

April 6, 1966

the children of mothers who, for one reason or another, can't provide care for them during the day," she said.

"We like to pretend that Mom's still in the kitchen, but the fact of the matter is, she hasn't been in the kitchen for years."

As part of her continuing fight for a better life for young children, Mrs. Guggenheimer resigned as cochairman of the city antipoverty program's Headstart Committee yesterday. She did so in protest over conflicts in the running of the preschool enrichment program.

A SIZE 10 GRANDMOTHER

At 53 (she will be 54 next Monday), Elinor Guggenheimer is trim (size 10) and forthright, with a fine sense of the ridiculous.

She and her husband, Randolph, a partner in the law firm of Guggenheimer & Untermeyer, live in a cooperative apartment at 1095 Park Avenue. They are the parents of two sons, Charles, 32, and Randolph, 30, and the grandparents of two boys and a girl, all under 6.

"Actually, you'd better say young Randolph is 6 because he can read now and he always says he's almost 6," Mrs. Guggenheimer explained. "I wouldn't want to hurt his feelings."

In addition to her children and grandchildren, Mrs. Guggenheimer is proud of her indomitable mother-in-law, Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer, known to thousands of music lovers as Minnie. Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer is credited with almost single-handedly having founded the summer concerts at Lewisohn Stadium.

The younger Mrs. Guggenheimer's duties as a member of the New York City Planning Commission take up so much of her time that she does not have enough left over to pursue her hobbies as much as she pretends that she might like to.

"As the result of my famous mother-in-law, I am conversant with music," she said, "and in my spare time, I do needlepoint." To illustrate, she produced a piece of petti-point from her handbag and ran off a few stitches.

"I also play atrocious golf and cook divinely," she said. "Honesty compels me to tell you that when I get finished, however, the kitchen is a mess."

She gives a course on park and recreation planning at the New School for Social Research each fall, paints, collect Chinese porcelain, and writes skits.

BARNARD GRADUATE

Mrs. Guggenheimer is a native New Yorker, the only child of the late Nathan Coleman, a commercial banker, and Mrs. Lillian Coleman.

She was educated at Horace Mann, a private school which at that time accepted girls; Vassar and Barnard College, from which she graduated. Later, she took courses at Columbia University's Teacher's College and Pratt Institute in early childhood education and city planning, respectively.

A woman who takes her work seriously, she has been rumored to be informally soliciting support for the Manhattan Borough presidency to replace Mrs. Constance Baker Motley.

Although Mrs. Guggenheimer becomes incensed at the lag in day-care facilities in this country, she nevertheless sees some hope ahead.

"If Operation Headstart can be developed to relate to day-care centers, this would be a step forward," she said. "There is hope in the small amount of Federal funds that have served to stimulate licensing laws for the protection of children in group programs."

Governor Rockefeller's program to appropriate funds for day care is also a positive move, she feels.

"I don't want to stir things up to make trouble," she said seriously. "I want to be able to speak freely to end trouble and bring peace. There's a difference."

SENATOR FULBRIGHT SPEAKS OUT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the views of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] deserves special attention. Senator FULBRIGHT has not hesitated to make his opinions about our involvement in Vietnam known, and many of his statements are already in the RECORD. A recent and very timely article has been brought to my attention, however, and I feel it merits the special scrutiny of my colleagues. In the April 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post he has written a column entitled "We Must Negotiate Peace in Vietnam." Besides calling for American acceptance and understanding of the realities of the situation in Vietnam, he feels that the United States, as the most powerful Nation in the world, can afford to be magnanimous.

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:

WE MUST NEGOTIATE PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT)

America is a Great Society and it is becoming greater. Our people enjoy greater material abundance, with greater personal opportunity and human dignity, than any people have ever known in the history of the human race. There is, to be sure, much unfinished business in our society, but the fact remains that we are a great and fundamentally decent Nation; we know it—our ought to—and the world knows it.

At times, however, we act as though we did not believe in our own greatness, as though our prestige were constantly in jeopardy, requiring unending exertions to prove to the world that we are indeed a great and powerful Nation. We are told, for example, that we must beat the Russians to the moon, that we must build the world's fastest airplane, that we must maintain our pressures against Castro, that we must faithfully discharge dubious commitments, not primarily because these actions are considered essential in themselves but more because it is believed that if we did not do these things, our prestige, which is to say, our reputation for greatness, would be hopelessly compromised.

In the case of Vietnam, our honor and prestige are indeed involved, but they are involved principally because we laid them on the line and did so in a legally uncertain and politically casual way. Legally, under a reasonable interpretation of the SEATO treaty, we have agreed to act against external Communist attack in accordance with our constitutional processes but are obligated only to consult with our allies in the event of subversion from outside. We have neither the obligation nor the right to intervene in a civil war. If, prior to American intervention, the war in South Vietnam was essentially a civil war, as I believe to be the case, then the legal basis of American involvement is dubious. Practically and politically, whatever the legalities, the all-out commitment to South Vietnam was made almost casually, by a series of minor escalations of the American involvement, many of which were accompanied by statements that the war was not our war and would have to

be won or lost by the South Vietnamese themselves. Only when they were about to lose the war did the United States take it over.

The Executive and the Congress must share responsibility for the casual way in which the United States committed its honor and prestige to an unstable and intransigent regime which refuses to negotiate with its enemies and may yet drag the United States into an all-out war with China. The Executive tended to explain each increase in the American involvement in Vietnam as a tactical step rather than a change of policy, while the Congress failed to meet its general responsibility of holding the Executive to account and the Senate failed to assert its constitutional powers of "advice and consent" in the field of foreign policy.

It is my hope that the hearings on Vietnam recently held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and future proceedings now under consideration will help to correct past omissions on the part of the Congress. There is some evidence, for example, that we are now expanding our commitment to Thailand in the same disorderly way that we became so deeply involved in Vietnam. There is still time, however, for the Senate to insist that any new commitment to Thailand be contracted in full accord with our constitutional procedures, including full and frank debate.

We have committed our prestige to an unwise degree in Vietnam, and we have suffered accordingly some loss of prestige, but I do not think that America's greatness is questioned in the world, and I certainly do not think that strident behavior is the best way for a nation to prove its greatness or save its damaged pride. Indeed, in nations as in individuals, bellicosity is a mark of weakness and self-doubt rather than strength and self-assurance. There is something appropriate and admirable about a small or weak country standing up defiantly to a big and powerful country; such behavior confers upon the small country an assurance which it needs to nourish its dignity and self-respect. The same behavior on the part of a big nation is grotesque, marking it as a bully. The true mark of greatness is not assertiveness but magnanimity. "Magnanimity in politics," said Edmund Burke, "is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together."

It is precisely because of America's great strength and prestige that we can afford to be—that indeed it is in our interest to be—magnanimous in Vietnam. If the Vietcong or North Vietnam were to take the initiative in offering substantive concessions, they could plausibly be regarded as having been intimidated by American power. If we were to take the lead in suggesting peace terms involving a compromise with the Vietcong, many people would suppose that the American people had grown doubtful about the war—which is probably true—but no one could seriously believe that the United States had been frightened or intimidated into submission by a small and poor country in southeast Asia.

What then should we do, what can we offer, to try to end the war in Vietnam? The first step which I recommend is that we state explicitly and forthrightly that we recognize the Vietcong as a belligerent, with whom we are prepared to negotiate peace, and further, that we will use our considerable powers of persuasion in Saigon to induce the South Vietnamese Government, which has said that change its mind and indicate its willingness it will not negotiate with the Vietcong, to do so.

It has been said that the Vietcong is entitled to no special negotiating position because it is, after all, only one of many factions in South Vietnam. It is, however, a rather special faction inasmuch as it is the

one with which we are at war. The British did not regard George Washington and his fellow revolutionaries as the only faction in the Thirteen Colonies, much less a "legitimate" or legal one; they made peace with them because, assisted by the French, they were the ones who were fighting them in the field.

Moreover, and more important, however much we may regret it, the Vietcong is something more than an organized group of terrorists. It is, I think, a genuinely nationalist as well as a Communist movement, as evidenced by its impressive military performance over a long period against heavy odds.

Nationalism is the strongest single political force in the world today. In most of the emerging countries the nationalist movements have been non-Communist, with the result that Communist efforts at subversion have for the most part been unsuccessful. It is a tragic fact, but nonetheless a fact, that in Vietnam the effective nationalist movement is controlled by Communists. For this reason above all others I recommend that we state plainly and directly what President Johnson and Ambassador Harriman have hinted: that we acknowledge the Vietcong as a belligerent and invite it to participate, along with the governments of South Vietnam and North Vietnam, in formal peace negotiations.

