly gone, flush slightly. His aching eyes glistened in the glare of the camera lights, and he said, "Senator, is it just possible that there is something wrong with them?"

A world of meaning lay in this exchange, this impasse. These two men of undoubted patriotism, equally anxious that the dismal succession of world wars be broken, equally desirous that men be free to work out their own destinies, draw different lessons from the history of this century.

Rusk equates the current world problem with the problem of Hitler's time, and later, Stalin's time; he believes that unless this aggression in Vietnam is halted, Communist victory there will lead to other Communist victories in Asia and eventually to a last-ditch struggle in the form of disastrous world war.

FULBRIGHT believes that our very resistance to this aggression—and he wonders if it is a true aggression—is just as likely, if not more likely, in itself, to lead to endless disturbances in Asia and eventually world war, beginning with an American-Chinese showdown.

Rusk, who must enforce policy, reserves the benefits of the doubts to his own country; FULBRIGHT, who can, as scrutinizor of policies, afford the luxury of public uncertainty, grants the benefits of some doubts to the enemy. He does not believe communism is a world, monolithic force, successfully spreading its tentacles.

Rusk thinks of America as the last, best hope of civilized man; FULBRIGHT thinks of America as the best but not the only hope, and certainly not the last that history will see.

On the morning after the Nation had witnessed this direct clash of two strong wills, I walked into the New Senate Office Building. The second door on the left is that of the gentleman from Arkansas. On this morning-after, it was as quiet as the eye of a hurricane. Three secretaries were at their desks in the outer office, each desk stacked with mail. Up to that hour, the Fulbright office had received about 10,000 letters, postcards, and telegrams. They were running about 17 to one in favor of the Senator and his effort.

The Senator's private office is simply furnished with green-leather chairs and a couch. Low bookshelves line the walls. One abstract painting is on the wall. The Senator's college degrees. The framed original of the Fulbright resolution of 1943, which the freshman Representative had got through the House and which, 2 years before the United Nations was founded, put the American Congress on record as favoring an international organization to preserve the peace of the world.

There are framed photographs showing FULBRIGHT with L.B.J. One is incrimbed by the President to the Senator this way: "Than whom there is no better." Another shows Mr. Johnson leaning forward, earnestly talking to the Senator, who wears a worried scowl. This one bears, in the President's scrawl, the words: "To BILL. I can see I haven't been very persuasive."

FULBRIGHT opened the door in full movement, tossed a book on his desk and turned around to shake hands, all with the casual grace of a third baseman dropping into the dugout and shedding his glove. It is this casualness, I think, that gave rise to the Washington myth that FULBRIGHT is a lazy man. In the congressional world of activists, of declaimers, of scurrillers, he is always under inner control. He refuses to be a major champion of minor issues. Like the trained athlete on the field or the trained actor on stage, he gives each move its physical and emotional due—no more.

His Arkansas contemporaries remember his style as a halfback at the State university. No lost motion, no frantic sweat. He would often take the ball, then for a moment stand relaxed, almost like a man lost in thought, until he saw an opening. Then he would go for it hard. He plays politics in the same manner today.

His written speeches are the works of a craftsman of English. They flow from premise through argument to conclusion with logic and precision. But in private conversation, like many men whose minds work faster than their tongues, he will double back and around and back again. With people with whom he feels comfortable, he loves to talk. We talked, a long time, of the world as his mind encompasses it, of this public, naked exposure of the American soul that he had deliberately brought about in full understanding of its inherent dangers to the war itself and to FULBRIGHT himself as man and Senator.

I told him that he has become stamped as the leading American critic of America in the world, and I wondered about the core of his unease.

"Well, Eric, I'm the poorest person in the world to say what others think of me. They may think I'm just a congenital sorehead for all I know. I hope not. It's not because I think we're no good that I criticize our country. It's because I think it's so very good and has an opportunity to do so much more than any country in history."

He fiddled with a package of those charcoal-tipped cigarettes—his adversary, Secretary Rusk, smokes the same brand—and regarded me with that raised-eyebrow expression when I reminded him of his public ruminations about the disintegration of the Greek democracy when it extended its power commitments to Syracuse; about the Germanic obsession with power in this century, just when Germany was flourishing as a culture. FULBRIGHT had said once: "Neither God nor nature has preordained the triumph of our free society, and it would be a tragic mistake to assume the inevitability of our survival."

Now, he leaned abruptly back in his chair, in a gesture reminiscent of the halfback squaring up with the ball in his arms. "Here we are, the most powerful and richest country in the world, a great continent under one government. I think of the advances we've made—there's my own State, which had a per capita income of \$250 only 25 years ago. Now, it's about \$1,700. If we'll just not follow the same arrogant, egotistical policies of so many powerful nations, particularly in foreign affairs, we could really break the cycle that has so dreadfully involved the world in silly and destructive wars."

"Take the Dominican Republic. This perhaps spurred on my feelings about Vietnam. I know you don't agree with me, but this

seemed to me an utterly inexcusable interference in the affairs of a small country. These people want to do something for themselves. As those Africans at the conference in New Zealand said, "We want to make our own mistakes." You see, it gives them assurance; then they move on and create whatever kind of political and social fabric that best suits them. They're not a great danger to the security of the world. It offends me that because we're so powerful, we butt in on other people's business.

"Great countries have done this time after time. I was just reading this book called 'Foreign Mud,' about the way Britain got into the war with China over the opium trade. In the long run, this contributes to the destruction of the big countries."

I suggested that he had a sense of personal embarrassment about some of America's actions.

"I'm just embarrassed in front of the world. This vague thing called world opinion. I mean they expect so much of us. We've been such a fortunate country. We are drawn from so many different cultures, we were lucky in our material resources. The idea of democracy, as our great men from Washington through Lincoln have said it—not just a specialized form of government, but the people participating with all their dignity. This is a great ideal. We don't live up to it—nobody can, absolutely—but we've approached it, closer than any other great country."

I told the Senator he confused me a bit, that throughout the hearings he had argued against the "hawks," who feared that withdrawal or compromise or switching to a defensive military position in Vietnam would damage our prestige in the world. Now, it seemed to me, he was himself emphasizing America's prestige. He sat bolt upright.

"Maybe I—you're quite right, perhaps it is our prestige I'm concerned with, but we differ in the way we would support that prestige. I think that asserting our military power against a little country destroys that prestige. I think our prestige requires that we be magnanimous in refraining from imposing our will on a country that is obviously at our mercy."

"This war—I just cannot bring myself to believe that how the Vietnamese work out their internal problems is worth a major war or even gives us the right to intervene. You see, part of this grows from a great apprehension about communism. It grew out of Stalin's barbaric use of his position as a Communist leader. But communism as a philosophy, or as a system, is not really a matter that we ought to go to war about. It's the actions of the particular people who practice it. I would support anybody who would restrain the kind of imperialism that Stalin represented. But at the other extreme is the communism of Yugoslavia. They are so much better off than they were under the Turks or under the monarchy. It is peaceful, it doesn't threaten people. So I think we get all mixed up about communism. And the reiteration by the administration of Communist aggression offends me. If they would put it the other way, that this is an aggression by a people—I think they have the Chinese in the back of their minds. If this is just Chinese imperialism, that's a different question. But they use these terms in inflame the emotions, people's fears. It's like talking about the atrocities, as if only these people were guilty of atrocities. Every people, at some time in their history, have engaged in the same kind of cruelties in relation to whatever weapons they may have had. This type of thing inhibits rational consideration of what's really involved, and that's why it offends me."