My second recommendation is that we state forthrightly and explicitly, in advance of negotiations, that we are prepared to conclude a peace agreement providing for an internationally supervised election to determine the future of South Vietnam and, further, that we are prepared to accept the outcome of such an election, whatever that outcome might be. The latter assurance is important because, among the many violations of the Geneva agreements of 1954 committed by both sides, the most significant was the refusal of President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam to allow the election provided for at Geneva to take place, and America's complicity in that refusal.

I suggest further, in this connection, that we use all available channels to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong that, whatever the future political complexion of Vietnam, Communist or non-Communist, united or divided, it can enjoy a secure and independent existence and normal relations with the United States as long as it respects the independence of its neighbors and as long as it upholds its own independence of China.

Such a settlement would not constitute a victory in the traditional sense; but neither would it represent a decision, as has been suggested, to "scuttle and run." It would, quite simply, represent a compromise, including, as any compromise must, concessions by the United States. A concession, however, is not a humiliation and may indeed be turned to one's own advantage, as General de Gaulle demonstrated by giving freedom to Algeria and as Khrushchev demonstrated by proclaiming himself a peacemaker while yielding to the American ultimatum in the Cuban missile crisis. The concessions we must make are necessary as an act of commonsense in a tragic situation; as Walter Lippmann has written, "a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future." And as George Kennan said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February: "I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives."

It may be difficult indeed to persuade the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to enter a negotiation along the lines indicated. They have little reason to trust the Western

nations, having been betrayed by the French in 1946, who recognized Vietnam as a "free state" and promised a referendum on its unity but then tried to reassert their colonial authority, and by Diem and his American sponsors in 1955 when we encouraged him in his refusal to hold the elections provided for by the Geneva agreements. It will be necessary to show our good faith as well as to insist on the good faith of the other side. It may be that at first we will be rebuffed and, if so, we can do no better than to restate our assurances, patiently and repeatedly, conducting ourselves in a manner befitting a great and mature nation.

There is an unacknowledged presence in all that we think and say and do in connection with Vietnam; it is the presence of China. We wage war against the Vietcong and North Vietnam, but we regard them as instruments of China, and it is China that we consider to be the real threat to the security of southeast Asia. If it were not for our concern with China and what she might do, it would probably be an easier matter to come to terms with our enemies in Vietnam. Our prospects in Vietnam cannot therefore be separated from our attitude toward China and China's attitude toward us.

United Nations Secretary General U Thant recently described China as a country "obsessed with fear and suspicion," a country undergoing a kind of "nervous breakdown." U Thant's words suggest the need for Americans to make a critical choice in their attitude toward China. On the one hand, we can treat her as persons with "nervous breakdowns" were treated in centuries past; we can throw her into the figurative snakepit of world politics, treating her as an insane and predatory creature, an outlaw with whom there can be no accommodation. On the other hand, we can treat China by the more civilized standards deriving from our modern understanding of human behavior; while resisting any aggressive act she commits, we can at the same time treat China as a respected member of the world community now going through a period of dangerous chauvinism and warranting our best efforts to rehabilitate her to the world community.

I hope that America will make the second choice. I hope that in its attitude toward China, America will act with the magnanimity that befits a great nation by following the advice of Pope Paul, who said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly: "Your vocation is to make brothers not only of some, but of all peoples, a difficult undertaking, indeed; but this it is, your most noble undertaking. * * * We will go further, and say: strive to bring back among you any who have separated themselves and study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood, in honor and loyalty, those who do not yet share in it."

The hatred of the Chinese Communists for America is something more than the normal political hostility of one nation toward another whose policies thwart the realization of its ambitions. America is hated as the leading Nation of the West, as the center and purveyor of a civilization which has had a devastating effect on China and subjected it to such humiliations as few great nations in history have undergone. I am inclined to the view that China's irrational and hostile behavior has a great deal to do with ancient grievances and that the Chinese regard their quarrel with America not only as an ideological struggle but also as an ultimate historical reckoning for China's humiliations during the past century at the hands of Western nations.

It is impossible in a few words to describe the deep and bitter humiliation inflicted upon the Chinese, a great and civilized people, by imperialist nations, including Russia and, to a degree, America. Something of its flavor, however, can be gotten from a young Chinese engineer's account of his return

from Europe to China in 1913 with his Belgian wife and son. Referring to his arrival in Shanghai, where Western interests owned the hotels, restaurants, and other public facilities, he wrote:

"In Shanghai it was agony, for there it was only too plain that in my own country I was nothing but an inferior, despised being. There were parks and restaurants and hotels I could not enter, although she could. I had no rights on the soil of a Chinese city which did not belong to the Chinese; she had rights by reason of something called skin."

"We boarded the English steamer from Shanghai to Hankow; the first class was for Europeans only, and there was no other steamer. Marguerite leaned her arms on the railings and stared at the river. She was in first class, with our son. I went second class. I had insisted it should be so. 'It is too hot for you here below.'"

Today China stands isolated, mistrustful and hostile toward the outside world. Her illustrious history of 4,000 years has contributed to the view of herself as a superior civilization set upon by hostile barbarians. In the wake of so tragic and unique a national experience, one can hardly be sanguine about immediate prospects for drawing China into the community of nations as a trustworthy and responsible partner. A great deal is at stake, however, and it would be tragic folly if we did not do what little we can to rehabilitate China to the world community. The West, to be sure, must defend itself against irrational and aggressive Chinese behavior, but in the long run we can only hope to be safe in the world with a powerful and dynamic China by drawing her out of isolation. Treated with friendliness and respect, China may be brought in time to see that the "barbarians" of the West are in fact less barbaric than they seem.

As Secretary General U Thant pointed out, China is going through a difficult period; it befits us as a great nation to act upon this fact with understanding and magnanimity. If we can bring ourselves to do so, we will be on the way to a solution of the great problems that beset us in eastern Asia. The prospects for an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam have everything to do with China and its relations with the outside world, because China is the greatest nation of Asia. It is not within our power to make it otherwise, but it is within our power to repair some of the damage done by the arrogance and condescension of the past.

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this country has been plagued with a serious boxcar shortage for several years. This problem is now reaching crisis proportions.

The crisis is most severe in the great grain producing areas of the Midwest and the lumber producing regions of the Northwest. However, the shortage has become so pressing that all sections of the country are beginning to suffer.

There is now a current daily shortage of around 14,000 plain boxcars. And, Mr. President, we have not yet entered the heavy demand period which begins with the commencement of the wheat harvest in June and extends through the corn harvest this fall.

I have had letters and telegrams from flour millers and grain elevator operators in Kansas telling of the hardships these shortages are causing. Several flour mills in Kansas are already being forced to periodically close down operations because of the unavailability of boxcars.

April 6, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7541

PROPHETIC LETTER FROM
VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently, my administrative assistant, Lee Williams, and I received a rather remarkable letter from a constituent of mine who was in Vietnam. The letter is dated last January 13 and was mailed from Bangkok. Since late developments in Vietnam indicate further deterioration of the situation I think this letter takes on a prophetic light.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

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

BANGKOK, THAILAND,
January 13, 1966.

DEAR LEE AND SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is a strange sort of salutation, I know, but although it is a bit cliché to mention it, I have never ever written a letter expressing my views to a newspaper, an editor, or a public official, and I have no intention of starting now; it always struck me as a bit presumptuous. So please let it take the form of what it is, a personal letter to you, Lee, and if you care to show it to the Senator or feel that it deserves his attention, do so.

Please permit me to be egomaniacal enough to comment on my observations in Vietnam. The old Wilsonian gambit of 14 points seems to be fashionable again, so here are an arbitrary 14 impressions received in Saigon where I talked intensively to over 200 people from colonels to privates, journalists and businessmen, Vietnamese, and English and French colonials. Here is what I found:

1. The war is not only not going well, the situation is worse than is reported in the press and worse, I believe, that is indicated in intelligence reports; I have had intelligence officers admit as much to me privately.

2. The kill ratio is, to be sure, in our favor, but the nature of the war is such that it would be most difficult to ascertain objectively what it is. And the formula used to arrive at casualty figures on either side are so esoteric as to resemble Italian bridge bidding conventions or Mr. Gallup's strange techniques of adjusting his polling results to be congruent with earlier assumed hypotheses. So "moderate" and "heavy" casualties are not only meaningless; so are the weekly totals of K.I.A. I would rather explain privately why this is so.

3. The kill ratio is irrelevant anyway. Were it 20 to 1, which it is not, the American military posture would not be, necessarily, substantially enhanced.

4. In one aspect, the number of U.S. military personnel is irrelevant. Since most are literally confined in closely guarded compounds, protected by moat-like defenses of concertina-wire and incessant barrages of U.S. artillery and 85- and 105-millimeter mortar fire, there is no necessary relationship; per se, between the bigness of these bastions in personnel and their security.