FULBRIGHT is certain that the nationalist instinct is stronger than communism as an ideology and that Vietnam is a classic in-

stance of this. The Vietnamese were a nation, they had a national identity, they were taken by force by a Western country (France), and he thinks they were trying to reassert their national independence. He finds it "really hard" to see the difference between this and what the Americans did in 1776.

The world moves on. FULBRIGHT thinks the world and the nature of the threat from Communists have greatly altered since Stalin's time. The balance of power has changed to a highly unstable nuclear stalemate; Western Europe has recovered; the former colonial and semicolonial nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America are on the rise, caught up in an emotional fever of nationalism. And Soviet foreign policies have changed. Khrushchev's tactics were far more subtle and varied than Stalin's, more challenging to the nerves and the patience of the West. But Khrushchev made a terrible blunder when he put the missiles into Cuba, and that successful confrontation, the Senator thinks, was the most visible milestone on the road to a different East-West relationship.

FULBRIGHT has recently been accused of inconsistency because, his critics say, he was a hawk at the time of the missile crisis and recommended we invade Cuba and have done with both the missile threat and Fidel Castro. But he explains that when President Kennedy asked him to break off his campaigning trip in Arkansas and come to the White House, FULBRIGHT knew none of the background. He knew nothing of the exchanges of letters between Kennedy and Khrushchev. He had no chance to think about the chances of the naval quarantine succeeding.

In any case, he told me, President Kennedy "wasn't asking us for consultation. He had already made up his mind. He had his speech written, and 10 minutes after the meeting, he went out and gave it. We were told that they were going to put in the quarantine and that if the Russians didn't turn back and didn't respect it, that the administration itself was prepared to take Cuba."

He is deeply perturbed by the apparent paradox that the United States leaves alone a Communist tyranny 90 miles from our shores, but sends our forces 10,000 miles away to fight Communists. "If we can live with Cuba, what difference does it make about Vietnam?" he said. He is not sure that the enemy in Vietnam wants the kind of communism practiced in Russia or would have that kind of communism if they ran the country. He inclines to believe that nationalism would be the dominant spirit in a land that has historically been anti-Chinese. Even if the regime bore the label "Communist," it would amount to a kind of buffer state against China. A Vietnam regime set up by us with the outward trappings of democracy, in close connection with us, would actually be weaker in the sense that it would be more tempting to China, when and if China does become really aggressive in the military sense.

"I think if we had never stuck our nose in this business, it would have long since been settled in accordance with whatever the major forces within Vietnam were. I think we have delayed that settlement, and I think we have a good deal on our consciences for having intervened there in the first instance in 1950 [when we aided the French]."

Secretary of State Rusk talks about the things that are wrong with "them." He talks about "the other fellow." I asked FULBRIGHT who this enemy precisely is—the Vietcong? North Vietnam? China? FULBRIGHT replied, "I don't know. He says Hanoi, but I cannot free my own mind from the belief that he means China."

It is a fair inference that FULBRIGHT does not think there is enough evidence to con-

clude that China is bent on conquest in the Hitler manner or that she can work her will very far through external subversion. The world-encompassing goals as stated by the Chinese defense minister, Lin Piao, have been cited by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to justify the apocalyptic view that China is determined to become the dominant influence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But China has been suffering setbacks—in Indonesia, in several African nations, and in China.

FULBRIGHT, as a student of history and its unpredictability, would find such fears childish. He is more inclined to interpret China's thunderous propaganda challenges as Secretary-General U Thant of the United Nations does—as the natural behavior of a regime that is overwhelmed with difficulties at home and feels increasingly "encircled" by the power of Russia and the United States. FULBRIGHT's mental processes are such that he would try to imagine the reaction of his own country if a Chinese Army were fighting, say, in lower Mexico, and their planes were dropping bombs within 40 miles of the Rio Grande.

He tries to turn an international problem around, not only to understand an adversary's basic interests, but to try to imagine how the adversary feels in his heart. He thinks the world is too dangerous to do otherwise. For this reason, he is perhaps more popular in Europe than he is in his own country—much like the late Adlai E. Stevenson, a comparison FULBRIGHT by no means objects to.

The Vietnam war seems to appall him in its every aspect. He doesn't think we are even improving the Vietnamese economy, but destroying it, as of now. "I have a letter from a friend in a hospital in Bangkok," he told me, "and there's beginning this same distortion in Thailand's economy. We end up creating an awful situation we're not able to control, and if we should suddenly pull out tomorrow, they'd be in much worse shape than they were when we got there."

The Senator straightened and stretched and moved aside a sheaf of letters on his desk. One was a copy of a "petition" from some people in California who were demanding his recall on grounds of treason. FULBRIGHT chuckled—he has a genuine chuckle and a genuine belly laugh.

"I get all kinds of stuff like that. I used to in the days of McCarthy. That doesn't bother me very much."

I mentioned a remark by his secretary that the current mail was running heavier than any in her experience. "That's Pallie Sims," he said. "She's my stalwart. She gets here early and leaves late. I called her on the phone yesterday and said, 'Is Lee there?' and she said, 'Could I tell him who is calling?' I said, 'Now, Pallie, if you don't recognize me'—oh, she nearly died. She said, 'I'll tell you, Senator, we're nearly frantic. These phones have been ringing nearly all afternoon. I don't even recognize my own voice.'"

"Oh, I don't know. In a month or two, it will all be forgotten. The only thing I hope for out of this is that it may create a greater degree of caution, provoke more thoughtfulness. Not that I don't think the President is a cautious man, but I think he'll give much more careful consideration before an enlargement of the war."

If, I asked FULBRIGHT, he considers the whole thing in Vietnam a series of mistakes, where was the critical error made? He said the first mistake was made in 1950 when we supported the French. "Then, we had a second opportunity to leave them alone in 1954 (after the fall of Dienbienphu). Then, it gradually grew, like Topsy. I think it was a mistake for us to support Diem. He was calling the shots, and we were taking the blame and the responsibility. Then Diem was killed. Perhaps that would have been a time to say let's have a conference and see if we can't settle it by negotiation."

April 20, 1966

8237

After the Gulf of Tonkin incident in the summer of 1964, FULBRIGHT was floor manager for the resolution that gave congressional endorsement to the President to take any and all necessary measures to repel aggression. Today, he regrets his role in granting this blank check, though he observed at the time of its passage that Congress did not have in mind the use of American ground armies in this war. He objected to a limiting amendment proposed by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, because the administration said it was an emergency, and quick, sharp response was needed to deter North Vietnam.

"But this Gulf of Tonkin incident, if I may say so, was a very vague one. We were briefed on it, but we have no way of knowing, even to this day, what actually happened. I don't know whether we provoked that attack in connection with supervising or helping a raid by South Vietnamese or not. Our evidence was sketchy as to whether those PT boats, or some kind of boats, that were approaching were coming to investigate or whether they actually attacked. I have been told there was no physical damage. They weren't hit by anything. I heard one man say there was one bullet hole in one of those ships. One bullet hole."

President Johnson, who FULBRIGHT feels did not want this war any more than he did himself, used to cite that congressional resolution as his authority for what he has done in Vietnam. Before that, he cited the Eisenhower and Kennedy "commitments." Recently, he and Secretary Rusk have put the emphasis on the SEATO treaty. The FULBRIGHT school of critics argues that the treaty did not oblige us to fight in Vietnam any more than it obliges the other signatories, nearly all of whom are not fighting with us.

Senator FULBRIGHT thinks our policy toward China has gone wrong since the great war ended. He is appalled that the most powerful nation in the world and the most populous nation in the world, both now nuclear powers, are not even on speaking terms, with nothing like the avenues of communication that existed between Russia and the United States during their times of dangerous tensions.

"One of the most disgraceful periods of all in our foreign policy," he said, "was our persistence in the support of Chiang Kai-shek after he collapsed. I don't think there was anything we could have done. I regretted very much they were Communists who won. But we should have stopped, and cut our losses." Still, changing the status of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa, FULBRIGHT thinks, is out of the question at the moment.

He wonders if it would not have been better to have supported Ho Chi Minh at the outset, in what some regard as his struggle for Vietnamese independence, Communist though he is. He doubts that the Vietcong is no more than a puppet of North Vietnam, as the administration argues. He thinks they may very well have an identity and purpose of their own and that we ought to be working to split them off from Hanoi.

He wonders just how much expert knowledge about China is operating inside the administration. "There are only five in the China section of the State Department. Think of it—the biggest country in the world, and we've got five fellows. We've got a few in Hong Kong, trying to interpret China from there. And then we have the professors."

The Senator takes pains to point out that he claims no expertise on Asia himself, that he's been to Asia only twice and never to Vietnam, and that his foreign policy energies for years have been concentrated on Europe. For this reason, he has been teaching himself Asian history—he usually has a book under his arm when he moves about Washington. He has been in contact with one or

two of the "old China hands," driven out of their careers in the hysteria of the McCarthy period. He invites Asian authorities, occasionally Chinese, to his handsome house just off Embassy Row for tea and talk. In order to get some long-range perspective on China for himself and his senatorial colleagues, he extended the committee hearings to invite testimony by scholars of Asia. He is determined to get at the roots of the whole, vast, dangerous confrontation with China and, teacher that he is by instinct and early training, determined to share this understanding with the American people.

FULBRIGHT is not at all sure that he agrees with the current intellectual fashion of regarding "spheres of influence" as an outmoded concept. He has acquired a high regard for Asian culture, but reminds himself that we are the children of Europe, sharing common concepts of law and politics, existing in the same cultural fabric. Part of the fashionable argument is that missiles and jets have shrunk the world in time and space, if not yet in cultures and casts of mind, and that our power can reach anywhere in minutes or hours. This argument says, in effect, that every place on the globe is essentially equidistance from America, and that we should adjust our foreign policies accordingly. Though he did not put it this way himself, I think the Senator would regard this notion as a variant for the technological age of what psychologists call "the illusion of the central position," which begins with the child in the crib and continues to affect the psyche of whole peoples.

He finds degrees of illusion in the American sense of historic time. We built a continent in a hurry, by a combination of good fortune in our people, soil and climate, a phenomenon without parallel. So we instinctively believe human problems are to be solved, not alleviated, as Europeans instinctively feel. What we accomplish at home, we seem to think we can accomplish in alien societies and with the same speed. And so our governmental semantics has outrun the realities, and we have talked about "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," about "liberating" East Europe, about resuscitating Latin American economies in a decade's time, and about exporting democracy, American-style, which is scarcely possible.

BILL FULBRIGHT comes from Arkansas, which "made no progress at all from 1865 until about 1940. We were really an underdeveloped society, an exploited society, a colony of the Northeast, whose great corporations sucked out whatever natural wealth we had." All this helps explain why FULBRIGHT's time sense is different and why he has an instinctive sympathy for the poor lands of the earth, including Vietnam. His famous student exchange program may one day prove to have been our most enlightened foreign policy, the strongest of the new threads holding peoples together in understanding, but the father of the project would emphasize "one day." It is part of his whole vision of foreign policy, which he sees not as construction but as a process, not as the building of an edifice but as the cultivation of natural things in a given direction. Time is life. He wants no rash actions to abolish the gift of time.

And it is his Arkansas roots and his Arkansas political base that explain the painful, public paradox of FULBRIGHT, the humanitarian, the man of enlightenment, who has voted the straight Southern line on Negro rights, the overwhelming moral issue of modern America. He would flush with anger if anyone called him a bigot or a Negro hater. Clearly, he is neither. But he lives with this "inner discomfort" and does not disguise the fact. His soul must exist in different divided worlds: Fayetteville and Oxford, England; the Ozark back country

and Philadelphia's main line, where he found his charming, enlightened bride. If he hates to talk about this, it is not only because the painful paradox unavoidably exists, but because he fears people will think he is making excuses for himself.

So he has been a constant target of the slyderule liberals, in spite of all he has done for Negro education and health, where he thinks the foundation stones of Negro progress lie; in spite of his lonely courage in opposing Senator McCarthy to his face when the liberals *bête noire* was at the peak of his terrifying power; in spite of his early support for the United Nations and foreign aid, and at a time when the Arkansas majority was against these innovations. But on the bills for civil rights per se—no. And for the same simple, candid reason that he would never oppose the Arkansas agricultural council on cotton policy—he did not wish to be retired from public life.

It is an ancient story and dilemma for men in politics. They must survive, first of all, if they are to accomplish anything. This is why, for example, the liberal Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY never dreamt of opposing Minnesota's dairy industry. It is why young Congressman John F. Kennedy voted fresh appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee when he thought the committee's methods an abomination. ("I would be dead in my district, otherwise," he told me at the time.)

As President, incidentally, Kennedy seriously considered FULBRIGHT for Secretary of State because he liked "the play of his mind." But FULBRIGHT's name was crossed off the list because of the certainty of opposition by Negro and other civil rights groups. Did the Senator himself want to be Secretary of State? "I certainly did not," he said to me. Some of his friends think otherwise.

It is not generally known, but FULBRIGHT was also seriously considered for the presidency of Columbia University before General Eisenhower was given the post. (In his thirties, FULBRIGHT had been president of the University of Arkansas.) Trustees of Columbia asked him if he would consider the job. But this query came too soon—or too late. He had recently been elected to the Senate, in a bitter campaign, with the help of many friends, and, "I thought it immoral to just leave because of what looked like a better job."

Is this his final term as a Senator?

"Eric, you know a politician can't say that. I'll say I've given it no thought."