5. Although there is, to be sure, much to be said for the tactical advantages of a U.S. buildup if necessary, one obvious disadvantage is that we have beyond doubt greatly increased the number of possible targets for the enemy to strike at. Not only by airstrike, should events lead to that tragic eventuality, but by ground attack as well. So it is quite conceivable that we have created a certain potential vulnerability to sudden heavy losses via the sudden raid, the hidden plastic bomb, etc.

6. There is a general, although not universal, "gung ho" spirit among enlisted personnel, NCO's, and lower and middle-ranking officers, particularly in combat areas, morale is unbelievably high and sincere. There is something about combat that produces this—a messianic attitude of anger. This is not an unmixed blessing. It can lead to dangerous complacency and overconfidence. In addition to which it impairs the effectiveness of the avowed policy of the "pacification" of the South Vietnamese people, which is now most difficult at best. It is strange to talk to these men in the field who are against any cease-fire, any even temporary cessation of hostilities, and who talk blithely of remaining for 10 years and wanting to die there if necessary (sic)—and then to talk to colonels in Saigon who know the fields as well and who are infinitely more pessimistic, more cynical, and more realistic. One colonel who is most erudite (there is such a breed of officer, believe it or not) told me, "If there is a God, and he is very kind to us, and given a million men and give years and a miracle in making the South Vietnamese people like us, we stand an outside chance of a stalemate." These are harsh and bitter words, and I prefer to regard his remark as hyperbole, but there is considerable evidence that he may be stating the situation realistically.

7. There has never been an adequate picture painted of the tragic fruits of generations of French misrule. Vietnam is dotted with magnificent old French colonial mansions which serve as reminders of a dispensation which did nothing but suppress, which provided no education beyond the primary grades, which insulted a national dignity in countless ways. These mansions are inhabited by American officers now; I have been in several, and it's a nice life, indeed. But make no mistake about it: deservedly or not, we are now the inheritors of the French mantle. We are Westerners, the outsider, the alien. To the leftists, we are villains; to the rightists we are fools (even if, out of temporary self-interest, we are allies). Left or right, there are very few South Vietnamese indeed who do not hate the shadows that remain of the Navarres and the Salans and who do not inwardly cheer at the memory of Dienbienphu.

8. So, as a consequence, any fancied similarities between Vietnam today and the problems of pacification of the Japanese people during the occupation are absurd. Too, any analogy between Vietnam and Korea is equally absurd. There we have a relatively conventional war; here we have none. There we had a battle line most of the time; here we have none. There we had a relatively defensible terrain; here we have none, there we had a people who had some faith, however misplaced, in the prospects for an eventual American victory; here we lack even that.

9. There is little understanding in the United States of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Vietcong tax collection methods throughout South Vietnam. They need money badly and they get it. They get it from individuals and they get it from businesses. They get it from the Vietnamese, from the French, and they get it on occasion from the Americans. Take a prominent hotel. It is French-owned, and common knowledge that they pay "rent" or what in the Capone era we called "protection money" to the VC. They are not fools. They want to avoid the fate of the Metropole Hotel. Officers and journalists of all nations like to drink on its comfortable terrace. As a U.S. intelligence colonel put it to me over a martini there, "You know, it's damned nice to be able to drink with impunity." It is no secret, and you have seen it in the press, that on more than one occasion Standard Oil has had to pay tolls to the VC to get U.S. gasoline through to our own forces. The VC has felt

that money would do them more good than our gasoline would do them harm, and they are probably right.

10. This whole problem of blackmail to buy off terrorists leads us to the point of terrorism itself as a modus vivendi of modern insurgency. It is effective; it is cheap in cost; it is demoralizing. It has convinced hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese who would otherwise (for selfish, not ideological, reasons) be for us of the prudence of "playing both sides." And an extremely high proportion do "play both sides." The VC has a new trick in Saigon: a hand grenade with the detonating lever (spring loaded) taped down with ordinary Scotch tape; the pin is pulled; the grenade is gently dropped in the gas tank of a truck; in a matter of time, depending on how much tape is wrapped around the lever, the gas dissolves the adhesive on the tape; the bomb explodes with far greater effectiveness because of the gasoline. The weapon is cheap, simple, imaginative, and effective. Best of all, it can be inconspicuously deposited in a gasoline tank at night by any teenager. (The bomb that almost got us was tossed by a 15-year-old boy.)

11. The sad fact is that the ARVN's (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) are pretty generally ineffective. True, they die, sometimes with heroism, and I do not mean to denigrate the quality of their sacrifice when it is made. But wars have a way of being won by the living, not by the dead. Corruption and inefficiency have been complicating factors. A greater problem is the fact that most lieutenants and captains of experience have been killed off. The Ky regime has a tendency to look for new cadre and combat officers from the ranks of an educated class; they are loathe to promote a country boy of demonstrated leadership ability under combat conditions. Having an elite class of educated officers is all very well, but lieutenants have a notoriously high attrition rate in combat, as we discovered in Korea, and it is getting increasingly difficult to find South Vietnamese officers who have been schooled in Switzerland.

12. Many old hands in Saigon, who know far more about it than I, are convinced that the VC could step up systematic terrorism tenfold if they should so desire. A multiplicity of factors reluctantly impel me to the same conclusion. There has been a suspicious restraint about not bombing some targets which are more than inviting to them, surely. One reason, of course, is public opinion. But there is more to it than that. There is more than a little evidence that some of this restraint has been out of a conviction that some obvious targets will be needed as soon as they are captured. At any rate, we just literally could be sitting on a bomb so far as increased terrorism is concerned.

13. May I mention for a moment our consistent failure to use psychological warfare to an advantage. As you know, I believe passionately in the power of words, and I am more than aware of the human tendency to overrate those things in which we are most interested. But I believe that words and ideas are very substantial and tangible things indeed. The effectiveness of the VC soldier, frequently clothed in a loincloth, barefoot, hungry with but little stale rice, demonstrates to what lengths a man will fight with great dedication on a diet of words. Ho Chi Minh has traveled very far on a road paved with words like "freedom" and "liberty." Yet an American colonel I know, a good leader whose men have had a frightful casualty rate (up to 40 percent in some units), had to fight to get one old loud-speaker to use to speak to the VC at night when they surround his camp and come up close. He also uses a hand-held transistorized megaphone. This program has been

instituted at his own initiative, with no cooperation from officialdom. Yet it has netted a couple of dozen defections recently. I think this is an enterprising officer. More has been done recently, but still little. Forgive me for overemphasizing this, but it is one symptom of our singular obsession with the use of force. I question both our original involvement and the deepening of our commitment. But so long as we are there it would seem vitally incumbent that we speak and speak with sincerity to these people, and not in terms of defending them against communism, either, which, rightly or wrongly, strikes most of them as a bit silly.

To those of us who believe that America has a message to proclaim or, if you will, a "product" to "sell," the failure to do so seems hard to explain.

To countless millions America has stood as a shining example of a nation that is basically revolutionary. This has been true for generations, and, thankfully, is still true today to our admirers, and we have many. We have been revolutionary not only because we were cast from the cauldron of revolt, we have been revolutionary politically, ideologically, technologically. Paine and Jefferson and Lincoln (the latter is a big name in Asia, by the way, even among people who dislike us) were but the first in a long line of iconoclasts to which some would add the name FORERUNNER. The mass-production of Whitney and later Ford have had a more profound effect upon the masses of agrarian societies than have most Marxists. From vaccination to the vacuum tube, from Singer's sewingmachine to the self-starter, from telegraphy to the transistor, from movies to mechanized farming, and from the Founding Fathers to Fulbright scholarships, America has been the great destroyer of the embodiment old and the great builder of the beautiful new. To most of the underdeveloped nations of the world, Edison will still outsell Lenin any day of the week if the product is properly packaged. If not, then Lenin may fill the void. At any rate, America has always stood, thank God, not for slow mutation, but for sudden and violent change, and for anything but the status quo. How infinitely sad it is that when many nations cried out for sudden emergence, we chose to issue patrician policy statements from State on stability. It is fundamental in the affairs of men that when you see the imminent and inevitable death of an ancient regime, that you go to the funeral, but you are amiable to the heirs and do not sit forever holding hands with the corpse in necrophilial devotion.

Sorry to dwell on this point.

11. Finally, this is something that is distasteful and impolitic to write, but it needs saying. Before I do let me reassure you that I am for victory if possible and have always, of course, wanted to prevent the spread of communism to any area because of its monolithic nature and denial of the right to the pluralistic society that I hope will be the universal destiny of all mankind. Having said that, here is the sad truth: Father Ho is a great leader who I happen to believe with considerable evidence is more admired in the south than any other Vietnamese. Were a plebiscite to be held today, he would still win resoundingly over Bao Dai, or the late Ngo Dinh Diem—or, yes, even Premier Ky. Ho, the former cook at the Carlton in London is so strong with the peasant that ever were he to be killed, his posthumous influence as a living legend would sharply imperil our interests. Numerous very loyal American commanders have admitted as much to me privately. Expressed as a simple syllogism, it comes out like this: (1) It is fundamental and I believe generally conceded that we cannot win the war without the Vietnamese people; (2) in view of the force and magnitude of Ho's appeal and of the limited and diffuse nature of our own

appeal as liberators, it is highly questionable whether we can ever get more than token support, and that largely the result of our money; (3) ergo, it is highly questionable whether we can ever have victory.