At a trim and fit 61, the gentleman from Arkansas has become the most arresting figure in the U.S. Senate. He has proved the Senate can advise as well as consent, and by a thousand signs, it is clear that President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense all take his advice very, very seriously, whether they admit it or not. It may be that he is working a slow change in American Far Eastern policy. He has done this with no power save his position as foreign relations chairman and the power of intellect. His vision of America's role in the world may not prevail in our practices. But he will have said what he had to say, and the people have listened. He does not know what more a legislator can do for his country. Having done it, he appears to stand now at the high point of his life, the apogee of his career. In any chapter on the year 1966 in any future history book, the name FULBRIGHT will appear, writ large and often.

The nature and the use of the great American power haunt his thoughts. He is no dreamer. He knows that in the world politics of this brilliant and frightening century, purity will precede paralysis; but he also knows that pride still precedes a fall. He knows that good will without power behind

It is merely an attitude; but he also knows that power without good will can mean calamity.

It was past noon on that Saturday morning in February when the Senator and I got out of our chairs. Another contingent of TV cameramen had arrived in the outer office.

SENATE REVOLT: A HEATED SEARCH FOR A VIETNAM POLICY

I said, "Senator, I think you want to believe that rationality and order are stronger forces than irrationality and disorder in this world."

"Now, you remind me of something, Eric. Here's a little essay sent me by an old fellow who lives back in the Ozarks, a mountaineer without much formal education."

FULBRIGHT read the essay, which said, in part: "With all man's limitations, he yet has one advantage over animals—the power of reason, but history shows that he often discards that for superstition * * * he is the only animal that will build homes, towns, and cities at such a cost in sacrifice and suffering and then turn around and destroy them in war * * * where he came from, or when, or how, or where he is going after death he does not know, but he hopes to live again in ease and idleness where he can worship his gods and enjoy himself, watching his fellow creatures wriggle and writhe in eternal flames down in hell."

FULBRIGHT chuckled and said he didn't believe the world was a rational place, he just hoped we could move it in that direction. "I'm not sure I'm very optimistic about the human race. But if you are to function at all in this business or nearly any other, you have to believe it's possible."

Like his friend, Adlai Stevenson, Senator FULBRIGHT lives, not with indecisiveness, as so many think, but with the courage of his doubts. He knows the great secret. Sophocles expressed it: "This law shall ever be true: Nothing that is vast enters into the life of mortals without a curse."

"Twentieth century communism is a vast thing. So is the American power."

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, as an example of an analysis which is many degrees removed from that of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I would call the attention of the Senate to an editorial written by Mr. Weldon James, of the Louisville Courier-Journal, who resigned his post on that illustrious newspaper to return to active duty in the Marine Corps to "testify to my belief that the U.S. policy in Vietnam is right."

Mr. James points out that "diversity of critical opinion is not only the right, but the great strength, of a democracy" and he exercises his critical opinion to good effect in the signed editorial which marked his departure from the Courier-Journal.

Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that his editorial of April 14, also be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Apr. 14 1966]

A SIGNED EDITORIAL: IT'S PAST TIME TO SAY, "TO HELL WITH HO"

(By Weldon James)

This is one editorial only a great newspaper could invite anyone to write and to sign.

I quit. I resign as an associate editor of the Courier-Journal. I am going on active duty in the Marine Corps to testify to my belief that U.S. policy in Vietnam is right—

and that the quicker more newspapers and more people give the President solid support, the shorter and less dangerously complicated the war there will be.

The Courier-Journal, as its readers know, is no appeaser on Vietnam, no advocate of U.S. withdrawal. But it does not speak with the sharpness I believe the continuing crisis demands.

I believe that the United States was right about Vietnam in 1954, right when President Kennedy increased our involvement, right when President Johnson did likewise, and right to commit, in the President's words, "whatever it takes" to deny the Communists a military triumph there.

I believe Lyndon Johnson is as right as Roosevelt, as timely as Truman, as cautiously correct as Kennedy, and as entitled to Eisenhower's and the Nation's support as the Courier-Journal used to say in editorials I wrote.

But the Courier-Journal, like some other great newspapers, no longer takes a forthright stand on this paramount issue. I respect the conscientiousness of its reasoning, but I am not convinced.

NO TIME TO PLAY HAMLET

This is no time for the press of a great nation to play Hamlet—or Lippmann. Walter Lippmann's gloom about the Truman doctrine was 100 percent wrong. That doctrine played a decisive role in converting the Soviet Union to a belief in peaceful co-existence. Its great dividend is the historic rift between Peking and Moscow today.

Mr. Lippmann's China-doorstep arguments about southeast Asia today are identical with his Russia-doorstep arguments about Greece and Turkey in 1947—and I believe identically fallacious about what the United States should do and can do.

The Courier-Journal has not endorsed the Lippmann line, nor has it been guilty of the vacillation or the silence or the yes-butts of a good part of the American press that have misled both Hanoi and Peking. But in recent months it has been something less than decisive. And all this across the Nation has nurtured honest confusion of the minority in this country—and unintentionally encouraged the sit-ins, the draft-card burners, the neoisolationist belief that if only the United States were to withdraw from southeast Asia (or any other trouble-spot), the world would have instant peace.

No one can deny that the issues in southeast Asia are terribly complex, or contend that we have not made mistakes there. It would be a miracle if we had not. And I fully respect the honest doubts and anxieties of some of my colleagues and of other thoughtful Americans who differ from my views. But I believe it is past time they resolved them and invoked positive support for the President. This could, in my emphatic belief, keep the war limited—and help to shorten it.

Diversity of critical opinion is not only a right but the great strength of a democracy, and no American I know would limit it. But there is enough evidence at hand for the American jury to reach a verdict on Vietnam. The evidence is not just two decades of history but the exposition of that history and of the facts today by the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, Averell Harriman, McGeorge Bundy, and a host of others.

At moments in history when their declarations had a powerful and useful impact on public opinion, the Courier-Journal's Henry Watterson said "to hell with the Hohenzollerns" and Mark Ethridge and Barryingham said in effect "to hell with Hitler"—and Bingham went into the Navy before Pearl Harbor to show where he stood. I hold it is past time to say to hell with Ho—and to speed him toward that destination until he sees the virtues of the conference table.

That solution manifestly is impossible as long as Ho believes that the American people will indeed, as he long ago boasted, weary, waver, and withdraw.

If we don't get the message to Ho now, the need to get it to Mao Tse-tung will be upon us in time. He's told us what he plans. It is as foolish to laugh at his boasts and Red China's "weakness" now as it was to laugh at "that clown Hitler" and Nazi Germany's "weakness" in the 1930's.

Some of my good but regrettably misinformed friends have attributed the positiveness of my views to my long ties with the Marine Corps, instead of to reason, logic, and a lifelong study of history.

This is nonsense, of course. The Marine Corps has no foreign policy. It has no politics. Sound out six marine sergeants—or six marine generals, for that matter—and you'll find as many differing "experts" on foreign affairs and politics as you'll find in the corner tavern.

The Marine Corps, as a long succession of its Commandants have made plain, has but one job. That is to obey the orders of the civilian Commander in Chief, the President.

But the Marine Corps does teach the uses of disciplined rage and the application of "measured strength"—exactly what the United States is employing in Vietnam today. And it has been asking for Reserves to volunteer. I am proud it believes I can be of some use to it now, thanks in great part to the generosity with which the Courier-Journal over the years has enabled me to advance my training in Marine Corps schools, the National War College, and with Navy and Marine forces on the job in Europe and the Orient.