Conclusions: As to solutions, I have none, and do not pretend to. But having just returned from there, I am very frightened. I could talk about bright spots; there are many. I do not think they override the stark, terrifying realities of a stalemate, at best, purchased at inconceivable cost and coupled with humiliating setbacks and losses. Then always, and I do not say this lightly, there is the unlikely but ever-present possibility of catastrophe. The road from Valley Forge to Vietnam has been a long one, and the analogy is more than alliterative; there are some similarities, only this time we are the British and they are barefoot. Too long have we taken our invincibility for granted.

Ho Chi Minh is not only the translator (into Vietnamese) of the tactics of Mao Tse-tung; he has gone beyond Maoist tactics and usual concepts of insurgency. His classic metaphor should be taken seriously: that the people are the sea, and the Vietcong are the fish that swim within the sea, omnipresent, clandestine, invisible.

I once again know of no easy solutions and were I gifted with such apocalyptic inspirations I would not presume to advise others. But if I had the responsibility to make the decision—and I am thankful I do not—I believe I would take a couple of drinks and then agree, covertly probably, to direct negotiations with the Vietcong (which we have not yet agreed to) and possibly consider major concessions with regard to Hanoi's third point.

By the time you read this, the world will probably know the answer as to the success or failure of the President's peace offensive, which has been theatrically impressive to most of the world's press (including the Asian). But in view of the deteriorating American situation I have just seen there, I cannot view with optimism the likelihood of immediate peace without further compromises.

In short, I would rather America err on the side of being overly generous than on the side of military miscalculation of inconceivable cost.

For what, the world might well ask should we win the gamble, have we won?

Glad to be able to say hello and talk about all the things that I cannot broadcast about to someone who is openminded enough to understand the difficulty of our position and that it is not necessarily un-American to ask questions about what is wisdom or have doubts about destiny or wonder about the world.

Warm regards,

PUBLIUS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., ADDS A MAJOR LEAGUE HOCKEY TEAM TO ITS BIG LEAGUE SPORTS GALAXY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, St. Louis, Mo., is proud of its Cardinals baseball and football teams and its Hawks basketball team.

To this big league sports galaxy has now been added what I am sure will be bright new star; namely, a major league hockey team.

The new team is named for a song synonymous with Missouri's largest city, the St. Louis Blues. Its home will be the Arena, scene of many ice extravaganzas.

St. Louis and the National Hockey League are both fortunate that the Missouri city was the final selection in a six-team expansion of the league which also

added Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Pittsburgh to the league.

Mr. William Jennings, president of the New York Rangers hockey team and chairman of the league's expansion committee, announced that selection of St. Louis was unanimously approved by the league.

In welcoming St. Louis into major league hockey, he also stated that he felt the St. Louis group which was awarded the franchise is outstanding.

Knowing these men personally, I certainly agree with Mr. Jennings' assessment of them, and I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who could not be present today because of official duties as a representative of the Senate at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and who is on a study visit to the NATO countries, would also agree.

President of the St. Louis Blues is Mr. Sidney Salomon, Jr., president of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates. Board members are Mr. Robert Wolfson, chairman of the board of GEM International; Mr. Sidney Salomon III, of Sidney Salomon, Jr. & Associates and a member of the Missouri State Athletic Commission; Mr. James R. James, Jr., chairman of the board of the Clayton Bank; Mr. Preston Estep, chairman of the board of the Bank of St. Louis; Mr. Elliott Stein, president of Church, Stein & Franc; Mr. John Sout, president of Fruin-Calton Construction Co.; Mr. Stanley H. Rosenzweig, chairman of the board of Electronic Wholesales, Inc., and Mr. Louis Menk, president of the Burlington Railroad Co.

The addition of major league hockey should contribute substantially to the sports boom in St. Louis which is keyed to the huge new Busch Memorial Stadium which opens this year on the riverfront.

It rounds out a major league sports program for a major league town which is observing its 200th anniversary.

AID FOR DROUGHT-STRIKEN INDIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud as an American to hear President Johnson's response to Mrs. Gandhi's worldwide appeal for help for her drought-stricken nation.

The President has responded in the humanitarian traditions of this Nation, and I feel privileged to pledge him my support of this far-reaching program to assist our sister democracy.

It is tragic and ironic that a nation which has done so much to help itself must now be halted in its truly impressive economic progress by a natural disaster.

We are told that the drought which has struck India is the worst the world has seen since our own water-starved years of the early thirties.

India's appeal to the world for aid to survive this disaster is a justified appeal, and I was pleased to hear the President couple his pledge of generous aid from this country with an appeal to other nations of the world to contribute the maximum they can in food, in fertilizers, in

April 6, 1966

7566

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
April 6, 1966.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on the amendments to the Social Security Act reported out by the House Committee on Ways and Means, which are to be considered as amendments to H.R. 6319. The Department supports the amendments recommended by the House committee.

We trust that the Senate will be able to act on this legislation as promptly as possible. We strongly urge the adoption of this legislation as amended.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House and that the bill as agreed to be immediately sent to the White House, so that elderly persons who were unable to file for medical coverage by the March 31 deadline will have a further opportunity to file.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has just mentioned, the 60-day extension was recommended by the Committee on Finance. The House accepted that amendment, as I understand, but with an amendment that should a State desire to make contributions to take care of persons who are on social security, or who are receiving public assistance and are not able financially to pay for it, the State, of its own volition, may make those payments.

Mr. SMATHERS. The understanding of the Senator from Kansas is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I think that is a good amendment. I heartily approve it. I hope it will be unanimously approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate. The motion was agreed to.

Vietnam—ADDRESS BY SENATOR
DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT AIR
FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO
SPRINGS, COLO., MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a week ago today the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] delivered what I believe is a very important speech before the Air Force Academy, in Colorado Springs. His speech is entitled, "The Meaning of Vietnam." With his usual flare for forthrightness, forcefulness, and accuracy, the Senator from Connecticut analyzed what the United States is doing in Vietnam and what the problems are, including the problems that arise from the dissension we see in our own country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well thought through speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., Wednesday, March 30, 1966)

Your invitation to address this assembly of the Air Force Academy is an honor which means very much to me.

We are today involved in a worldwide battle with an enemy ever whit as evil and every whit as ruthless as the Nazis. How long this struggle will endure no prudent man can today predict. But it is clear that the very survival of freedom depends on the outcome of the critical battles which are today being fought and which are bound to be fought on many fronts over the years to come.

In these battles, you, as graduates of the Air Force Academy will play a role of signal importance.

Ever since the Battle of Britain, the men who fly have made contributions and suffered sacrifices that are out of all proportion to their actual number.

The future years, I am afraid, are pregnant with heavy responsibilities for all of you. I know that you will not shrink from these responsibilities. I am certain that you will accept them gladly, in the spirit of those who have gone before you.

After all the nonsense that has been spoken by the critics of our Vietnam policy, it is a most refreshing experience to be here with you today.

Here there are no faint hearts, no divided counsels, no tortured self-doubting, no appeasement masquerading as something noble and humanitarian.

You understand that Vietnam is a testing ground and that the outcome of the battle now being fought there may determine for centuries to come the fate of our country and of all mankind.

You understand—as the critics of our Vietnam policy fail to understand—that peace can never be assured by timidity or appeasement or retreat, and that freedom cannot survive unless we who enjoy its blessings are prepared to stand up to Communist aggression, and to match the Communists in dedication and ardor and sacrifice.

You understand that if we fail to hold the line against Communist aggression in Vietnam, we will be faced on the morrow by a dozen Vietnam crises in various parts of the world.

You understand, in short, that, in the complex world in which we live, freedom is indivisible and that our unrivaled strength as a nation imposes on us the responsibility of assisting every nation, great and small, that seeks to maintain its independence in the face of Communist aggression.

Although I know I do not have to convince you of all these things, I want to address my remarks today to a few of the many arguments that have been advanced against our Vietnam policy.

1. THE PACIFISTS

First of all, there are the pacifists, who oppose our intervention in Vietnam because they hold that it is wrong to kill under any circumstances. While the ideal of pacifism may be an admirable thing when regarded abstractly, I frankly fail to understand how any intelligent man can seek to apply this abstract ideal to the world of politics.

To be truly consistent, a pacifist would have to abjure violence of all kinds, not merely in the relations between nations, but

in his personal relations with his fellow man. And this kind of truly consistent pacifism, in my opinion, is virtually nonexistent.