A few comments on the national scene:

It is well-nigh incredible to me that some self-styled liberal Democrats should be ignoring the posthumous revelation by his son of Adlai Stevenson's true position on Vietnam (the Courier-Journal, of course, took sensible editorial notice of this). It is even more shocking that they should be seeking to explain away Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY's vigorous and persuasive support of the President's policies as the calculated insincerity of "a White House captive." They owe it to their label—and to the country—to go back and ponder what John F. Kennedy said and did about Vietnam.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1067, Senate Resolution 224.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 224) to provide six additional professional staff members and six additional clerical assistants for the Committee on Finance which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and insert:

That the Committee on Finance is authorized—

A2148

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 20, 1966

owners maintain decent living standards on their income property.

Mr. Stephens' article follows:

SLUM LANDLORDS—SHARKS, PARASITES

(By Gene Stephens)

Cincinnati health commissioner, Dr. Kenneth I. E. MacLeod, has some very definite ideas about dealing with the city's slum housing problems.

They include treating all alike—landlords and tenants.

"It is not the job of the inspector—health, fire, or housing—to modify or adjust the law to suit the individual case. The law should be enforced as it is and presumably as it was meant to be. If the law is too slight or too harsh and the citizens want modifications, it is up to them to get the law changed," Dr. MacLeod said.

The commissioner said he has no sympathy for the slum landlords who don't keep up their property. "They are sharks, slave dealers, and parasites on society. They live off the sick—in this case, the poor. They should be eliminated by every possible means," he said.

Dr. MacLeod said he might be a little unconventional but he feels, "More important than the owners profits is where and how the people of our city live."

"No one asked these people to be owners of property. They chose to be, on their own," he said.

"Many of them claim they are rendering a public service by providing homes for the poor," he said. "This is true only if they provide good homes."

The standard answer to this is, "How can I provide a service with the kind of tenants I have?" Dr. MacLeod said, "I remind him that he has a responsibility for the people he allows to live in his housing.

"He can make any requirements on tenants he wants. If he doesn't like the way they keep house, he can educate them, but he is still responsible for them. And, of course, he still has the ultimate say—eviction," he said.

Dr. MacLeod said he sees three types of property owners in Cincinnati—the ethical, the unfortunate, and the slum landlord.

The ethical property owner, he said, is probably in the majority and corrects health, fire, or building violations on notice.

The unfortunates, often elderly, usually rely on the little income they get from deteriorating houses, often the old homeplace. The best remedy, he said, is to force the sale of their property and enforce the orders on the new owner.

The slum landlord does little to comply with orders, he said.

"I don't agree that the code should be bent to suit these individuals. If it is unfortunate, we can't help that. We can't be too sympathetic because this property is a plague on the neighborhood and threatens to affect the lives of many other people. If this person can't afford to keep up the property, he must move. That's reality," Dr. MacLeod said.

He said the city has agencies to help these people and "they too much do their job."

On the question of court action, the commissioner said, "We need proper backing of the court and adequate, not laughable, penalties."

He said many answers to slum housing problems lie in "cooperation and integration of the programs of several enforcement agencies—fire, health, and building included—even to the point of integrated inspections whenever that is feasible."

He suggested the city health department can play a bigger part in eliminating slum housing than it has in the past.

"I don't want to take any powers away from any other department but I think the health inspector should be responsible for determining if a building is unfit for human habitation," he said.

This, he said, includes esthetic requirements—"which are important to the mental health of the inhabitants"—as well as sanitary and some safety requirements.

Formerly health commissioner in Worcester, Mass., Dr. MacLeod said Massachusetts law recognizes this role of the health departments.

In Cincinnati, where orders of the health department are mainly to clean up for sanitary reasons, Dr. MacLeod said about half are against tenants and about half against owners and prosecution for noncompliance ranges from 30 to 90 days.

Many conditions in slum housing are dangerous from a health and safety standpoint, Dr. MacLeod said. In the last 10 years, 304 cases of lead poisoning have been reported in Cincinnati and 27 children have died from it, he said.

"Most of these cases involved small children eating paint scraps that have flaked off the walls and some have involved babies teething on window sills painted with lead base paint," the commissioner said.

Now paint used in the city cannot have more than 1 percent lead content but, he said, "many cases are still coming from slum areas where buildings have not been repainted and old paint scraped off since this ordinance was passed."

The commissioner said tenants also have responsibilities which they must learn. Someone, he said, must start educating them and helping them meet these responsibilities.

"It is silly to uplift housing unless you have programs of education to help the people in this housing," he said.

"Door-to-door contact will have to be used in many cases to tell these people of available aid and encourage them to use it.

"Public schools can do much more than they are now. One way is by making health education mandatory and a major subject in schools," he said.

Dr. MacLeod said he thinks civil rights and civic organizations can also help. "They have already done a great service by bringing these conditions to the attention of the public and officials. But I fear in many cases they have accentuated the rights of the tenant to the point they have made him forget he also has responsibilities," he said.

In summary, the commissioner said, "We are living in America, the richest country in the world, and if we cannot afford to develop adequate housing for the poor it is a sad commentary on the United States."

Long-Range Look at Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Ahlgren, editor of the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, is a renowned student of international affairs. He has traveled extensively throughout the world. With the keen insight of a top newspaperman he has gathered facts and information to form the basis for sound judgment of world problems.

This fortunate combination of journalistic and persuasive speaking ability has made Frank Ahlgren one of the most sought-after speakers in the Midsouth, and his talks on international affairs are masterpieces of clarity and good sense.

In a recent editorial in the Commercial

Appeal, Mr. Ahlgren takes a long-range look at Vietnam, and with the eye of the newspaperman, brings to bear the factual information that makes for clear decisions. His comment should be read carefully by all, and it is a pleasure to commend this editorial to the Members:

LONG-RANGE LOOK AT VIETNAM

While Washington officials may be breathing a small sigh of relief as political disension simmers down in South Vietnam, they need not expect a long respite.

In the first place, the Saigon government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky has only until about July to fulfill the promise made to the Buddhist opposition that a civilian government will be instituted. South Vietnam's internal crisis has merely been postponed, and indeed it is not certain that it has been fully dampened for the present.

Second, the Johnson administration is now under fire from two sides in the United States. The Fulbright-Morse faction that wants America to pull back from involvement in Vietnam extends out to a lunatic fringe that is actually pro-Vietcong with racial overtones. That has been worrisome enough. But now Mr. Johnson is getting flak from the other side; namely, Republican leaders in Congress who have until now been largely unified with the administration on its Vietnam policy.

President Johnson has no hope of acquiring his coveted consensus where Vietnam is concerned. Two elements in this country are poles apart, one wanting the United States to abandon southeast Asia and the other demanding a total military victory over the Vietcong.

In this crossfire, which becomes more heated as election time nears, the Johnson administration will need tough armor.

Washington decisions regarding Vietnam have necessarily been long range. That approach is still essential. There will be no quick end to the war, nor can we evade American responsibilities in international affairs by backing down in Vietnam because of its internecline quarrels.