How many pacifists for example would consider it their duty to stand idly by if some maniac embarked on a berserk orgy of killing in the streets? And how many pacifists, in their devotion to nonviolence, would limit themselves to simple remonstrance if they saw some criminal assault their wives?

The harsh fact is that, as much as we may abhor violence and love peace, there are situations in the relations between nations, just as there are situations in our everyday lives, when the employment of violence becomes a moral imperative in the defense of life and liberty.

It was so when the free world mobilized its resources to meet the threat of Nazi aggression. It was so in the Korean war. And it is so in Vietnam again today.

2. THE FRAUDULENT PACIFISTS

But even more numerous and more confused than the pacifists are those fraudulent pacifists who supported the war against Hitler, but who now lecture us on the wickedness of resorting to force in Vietnam. As Prof. John Roche, former president of Americans for Democratic Action, has pointed out, the true pacifist is precluded by his beliefs from having any favorite wars.

3. THE FRIENDS OF THE VIETCONG

Then there are those critics of our Vietnam policy who are so bemused by the word "revolution" that they tend to sympathize, openly or covertly, with the Vietcong, regarding them as bearers of social and political progress who truly reflect the aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

I can understand a Communist sympathizing with the Vietcong, because this is the attitude to which his perverted philosophy inevitably leads him. But I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the attitude of those non-Communists who, on the one hand, damn the Saigon government as reactionary and, on the other hand concede the banner of progress to the Vietcong.

If progress means anything, it should mean the betterment of the human lot, the progressive expansion of freedom and justice, and the rejection of force as an instrument of national policy.

Accepting these criteria of progress, the Communist regimes in every country would have to be put down as among the most reactionary in history.

Wherever they have come to power they have obliterated every vestige of human freedom, regimented every aspect of the lives of the people, and massacred hundreds of thousands of opponents and imprisoned many more.

On top of this, the incentive desert which characterizes Communist rule has everywhere resulted in reduced food production and in a lowered standard of living.

And, finally, communism is the total antithesis of progress because of its commitment to subversion and aggression.

But just as there were many people who once assured us that the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers, there are those who today insist on regarding the Vietcong as progressives, or as true revolutionaries.

4. THOSE WHO SAY WE CANNOT WIN

Then there are those who have no illusions about the nature of the Vietcong, but who hold that we cannot possibly police the world. They tell us that we are already overextended and overcommitted; that southeast Asia is too remote to be of immediate concern to us; that the security of the United States does not stand or fall with Vietnam or southeast Asia; and that the Vietnam war, in any case, is one we cannot possibly win.

April 6, 1966

7565

as soon as the votes are in and counted. mation about the outcome of an election.

I have no objection to the reporting of partial returns as the ballots are counted or after the polls are closed.

I do not object in any way to the manner in which the various newspapers, wire services, and radio and television networks cover the news about the outcome of elections, because I think they do a good job of informing people of the results.

I do not feel the communications media should withhold information.

I do feel that we can make our presidential election process more fair for both political parties and all candidates by establishing a uniform closing time for all polling places.

If the advance reporting of results convinces great numbers of people that the outcome is a foregone conclusion, it influences citizens who have not voted.

There are some who would not vote because they are faced with considerable difficulty getting to the polls, and they think their vote would not make any difference.

They might be factory workers who are tired after a long day on the job, housewives who would have to go to the expense of hiring a babysitter so they could go vote or farmers who would have to drive some distance to the polls.

People who plan to work for a candidate as long as the polls are open tend to let up when they are told their candidate already has lost, or does not have a chance.

Then there are great numbers of people who respect the opinion of the majority. They conclude that if the majority decides a certain way, the majority probably is right and therefore they will cast their vote with the majority.

Thus, when people are told the election is decided before the polls are closed, and become convinced of it, there is interference with the right of people to vote freely and independently. In short, it amounts to unfair campaigning.

My proposed legislation would require all polls in the United States to close at the same time for the election of electors for President and Vice President and for the election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

It would take effect with the election of 1968 and would apply to every presidential election after that.

The closing time would be 9 p.m. in the eastern standard zone, 8 p.m. in the central standard zone, 7 p.m. in the mountain standard zone, 6 p.m. in the Pacific standard zone, 5 p.m. in the Yukon standard zone, 4 p.m. in the Alaska-Hawaii standard zone and 3 p.m. in the Bering standard zone.

I am not unaware that this calls for a rather early closing in Alaska and Hawaii. I believe, however, that we are faced with a serious national problem and that the national interest must prevail. The fact that the bill would not become effective until 1968 would not only give the State legislatures an opportunity to act next year, but it would give a long time to advertise this change.

It must also be borne in mind that a good portion of the important business of the country is transacted during limited hours, such as banking and business at a post office window and paying taxes. And, of course, there is no Federal law proposed as to how early the polls could be opened.

The voters who reside where Pacific standard time prevails or in the Yukon time zone, or in Alaska or Hawaii or in the Bering time zone, have a right to cast their vote without the problem that arises when voters feel that the election is over and their vote will be of no avail.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on H.R. 6319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries, which was read, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. TWO-MONTH EXTENSION OF INITIAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

"(a) The first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended (1) by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966', and (2) by striking out 'March 31, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 31, 1966'.

"(b) Section 1837(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out 'January 1, 1966' and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1966'.

"(c) Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1966' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 1, 1966'.

"(d) In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a) (2) (D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

"SEC. 4. COVERAGE, UNDER STATE AGREEMENTS, OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS ENTITLED TO SOCIAL SECURITY OR RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS.

"(a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

"Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937."

"(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the re-

quest of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into which such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

"(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

"(A) subsections (c) and (d) (2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)),

"(B) subsection (d) (3) (B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

"(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month)."

"(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as a member of a coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d)."

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of aforesaid bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, both the House and the Senate have agreed to the principal features of the bill. They relate to the tax treatment of expropriation loss recoveries. The chairman of the Committee on Finance, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long], explained these provisions in considerable detail when the bill was before the Senate on April 1. There is no reason to repeat the explanation of the tax features at this time.

In addition, no change has been made in the basic part of the bill as it passed the Senate at that time or in the bill as it passed the House.

An amendment added to the bill by the Senate extends the period for enrolling under part B of medicare for 2 months—from March 31 until May 31.

The House has agreed to the Senate amendment with technical modifications designed to facilitate medical insurance coverage of elderly persons who are receiving both social security benefits and public assistance. We have examined the House amendment and believe it is in keeping with the Senate provision. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that it, too, approves the House amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

April 6, 1966

I have always replied to these critics, by first of all getting them to agree—as they invariably will do—that it is necessary to draw a line somehow, somewhere, against the further advance of Communist imperialism.

I then remind them that, as remote as southeast Asia may appear to be, Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal and the Solomon Islands were equally remote.

And finally, I ask them where they propose to draw the line if Vietnam should fall.

For let there be no mistake about it: If we fall in Vietnam, through our own weakness or through the weakness of our Vietnamese allies, it will be exceedingly difficult to draw an effective line against the advance of communism anywhere in the Far East.

As for the argument that this is a war we cannot fight and cannot win, I say that we are fighting this war exceedingly well, that we have succeeded in seizing the initiative and holding it, and that we have already begun to win.

The American soldiers have shown an amazing ability to adapt themselves to guerrilla warfare.

The concept of air cavalry, which had never before been tried in battle, has given us a mobility that constantly confounds the enemy. It has enabled us to confine the insurgency with a manpower advantage of less than 3 to 1, compared with the figure of 10 and 15 to 1 which had heretofore been considered essential in dealing with guerrilla uprisings.

Our air arm has devised new tactics to deal with every type of contingency, and these tactics are constantly being refined.

Our commanding officers have succeeded in coordinating land, sea, and air power in a manner never before achieved in this kind of warfare—and the indications are that the Vietcong are still groping for a way to deal with this awesome orchestration of military power.

The morale of our forces is high. Indeed, from all accounts I have heard, I do not think it has ever been higher in any war. They know why they are in Vietnam. They are genuinely fond of the Vietnamese people. And their proficiency in antiguerrilla operations improves with each passing month.

On the other side, the difficulties of the Vietcong have grown by leaps and bounds.

Because they are scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel in the areas under their control, they have been obliged to accept massive support from regular North Vietnamese army units, which have been crossing into South Vietnam at the rate of 4,000 to 5,000 a month.

This accretion of northern manpower has serious disadvantages as well as advantages for the Vietcong.

The South Vietnamese have always disliked and resented the North Vietnamese. The large-scale entrance of regular units of the North Vietnamese army into the battle for South Vietnam, has alienated many of the peasants and has produced serious friction between the North Vietnamese regulars and the South Vietnamese guerrillas. It has also greatly increased the logistical problems of the enemy, so that our airmen more frequently discover enemy convoys and our armed forces more frequently uncover Vietcong stores of food and ammunition.