As this newspaper has often stated, the U.S. stake and commitments in the Pacific and Far East did not begin with the Eisenhower era or the Kennedy administration; they date back through World War II to a time as distant as the Spanish-American War.

The nature of today's involvement is different, but the future relationship of the United States with all nations of the world—from powers to struggling new governments—hinges now on how America behaves in Vietnam.

The President needs a thick hide to stand above the political quarrels within this country and to accept the fact that instability within South Vietnam is far from solution. At the same time the American people must appreciate and understand that administration handling of the Vietnam situation requires sacrifices and solidarity. Neither of the two main political parties in America has an enviable record as pertains to the mess in southeast Asia. But both have in the past tried to meet confusing issues with the best judgments available. No other major nation has been able to impose stability on a part of the world which has known little but turmoil; but the United States at least has a cogent plan for long-range action.

World Communist leaders, particularly those in Peking, want to impose their own tyranny on all of Vietnam and beyond. Withdrawal by America will not ease that aspect of global tension, but it would trigger new tensions in other spots. Arguing among ourselves in the free-speech context of this country, while a healthy reflection of people, participation in government does not equate

April 20, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2147

of rural Barnesville, Minn., has written me regarding the budget request for slashing the funds for the school milk program. While written with tongue in cheek, Mr. Swenson's excellent sense of humor does not detract from the deadly seriousness of his subject or the wisdom of his thoughts.

Under unanimous consent I include his letter at this point in the Record:

BARNESVILLE, MINN.,
April 8, 1966.

Representative OTIN LANGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANGEN: I must at this time take the liberty to voice my support for those in the Government who would like to cut the school lunch milk program from the budget. It is in my opinion, to the benefit of the dairy farmer and the people of the Nation if the Government stops this program. I shall clarify my position:

For example, Dairy Farmer Jones, who is just making it (as most of them barely manage to do) is supplying milk to Exploit Enterprises, a milk-producing firm who processes raw milk. This firm supplies, among others, the local schools. At present, the Government helps pay for this milk to make it more available to schoolchildren. This is one reason we want it stopped.

Because milk has a high protein content, it is an excellent brain food. If we make milk less available, we could raise children with inferior brains, and save a lot of money for crime prevention, because the kids would be too stupid to think of any trouble to get into.

Another reason we want it stopped is because we are wasting money on internal improvements while we could be using it for more sensible purposes such as: foreign aid to friendly allies like France, Indonesia, Cuba, Panama, etc.; or subsidizing draft card paper manufacturers.

But the main reason we want it discontinued is so that the dairy farmer can receive a fair price. If this program is ended, the price of milk given to Farmer Jones will go down, although Exploit Enterprises' won't. The results are:

1. A decrease in the number of dairy farms with those remaining finally being able to get a fair price after a period of a few centuries (as occurred in the hog market.)

2. The heads of Exploit Industries will achieve fat, taxable wallets.

3. The administration will rejoice because it has gained a few new members for the anti-poverty war (former farmers).

This is what I consider good economics, and therefore why I urge the suspension of the school lunch milk program.

With sincerest beliefs,

DAVID H. SWENSON.

Tax Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a bill, H.R. 10696, which would direct the Federal Government to share up to 5 percent of national revenues with the various State governments for use in the field of education. The measure received wide support, especially from Governors, who are constantly

seeking new sources of revenue to implement worthwhile State and local programs. Tax sharing would bolster our Federal concept by strengthening the States.

Mr. Paul Hope, writing in the April 18 Washington Star pointed out several reasons why this administration consistently refuses to support tax-sharing legislation.

It would be a sad commentary on this administration if it would allow personal and political considerations to color its judgment on this important legislation. If there were a substantial show of strong public sentiment for revenue sharing the White House might get the message.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Hope's Washington Close-Up column entitled "States Envy Federal Tax Rake-In" in the Appendix of the Record.

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP: STATES ENVY FEDERAL
TAX RAKE-IN

(By Paul Hope)

State governments, which have to scrounge around for operating cash like a housewife looking for money to buy a pound of bacon, figure it's about time they got cut into some kind of a poverty program.

If there ever was a poor cousin in the governmental scheme of things, it's the State government out there watching the tax money roll into Washington while the people beat on the statehouse door for service.

For some time now, the States have been hoping something would be done about getting them a share of Federal tax money—not just another handout with all sorts of strings attached, but some honest-to-goodness hard money they could budget according to where they think the greatest need is.

Such a plan has been proposed frequently. Walter W. Heller, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, suggested it. A Presidential task force also drew up a proposal, the details of which have never been released.

A few days ago, the Republican Coordinating Committee gave the idea a boost. It proposed a return to the States of a gradually increasing portion of personal and corporate income taxes collected by the Federal Government, starting with 2 percent the first year and increasing to 10 percent over a period of 8 years.

But the chances of such a scheme being approved anytime soon seem remote.

Early in the Johnson administration it seemed the President would propose that Congress enact a tax-sharing plan. But he apparently changed his mind.

For one thing, a newspaper reporter wrote that Johnson was considering it, and if there is anything the President doesn't like, it's having newsmen announce what he's going to do before he tells them.

For another, George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, doesn't approve—President Johnson said so. "George Meany told me he'd never go for it," Johnson was quoted as saying during an interview for a national magazine.

Then there's the possibility that giving the States back some of the money would mean less to finance the Federal programs of the Great Society.

Furthermore, there's more political mileage in handing out money through a Federal bureaucracy than in giving it directly to the States. It creates Federal jobs for one thing. About all you need under a tax-sharing plan is a check-writing machine and someone to lick the 50 envelopes.

And what better way to insure political fealty down the line than to have Governors, mayors, health and welfare directors, school

administrators and the like running to Washington hat in hand for Federal handouts.

Why, if Federal tax money were returned directly to the States, some of the Governors, finding their financial burdens eased, might reap some political benefit. With several of the biggest States being run by Republican Governors, that would never do.

Besides, it's easier to extract compliance with Federal regulations if you can threaten to yank away the goodies for misbehavior. For instance, it's easier, according to this theory, to make school districts desegregate if Federal funds can be cut off.

Never mind that they are disobeying the law of the land and the officials responsible ought to be called before the bar of justice for it. Just threaten to take away the money. It's easier that way.

Of course, there are instances when politics are such that this can't be done. Francis Keppel, the departing former chief of the U.S. Office of Education, found that out when he tried last year to withhold \$30 million in Federal school funds from Chicago.

Mayor Richard Daley, who runs the powerful Chicago Democratic machine which can always be counted on to produce the votes, called the White House, boiling mad. Keppel got dressed down and Chicago got the money. When Keppel resigned the other day, the White House didn't even figure he rated a public well done.

The usual practice when someone of Keppel's stature resigns is for the White House to at least release an exchange of pleasant letters between the President and the departing.

No one has suggested that the Federal Government eliminate all Federal aid programs. What has been suggested is that it cut the States in on a portion of the Federal income tax money in the form of a regular, lump-sum rebate that could be used as the States see fit in meeting their ever-rising budgets.

It has been estimated that State and local governments, which spent \$65 billion in 1964, will be spending \$155 billion by 1974. And it's getting tougher all the time for the States to find something else to tax.

So in this April tax season State Governors water at the mouth thinking about all that money going to Washington and wishing they could take a small bite.

Slum Landlords—Sharks, Parasites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note today the outspoken and honest statement about slum landlords by Cincinnati health commissioner, Dr. Kenneth I. E. MacLeod. Dr. MacLeod, in an interview with Cincinnati Enquirer reporter, Gene Stephens, in the April 1 issue of the Enquirer left no room for excuses by or for slum landlords. He described them as sharks, slave dealers, and parasites on society and separated them from ethical property owners.

Dr. MacLeod forcefully makes the point that a property owner has a responsibility for the people he allows to live in his housing. It is a point government officials throughout the United States should make in creating and enforcing laws to require that property

April 20, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2149

the dialog necessary to unify the country in action.

This is a time when resolve by the Johnson administration must be firm and leadership must be articulate. However unpopular some decisions may be, the President cannot afford to vacillate. Nor can we, the citizens, waver from our duty. Part of that duty is self-interest. But a bigger part is to open to the billions of people beyond our 50 States the opportunity to enjoy freedom and economic security—and peace.

Problems in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial carried in the April 14, 1966, issue of the Corson County, S. Dak., News.

This editorial summarizes as well as could be summarized the situation that exists with regard to agriculture and the philosophy and policies of this administration in not just dumping agricultural commodities but "in dumping the farmer."

The editorial is as follows:

Unless the prices of things the farmers have to sell go up as fast as the things they have to buy the farmers can't make money. This should not be hard to understand.

Farm prices today are about the same as they were on the average from 1947-49. Since those years farm machinery has gone up 80.7 percent, motor vehicles have gone up 62.8 percent, buildings and fence materials have gone up 32.4 percent, gas has gone up, labor has gone up, taxes have gone up. The cost of running a farm has gone up 21 percent.

Parity is the word used to measure the price of things the farmer sells in relation to what he buys. If he was getting 100 percent of parity he would be getting a fair price.

Beef cattle are at 89 percent of parity, wheat at 70 percent, corn at 71 percent, eggs at 86 percent, and the average farm prices at 82 percent of parity. In other words, the farmer is only getting 82 cents for the things he produces when he should be getting a dollar.

The cost of living has gone up. It is costing more to live. Food prices have gone up.

President Johnson has asked housewives to fight inflation by not buying high-priced food articles such as meat and dairy products. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is quoted in the New York Times as expressing pleasure with the fact the prices of farm products have dropped recently.

How do the President and his Secretary of Agriculture expect the farmers to make a living if the prices of the things they sell continually lag behind the price of the things they have to buy?

The answer, of course, is that the farmers have to turn to the Government for subsidies and the controls and frustrations that go with subsidies.

It has seemed for some time that the Federal Government is more interested in holding farm prices down than in letting them come up. When the price of grain threatens to go up the Commodity Credit Corporation dumps mountains of Government-held grain on the market. When beef prices go up

the Government allows imports to come in and flood the market. Export policies of the Government are making it prohibitive to ship hides which is costing stockmen about \$4 an animal. Wheat exports are hampered because wheat sent abroad under our Government programs has to go on American ships and the freight is higher than other ships charge so foreign countries get their grain elsewhere.

Farm prices aren't causing a big rise in the price of food. If the price of wheat doubled it wouldn't make more than a penny or two difference in the cost of a loaf of bread.

Food prices are going up because dollars all along the line are worth less. They are worth less because the Government is spending far beyond its income. Confidence in the American dollar is declining abroad and at home.

Inflation is hitting the farmer as well as anybody else. He has to buy a lot and the things he buys have been going up all the time. Surely the American people recognize it is only fair that the farmer should also get more for what he sells. He has a lot of catching up to do in the dollar department.

Zeus' Brother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial in the Rogersville Review of Rogersville, Tenn., pointed out an interesting fact about the statue in the public lobby of the United Nations Building in New York.

The true identity of the statue has now come to light. I think we should all know who the statue represents, and I am inserting the editorial at this point in the RECORD for the information of all.

[From the Rogersville (Tenn.) Review, Apr. 7, 1966]

CASE OF MISTAKEN IDENTITY

You just can't be sure of anything these days.

Take that splendid statue in the public lobby of the United Nations in New York. Perhaps many of you readers have seen and admired it, we have not.

The statue was presented to the world organization by Greece in 1953 and it bore the title, "Zeus of Artemesian."

We dare not think how many school groups vacationists, and visiting notables have been told by U.N. guides that the dominating statue was Zeus. Turns out now that it isn't Zeus at all, it's his brother, Poseidon.

The Greek Government, with scholarly concern, has notified the U.N. Secretariat that there has been a big mistake, that research proves the statue is not Zeus.

Not knowing what the statue looks like, we can only say that if it had been equipped with a triton (the three-pronged tool for managing storms) most anyone, including us, would have known it was Poseidon. The Greek Government would have, too.

While U.N. guides may have a little trouble switching from Zeus to Poseidon, the lobby is surely no less impressive because the statue is of the lesser Olympian brother. Either one would be a good symbol for U.N. halls.

Zeus is supposed to hurl thunderbolts, ac-

ording to Greek myth, and Poseidon to both stir up storms and calm the troubled waters.

On second thought, maybe it's a good thing Poseidon is in the U.N. rather than Zeus.

Thrift and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of all Members of the House the following editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, April 12, 1966, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, a nationally respected publication.

The editorial, entitled "Thrift and Inflation," is worthy of serious consideration. I would also agree that there are items which should not have cuts at all, or at the very most, cuts of 1 or 2 percent. We also recognize that the administration has advocated cuts in proven, valuable programs which should and must be restored. Conversely, as the editorial points out, there are items which could benefit from cuts far greater than a mere 5 percent. Let us take a real, hard look at the administration's budget. Let us reason together in moving to blockade inflationary trends.

The editorial follows:

THRIFT AND INFLATION

For many, if not most, big public operations there tends to be what might be termed an inefficiency slippage. This means that tighter control and shrewder planning could eliminate perhaps as much as 5 percent of the cost of many big Federal undertakings with no loss in ultimate result.

We do not know if the Republican forces in Congress had this in mind when they began their current drive to trim all domestic spending by one-twentieth during the coming fiscal year. Yet the fact that thrifter administration might enable the government to save this amount is, we believe, strong justification for the GOP effort.

True, this efforts has yet to get anywhere when weighed in dollar-and-cents terms. On both occasions that the GOP sought to attach riders to bills requiring that these latter be cut by 5 percent, the riders lost.

On the other hand, and if the effort is continued, future victories are by no means impossible. It is apparent that the United States is increasingly concerned over the effect which continued huge government spending is having upon the inflationary trends now gripping the national economy. In addition, it is by no means certain that most Americans would not prefer to see such spending curbed rather than be subjected to an antinflationary tax increase. Thus, the Republicans may well be advocating a more popular cause than as yet seen.