There are many evidences of deteriorating Vietcong morale.

The rate of defection from the Vietcong has now risen to almost 2,000 per month. And whereas intelligence was previously difficult to come by, there is now a massive and increasing flow of intelligence from areas under Vietcong control.

So, while the road ahead may still be long and difficult, there is every reason to believe that the situation in Vietnam will continue to improve, until ultimately the Communists will be obliged to abandon their aggression—as the Greek Communists were

once compelled to abandon their insurgency and as the Huk guerrillas at a later date were obliged to do in the Philippines.

So much for the argument that we are overextended and that we cannot possibly win the war in Vietnam.

5. THE APPEASERS

Then there are the appeasers, who urge us to be reasonable with the Communists and to be prepared to compromise with them, just as the appeasers of pre-Munich days insisted that peace could only be preserved if we were prepared to compromise with the Nazis.

I know that they resent being called appeasers—but then, if my memory serves me, Neville Chamberlain and the Clivdon set in Britain regarded themselves as exceedingly virtuous human beings and repudiated with equal vehemence the charge that they were appeasers.

The essence of modern appeasement is the attempt to purchase peace with aggressive dictatorial regimes by making concessions to them at the expense of other peoples. And in this sense, I see absolutely no moral or political difference between those who in 1939 urged that we placate Hitler by giving him part of Czechoslovakia, and those who today urge that we seek to placate the Vietcong by making significant concessions to them.

As Gen. Maxwell Taylor said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "How does one compromise the freedom of 15 million people?"

6. THE QUESTION OF A COALITION GOVERNMENT

The most common form of appeasement at this juncture in our national Vietnam debate is the proposal that we enter into negotiations with the Vietcong for the purpose of establishing a coalition government with their participation.

I find it difficult to believe that those who have made this proposal have studied the record of coalition governments between Communists and no-Communists, or have given adequate thought to the implications of their proposal or to its potential consequences.

First of all, I would like to answer the argument that our refusal to envisage this kind of solution places us in the position of demanding unconditional surrender from the Communists.

All we have ever asked of the Communists is that they call off their aggression against the people of South Vietnam.

We demand no reparations, nor does the Government of South Vietnam.

We seek no territory.

We ask no political conditions.

We have not even asked that North Vietnam permit the holding of free elections in its territory, in return for the holding of free elections in South Vietnam.

And while we demand nothing, we offer much.

I am certain, for example, that the South Vietnamese Government would be prepared to consent to a general amnesty covering all those who have participated in the Vietcong insurrection.

I say that I am certain of this because such an amnesty would simply represent an extension of the Chieu Hol program, under which all Vietcong who come over to the government side are automatically granted amnesty.

The combination of a general amnesty and the promise of a free election at an early date would enable members of the Vietcong movement to test their true degree of popular support by competing for elected office.

Beyond this, we have on our own side publicly committed ourselves to bring North Vietnam into the Mekong River development plan so that she may benefit from the tremendous potentialities that will be un-

leashed through the harnessing of the Mekong River.

If words have any meaning at all, I do not see how these terms could, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as "unconditional surrender." On the contrary, I can recall no war in which terms as generous as this have been offered to those guilty of aggression—and this in advance of any negotiations.

Those who say that anything less than an offer of a coalition government constitutes a demand for unconditional surrender are, whether they realize this or not, demanding a settlement that is tantamount to surrender by our side.

Even if we could talk our South Vietnamese allies into accepting a coalition government with the Communists, there is little reason for believing that such a solution would put an end to the fighting in South Vietnam—and there is much reason for fearing that it would turn South Vietnam over to complete communist control in very short order.

I recall that we used our influence in the postwar period to persuade our friends in the central European countries to enter into coalitions with the Communists. In every instance, the outcome was disastrous.

Let there be no mistake about it: If we endeavor to overrule the instincts and wishes of our South Vietnamese allies by forcing a "coalition government" solution down their throats, we will not receive the cooperation of a single self-respecting Vietnamese leader.

If despite this, we were to persist in this folly, we would wind up with a so-called coalition government which, apart from the Vietcong, would include only a handful of second- and third-rate opportunists, of whom the Communists would make short shrift.

Such a coalition government would turn out to be a Vietcong government virtually from the word "go."

I implore those sincere Americans who are advocating a coalition government in Vietnam to rethink the implications of their proposal.

I implore them also to give some thought to the fact that all this talk of recognizing the Vietcong and of forcing a coalition government on Vietnam encourages the Vietcong to persist, while it strikes dismay into the hearts of our Vietnamese allies.

I implore them to consider what the verdict of history will be if their recommendations should prevail and if the Communists should then take over, as they have done in so many other countries where we have played the perilous game of coalition government.

There are certain issues on which we can compromise and certain issues on which we cannot compromise.

We cannot compromise on the principle that aggression must never be rewarded. Because I take this stand, I repudiate with all my strength the suggestion that we should seek peace in South Vietnam by offering the Communists half the country or half control over its government.

On a moral level I consider this proposal tantamount to suggesting that we purchase peace with the American underworld by permitting them to legally retain a portion of the loot they have obtained by criminal means, or by giving them representation in our Government.

As there can be no compromise with crime, there can be no compromise with aggression.

As much as I may disagree with them, I believe that the critics of our Vietnam policy have performed a public service by raising the question of a coalition government at this time. They have helped to clear the air of rumors that such a solution was being given sympathetic consideration by the administration.

The ringing declarations of Vice President HUMPHREY, of Under Secretary Ball, of Mr. McGeorge Bundy, and of other key members

7568

of the administration team, have established beyond the possibility of doubt that the Johnson administration has understood the bitter lesson to be drawn from the experience with coalition governments in the postwar period.

The administration has made it clear to friend and foe alike that it will not abandon its commitment to the people of South Vietnam, that it will not buy peace through any dishonest or equivocal formula which compromises the position of our allies, and that it will not yield to the clamor of the tiny misguided minority who demand that we pull out of Vietnam.

If the Communists think otherwise, then they have gravely misread both the history and the present temper of the American people.

I wish to close with a quotation from Winston Churchill which I never tire of repeating.

During the dark days of the Battle of Britain, Churchill took time off from his duties to address the boys of his old school, Harrow. This was his message to them:

"Never give in. Never, never, never. Never yield to force and the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy. Never yield in any way, great or small, large or petty, except to convictions of honor and good sense."

The American people, and especially our Vietnam critics, would do well to take this advice to heart today.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR HON. LESLIE BIFFLE, FORMER SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the funeral services for Hon. Leslie Biffle, former Secretary of the Senate, will be at 11 o'clock a.m. on Saturday, April 9, 1966, in the Bethlehem Chapel of the National Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul. Burial will be private at Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1022, Senate Joint Resolution 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, debate on the proposed constitutional amendment will not start until the Senate returns from its Easter recess, which will be 1 week from today.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 7, 1966, at 9 o'clock a.m.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 16, 1966, of Wayne A. Wray to be postmaster at Barnes, in the State of Kansas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1966:

POSTMASTER

ALABAMA

Otis H. Moore, Jr., Sterrett.
Bessie J. Bragg, Ward.

ALASKA

Maudrey J. Sommer, Tanana.

CALIFORNIA

William R. Lackey, Bass Lake.
Paul J. Lay, Beaumont.
Shirley E. Ames, Bodega Bay.
Earl O. Good, Jr., Fullerton.
Irma L. Wylly, Jacumba.
Dorothy E. Birkhead, Morro Bay.
Carl L. Backlund, Torrance.
Betty J. Raper, Westend.

COLORADO

Rallin R. Gibson, Collbran.
Harry N. Pearson, Ignacio.

CONNECTICUT

Julia A. Wharton, Colebrook.
Edward W. Gray, Riverton.
Manuel W. Vetti, Stamford.

FLORIDA

James F. Myers, Casselberry.
James F. Bridges, Jr., Fort Pierce.
Francis A. Wynn, Homestead.
Franklin C. Smith, Interlachen.
John A. Norden, Lake Mary.
Maxwell E. Scott, Marco.
John O. Hampton, Melbourne.
Shearod W. Williams, Niceville.

GEORGIA

Mary B. Goolsby, Carlton.
Wilma G. Lawrence, McCaysville.
William B. Price, McIntyre.

ILLINOIS

James C. Stanley, Fairfield.
Norman A. Rutter, St. Libory.
Charles H. Gunier, Sheridan.

INDIANA

Earl F. Ley, Clay City.
Charles L. Powell, Denver.
Larry D. Garrison, Kingsford Heights.
Richard P. Gerhard, Kokomo.
N. Artelle Lassiter, Windfall.

IOWA

William H. Merkle, Fayette.
Clarita F. Witham, Truesdale.

KANSAS

Durward E. Smith, Admire.
Florence W. Kelley, Chanute.

Orval M. Siefers, Dorrance.
Louise L. Atwell, Kisnet.
Effie M. Dunn, Meriden.
Evelyn M. Caldwell, Preston.
Earl K. Pennington, Rantoul.

KENTUCKY

Victor D. Headrick, Tompkinsville.

LOUISIANA

John W. Vining, Amite.
Doland Vincent, Kaplan.
Jesse P. LeBlanc, Lockport.
Gerald J. Marquette, Napoleonville.
Nita S. Dabadie, Ventress.

MAINE

Frank L. Reynolds, Brooks.

MASSACHUSETTS

Nelson T. Cotter, Hanover.
Patrick J. Windward, Jr., Sterling Junction.
James F. Alley, West Tisbury.

MICHIGAN

Wallace J. Reed, Flushing.
Vern W. Bemus, Hazel Park.
Elmer A. Behrend, Powers.

MINNESOTA

James M. Pederson, Echo.
Thelma A. Reynolds, Holloway.
R. Vron Muir, Jackson.

MISSOURI

Walter J. Stuesse, Beaufort.
Archie L. Williams, Carl Junction.
Edward L. Rogers, Jr., Robertsville.
Winifred M. Puchta, Rockaway Beach.
Victor F. Mudd, Silex.
J. Walter Jones, Sweet Springs.

MONTANA

Fred W. Schepens, Glendive.

NEBRASKA

Howard D. Clements, Hay Springs.
Theodore E. Gaedke, Wellfleet.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John T. Richardson, East Barrington.
Walter P. Kretowicz, Keene.

NEW JERSEY

Louis J. Rossi, Avenel.
Joseph M. Gondola, Clifton.
Thomas F. Flynn, Emerson.

NEW MEXICO

Jenkins A. McRae, Jr., Alamogordo.
Alberto Romero, Mora.

NORTH CAROLINA

Boyce W. Cloninger, Catawba.
William P. Hudgins, Sunbury.

NORTH DAKOTA

Vernon L. Hansen, Kenmare.

OHIO

David F. Tootle, Frankfort.
Howard R. Van Schoik, Hilliard.
Joseph D. Buchanan, Norwich.
Matthew J. Dowling, Perrysburg.
Robert L. Booth, Tiffin.
Charles H. McGovney, West Union.

OKLAHOMA

James A. Maddux, Cheyenne.

PENNSYLVANIA

Steve A. Gavorchik, Fairchance.
Michael A. Hrehocik, Glassport.
Mary K. Hertzog, Lyon Station.
Harry W. Stark, Manchester.
J. Richard Hartman, Roaring Spring.
Louella J. Hanna, Spring Church.
Ralph J. Brooking, Starrucca.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John H. Atkinson, Jr., Myrtle Beach.

April 6, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

racy competition sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Russ' speech, which appeared in the RECORD on February 24, 1966, was a moving and forceful declaration.

I would also like to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars who make this annual competition possible. It is programs such as this which give millions of young Americans the opportunity to think fully upon the meaning of our democracy, its beginnings, its history, its future and the obligation of each generation to keep it alive by participation in its institutions.

One who has been most active in this program has been Mr. Ollie T. Frith, of Nashville. Mr. Frith is currently State commander of Tennessee for the American Legion and for the past 8 years has been chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy program. He served his country during both the Korean war and World War II and has been continually active in business and civic affairs in our community of Nashville and across Tennessee.

Time does not permit the listing of all Mr. Frith's civic activities but suffice it to say that they are broad and demanding. Nonetheless, he takes time from his demanding schedule to work with young people in the voice-of-democracy program. He does this because he firmly believes, as do the millions of other Americans who have served their country in uniform, that democracy cannot survive unless it is given active participation by those who live under it. The voice-of-democracy competition promotes this participation. Thus, not only are the young Americans who participate in this competition to be commended but also the members of the VFW for providing this means of encouragement for contemplation and articulation of the meaning of democracy.

Humphrey Clarifies Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Vice President came to Memphis and spelled out for community leaders some of the problems we are facing in Vietnam and throughout the world. He proved himself an eloquent spokesman as he clarified many issues that worry us all.

One of the questions thrown at him was what to do about the movement of supplies through the port of Haiphong. I include his reply at this point in the RECORD, as well as an editorial that appeared Sunday in the Commercial Appeal:

FROM A QUESTION PERIOD CONDUCTED BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT A LUNCHEON OF FUTURE MEMPHIS, INC., HOLIDAY-INN-RIVERMONT, APRIL 1, 1966

Question. Why have we continued to have our allies, for example the British, to ship

supplies to Haiphong, and why haven't we put up a blockade there?

Mr. HUMPHREY. This is a much overexaggerated case. The British are now shipping very little, if any, into the harbor of Haiphong. There are free-world ships that are under so-called charter—Panamanian, Greek, the maritime nations. We are using our best efforts to get these ships stopped and we have stopped a large amount of them by sheer persuasion.

But the commercial instinct of maritime nations is a strong one. It is a question that bothers us a great deal. It is a question of more conversation in the National Security Council than at most any other. If we mine the harbor or if we bomb the harbor or blockade the harbor we have to face up to what happens when the Soviet Union sends a ship down there. We are trying to keep this conflict within limits. We are trying to stop the struggle. We are trying to permit South Vietnam to have its own Government, its own elections. We are not even trying to conquer North Vietnam.

But we are trying to stop its participation in this conflict and defeat their participation.

Because most people say, if you really mean to, why don't you just go over after them. And the reason you just don't go after them, you might have several million Chinese, who don't have a lot of ammunition but a lot of bodies. And I am not sure what the Soviet Union would do with its treaty of alliances which goes until 1980 with China. It is my feeling they would respect it despite the cleavage that is going on between China and Russia. And this we hope to avoid. That is why we can make a pretty good case against the stopping of shipping into the port of Haiphong. This is not an industrial nation. Only 5 percent of the people live in the cities.

In North Vietnam there is only one major industry, a plant of any size. The maximum amount of tonnage that goes to their troops a day is 150. We are not fighting massed armies. If we could get a division or two to come across the line we could really take care of them. Our problem is ambush, guerrilla warfare. * * * But to go back to your question, we have used our good offices and, frankly, our pressure upon our allies to stop their shipments. Secondly, we do not feel that the amount of goods that is coming in seriously affects the military strength or seriously affects our power in the south. We unload more in 1 hour in the ports of South Vietnam than they unload in Haiphong in a week. So if it is a matter of supplies, my dear friend, there is no comparison. We have new port facilities there that will permit as much as 1 million tons a month. That is a lot of shipping.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Apr. 3, 1966]
HUMPHREY CLARIFIES ISSUES

As one reporter observed, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke enough words while in Memphis Friday to fill a small book.

A good editor, of course, would have been able to trim the words down to the length of a magazine article by eliminating repetition and rhetoric.

Nevertheless, Mr. HUMPHREY did uphold his reputation as an articulate spokesman for current Johnson administration policy, foreign as well as domestic. The repetition served to emphasize the fact that his statements were in harmony with thinking in the White House, the State Department and the Defense Department—not just off-the-cuff ramblings.

Anyone who heard Vice President HUMPHREY's comments on the southeast Asian situation came away with a clearer understanding of the problems and the American responses.

On the controversial question of whether Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam should be

blockaded or mined, the Vice President's answer was precise and helpful. Such a decision might have to be made in the future, he said, but the chances are that it would escalate the war. Shipments reaching Ho Chi Minh's military establishment through Haiphong do aid the Red buildup, but the amount is insignificant compared to supplies arriving by land. The risk, therefore, is not worth the cost—for the present, at least. Finally, Mr. HUMPHREY noted that the United States was a strong advocate of freedom of the seas, that America retaliated after the Tonkin Gulf incident in 1964 for the very reason that freedom of the seas had been violated by the Communists, and that to halt or damage ships of the Soviet Union and other countries destined for Haiphong would be to renege on our policy.

In reply to a question of deep concern to Americans—the doubt that the present military directory governing South Vietnam can survive rising civilian opposition—Mr. HUMPHREY was equally frank. The government of Premier Ky, which has been quite vocally supported by President Johnson, is indeed unstable, said the Vice President. But some of the military leaders now heading the directory are attempting to make themselves identified with the potential civilian government which would come into being after framing of a new South Vietnamese constitution and the holding of elections. As Mr. HUMPHREY said, any new government in Saigon would require the support of the military. So while he expressed a shade of pessimism he held out hope.

As a reflection of top-level thinking in Washington, the Vice President's words in Memphis carried weight. He underscored the fact that any decisive outcome in Vietnam is distant, and that in both the war and the explosive political situation the United States is going to have to play things by ear.

Should the time come when there is a break, when negotiations appear feasible, Mr. HUMPHREY reminded his listeners that 129 separate meetings between American and Peking diplomats have been held in Warsaw, Poland, in recent years, and that door remains open.