In any event, the GOP effort to trim spending by 5 percent (a fairly modest amount when all is said and done) could turn out to be an effective campaign issue next November. If the American people could be convinced that a 5 percent cut in Federal spending would have dampened inflation and (in the event that this is adopted) warded off an income tax rise, considerable political mileage could result.

Of course, a slash of one-twentieth in all items indiscriminately would not be a wise

A2150

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 20, 1966

move. There are items which should not have cuts at all or, at the very most, cuts of 1 or 2 percent. Conversely, there are items which could benefit from cuts far greater than a mere 5 percent. We suggest that the GOP consider the possibility of varying its proposals depending upon the item. But we believe that a holddown in Federal spending would be an efficient means of halting inflation and that the GOP is moving in the right direction.

W

Tri Quang Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly reassuring to learn the position of Thich Tri Quang, the Buddhist leader of South Vietnam, which is so well set forth in the following article by Joseph Alsop who I understand recently returned from Vietnam. His column, published in the Washington Post of April 20, follows:

TRI QUANG SPEAKS OUT

(By Joseph Alsop)

Instead of Senator MANSFIELD calling for negotiations, the headlines yesterday ought to have gone to Thich Tri Quang, calling for "victory over the Communists." In one surprising stroke, the ground has been cut out from under people like the Senator.

The basic assumptions of all Americans who take the Mansfield position are that the United States is somehow forcing the South Vietnamese people to continue their resistance to the Communists; and that there are great, though inarticulate, numbers of South Vietnamese who long for a negotiated peace with the Vietcong.

If these assumptions had any foundation whatever, that foundation would certainly have to be provided by Thich Tri Quang. This enigmatic Buddhist leader is a passionate Vietnamese nationalist, who has also been suspected, by a great many Americans, of being a strong neutralist. By any list, you would have to name Tri Quang as MANSFIELD's unique best bet in Vietnam.

With just that rather obviously in mind, a correspondent of Newsweek has just got Tri Quang to give him an interview, to which far too little attention has been paid. Tri Quang was asked, to begin with, whether a new government of South Vietnam "should begin to negotiate an end to the war." He replied roundly:

"If negotiations can really achieve peace in Vietnam, that peace should be the result of a victory over the Communists. It would be illogical to have peace resulting from negotiations that are to the advantage of the Communists."

He was then asked about the proposal so strangely made by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, to allow members of the Vietcong to join a future government after a negotiated peace. To this, Thich Tri Quang replied more roundly still:

"No Communist Party can be a real political party. No Communist Party can live in harmony with other political parties. Furthermore, the nationalist parties in Vietnam are still weak and could not cope with the Communist Party if it were allowed to join."

"Here you have it. If Tri Quang means what he says, as he appears to, he not only rejects absolutely the positions taken by Senators MANSFIELD and KENNEDY; he is also

considerably more intransigent than President Johnson. For the President, after all, is ready for "unconditional negotiations." Tri Quang only favors negotiations resulting from "a victory over the Communists."

All of which suggests that it is a little silly for people in this country to be so "nerve-wracked" by the recurrent bouts of political ferment in South Vietnam. To begin with, those who are most "nerve-wracked" are also those who called most loudly for the repudiation of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Since they got their way on that occasion, one is inclined to ask, "What on earth did you expect?"

On the one hand, although poor Diem had real virtues, the Vietnamese got their bellies full of authoritarian government during the Diem regime. On the other hand, this immensely talented, courageous and industrious people had no practice in self-government for close on a hundred years before Diem. And their leaders are therefore inexperienced, while the masses still lack political consciousness.

Hence a long period of cut and try is going to have to be tolerated, while the Vietnamese work out a political balance and political modes that suit their own habits, traditions and outlook. In this connection, too, the Tri Quang interview is of great significance. It indicates that most people (including this reporter) have been overrating the chances of the Vietnamese inadvertently stabbing themselves in the back while cutting-and-trying.

Militarily, the process of cut-and-try is certainly inconvenient though far from fatal. Politically, substantial progress has already been made. The ephemeral alternatives have been eliminated. The army, the Buddhists, and the Catholics have emerged as the true nationwide power groups. It remains to find a workable balance between the power groups.

There will be more cutting and trying before the balance is reached; and this will upset respectable Americans. Although few people here at home understand this, the South Vietnamese have much to look forward to. Theirs is a very rich country. Their people, long kept in backward ignorance by the French, have learned a hundred modern lessons from the cruel war.

If they win and there is peace, in fact, South Vietnam should be a very good country to live in—even if its government still "nerve wracks" those Americans who think Vietnam can only be led by that blood-boltered old murderer, Ho Chi Minh.

Poor In, Politics Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 16, 1966, Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News:

POOR IN, POLITICS OUT

Two comments coming from widely separated points on America's map sharpened the focus this week on the promising but only partially productive war on poverty.

In New Mexico, an Indian leader stressed the local involvement of his own people in operating these new programs and said some spectacular success had been achieved. For the first time, he exulted, Indian parents "have become exulted." Indian parents "have become excited about education for their children."

It was a different story, however, in Washington, D.C., at the clamorous "Poor People's Poverty Convention." But the disgraceful display by some hooting hecklers there should not obscure a fundamental feeling among many delegates that efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity to involve the poor in local programs were "a failure so far." A vocal Mississippian said she was "tired of beautiful speeches" and charged that plantation owners and police chiefs were running the programs back home.

"They're going to see me about my poverty?" she said. "They kept me in poverty."

These people spotlighted the heart of the matter, it seems to us—this whole question of involving the impoverished in shaping and administering and running these programs aimed at their own economic salvation. Involvement means stimulation, participation, commitment, shaking up tired patterns of helplessness.

Yet this precise principle, called "maximum feasible participation," is the one that political pressure apparently is forcing Sargent Shriver's OEO to retreat on. Too many politicians at all levels, it seems, fear the break-up of old patterns, distrust the implications of fully and actively involving the poor.

There is also the opposite danger, of course, of cynical elements shattering existing social patterns for their own jaded ends. Undoubtedly political "outs," racketeers and even Communists will penetrate and exploit this if they can. Additionally, the poverty program could be capsized by irresponsible action like that of the heckling mob at the poverty convention that booed and hooted at Shriver.

These types of risks—ideological, political, and just plain irresponsibility—need a constant alert, obviously, but they provide no reasons for scuttling the principle of involving the poor in teaching them to help themselves.

The OEO should insist on such genuine involvement at the local level—as is true here in Buffalo now, after some early skirmishes—and resist every kind of cynical political exploitation.

For the weakening of this unique feature of the antipoverty system, coupled with the heralded confusion and lack of administrative coordination, could destroy the promise of individual programs like that cited by the Indian leader.

The impoverished surely need hope, insight, coverage, and equal opportunity—not politics, irresponsibility, and administrative rivalry. For those very human, very overriding reasons, OEO should insist on keeping the poor in and politics out.

A New Era for Mankato, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an excellent article by Ted Rasmussen which appeared in the March 1966 issue of "Southwestern Scene," a publication of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. In recent years, there has been considerable publicity about the decay and deterioration of small rural towns and villages throughout rural America. Frequently, efforts of communities to offset economic reverses caused by the population shift from rural to urban areas go unnoticed