Memphis did as well as a host to the Vice President as he did as a guest. This city can be proud that there were no protest marches, no jeers, no incidents to blemish the visit.

As for Mr. HUMPHREY, he proved a charming visitor—and no doubt charmed a few conservatives with his disarming way.

The Quicker the Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the Beaver Falls, Pa., News Tribune, in my district, recently endorsed President Johnson's proposal for a new Department of Transportation.

The paper said:

Quick approval by Congress would get the department off the ground soon. The quicker it is in operation, the sooner the safety and the needed coordinate services will come.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

THE TWELFTH DEPARTMENT

The United States is the only major nation in the world that relies primarily upon

A1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 6, 1966

privately owned and operated transportation. While that policy has served us well and must be continued, private ownership has been made feasible only by the use of publicly granted authority and the investment of public resources.

As long ago as 1949, a Hoover Commission task force recommended the formation of a department to coordinate all nonregulatory transportation agencies of the Government. Again, in 1959, President Eisenhower recommended that such a department be formed. Now, President Johnson has submitted his blueprint for a Transportation Department with an urgency that should not be denied.

While the proposed Department would include all Government supervisory agencies for land, sea, and air transportation other than military, the argument the President used, that will arouse public support and no doubt congressional, is the need for automobile safety. Since the introduction of automobiles, 1.5 million Americans have been killed in car accidents. That is 3 times the 503,024 battle deaths suffered in all the wars beginning with the Revolution; and 1½ times of all deaths in war, including 496,002 noncombat.

The President indicts the shortcomings of the whole transportation system—the long time it takes to get to airfields, the commuter traffic jams, the idling of a high speed automated ship by labor delays, the sporadic way the system has grown and the need now to coordinate it so that persons and goods will be carried to the whole world rapidly and efficiently.

The Department would be the fifth largest in the Cabinet, consolidating sections and agencies with 100,000 employees and an annual expenditure of \$6 billion. Primarily, its functions would be transportation, promotion, and safety. It would not set rates, which would continue in the quasi-judicial regulatory agencies.

Quick approval by Congress would get the Department off the ground soon. The quicker it is in operation, the sooner the safety and the needed coordinate services will come.

Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Mr. F. Elwood Davis, president, Washington Board of Trade, and also a statement by Mr. Frank Blackwelder, the rector of All Souls Church.

I believe the Members of Congress will be interested in reading these two statements:

BLACKJACK ADDED TO BLACKMAIL

(By F. Elwood Davis)

The Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade deeply and sincerely regrets the continuing immoral methods being employed by SNCC and the Coalition of Conscience to secure acceptance for their so-called home rule proposal rather than the Board of Trade's constructive and responsible self-government proposal.

Their original blackmail efforts have been supplemented by the blackjack approach. They are singling out individuals and firms and threatening them with boycott action. It is inconceivable that the coalition can

emasculate the English language by using the word conscience in its name. We consider their tactics un-American, unjust, and completely without conscience.

The Board of Trade continues its effort to secure meaningful self-government. Just as it led the way for adoption of the 23d amendment, it is now seeking voting Members of Congress to represent District residents in the body which governs them. This can only be done by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States. The blackmail and blackjack Coalition of Conscience activities ruin the chances of getting these needed votes.

HOME RULE

(By Frank Blackwelder, rector of All Souls Church)

The vehemence with which the organization Coalition of Conscience has agitated for home rule in the District might be less distressing to Episcopalians if the suffragan bishop of Washington was not involved. If a parish clergyman occupied the position of cochairman of Coalition of Conscience any might assume he represented only himself and perhaps the majority of his members. But when a suffragan bishop acts as co-chairman, the impression is conveyed that he represents the diocese. The suffragan bishop lends the prestige of his office, the reputation for integrity of the Episcopal denomination, and provides a semblance of bona fide when he participates as cochairman of the Coalition of Conscience.

I can only say the suffragan bishop does not represent my point of view, not the point of view of most of the members of All Souls. Home rule is purely a political issue, which one may favor or oppose.

Since the suffragan bishop of Washington appears determined to battle for home rule using every weapon in the arsenal, what is going to happen in the diocese? His actions will please some but outrage others. The question is: How wide a division will there be?

The chairman of the Democratic Committee of the District, addressing the Episcopal clergy, said that he favored "home rule" for "it is right."

An act is right only when no other alternative is worthy or preferable.

The Democratic Committee chairman said also that he believed one could conscientiously and unprejudicially oppose "home rule."

Therefore, the choice between the present system of District of Columbia government and "home rule" is a matter of preference.

The organization "Coalition of Conscience" of which the suffragan bishop of Washington is cochairman has joined the "Free D.C. Movement" in a coercion boycott to pressure merchants to support "home rule." This amounts to the suffragan bishop leading an organization to suppress freedom of choice. Has involvement in this political boycott destroyed the suffragan bishop's position as a spiritual leader in the community?

A great many may back the suffragan bishop; that is the privilege of any for each is free to choose. Many others have become deeply antagonized.

It must puzzle the Washington Board of Trade to find itself the object of an attack by Coalition of Conscience of which the suffragan bishop of Washington is cochairman. The Washington Board of Trade is composed of the business leaders of the District of Columbia who are mainly responsible for the business and financial progress of Washington. The members of the board of trade are also leaders in United Givers' campaigns, boys' club organization and the service clubs. These fine people are civic and religious minded; they belong to the churches of Washington; many are Episcopalians. They are entitled to their opinions about home rule without molestation and pressure from

anyone. That an Episcopal bishop should be leading this ruthless attack on the board of trade to compel the board to act in a manner it judges not best for Washington is perplexing and out of place.

The proponents for home rule such as Coalition of Conscience propound the unproved promise that home rule will provide bountiful welfare, model schools, and improved housing. This may amount to beguiling the citizenry of Washington, for what city in America, having home rule, is as well off as Washington?

The religious leaders of our city, who are devoting enormous energies toward creating the attitude of unrest among the poor, suggesting rioting conditions are ripe, indicating the poor shall be blameless if they explode, are not going to be guiltless. If bloodshed results the Coalition of Conscience will have something on its conscience, if indeed it has a conscience.

An Overlooked Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Troy, N.Y., Times Record says:

The need for a single Federal agency to supervise the Nation's transportation system has long been overlooked.

It commends President Johnson for asking this Congress to create a new Department of Transportation to eliminate "the fragmentation of organization, direction, and planning resulting from the present division of responsibility among the welter of agencies" now handling the work. Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

LONG NEEDED

The need for a single Federal agency to supervise the Nation's transportation system has long been overlooked. Fortunately President Johnson attended to this necessity by recommending organization of such an agency and providing it with Cabinet status. It was long overdue. It will serve the national interest well when accomplished.

The fragmentation of organization, direction, and planning resulting from the present division of responsibility among the welter of agencies has invited the inefficiency and wastefulness which has resulted.

At present some 35 agencies with 100,000 employees and spending some \$6 billion annually supervise the Nation's transportation system. No longer can responsibility for the system be so diffused and diluted by distribution of control because of lack of overall direction.

The President wisely refrains from tampering with regulatory agencies, charged with overseeing the operation of the transportation system. Essentially the functions that the President recommended be consolidated in the new department were those of transportation, promotion, investment, and safety. Functions of ratesetting and economic regulation performed by the other agencies would remain where they are. The independence of control is respected by this arrangement, along with the need for coordinated planning and projection which best can function independently of regulatory agencies.

At last, too, the Federal Government will respond to the national conscience and be-

expected to permit production of present isotopes in greater volume and at lower costs.

Three steps, so we are told, are necessary to enlarging the scope of this work now underway at Savannah River.

The first, approval by the AEC—given in its 1967 budget request of Congress—has been taken.

The second must be the authorization by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The third step, once authorized by the Joint Committee, is appropriation of the funds for the construction.

In that Georgia's Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL is a member of both the Joint Committee and the Appropriations Committee, it is to be hoped that he will look with favor on the proposal of the AEC for this addition. We like to think he will.

Residents of this area should be grateful to members of the American Nuclear Society for enabling them to better understand the purposes of radioisotopes and their limitless potential in the area of peacetime progress.

Freedom Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are very much concerned about the war in Vietnam. Beatniks and draft card burners seem to be getting the spotlight by our press.

As a veteran who served overseas during World War II for 2 years, I am sure I speak for millions of Americans when I say these people are a disgrace to our country. They are doing nothing but aiding and abetting the enemy.

Thank God we have citizens in this country who are willing to give consideration and support to the need of defending America against communism wherever it is found, whether in Vietnam or any place else.

One of my good friends and constituents, Mr. Otto C. Biggs, who runs a small grocery store in Benton, Ill., is such an American. Mr. Biggs is a veteran of World War II and his oldest son fought in the Korean war, and he has a younger son who will soon be finished dental school, then enter the service.

With regard to our Vietnam policy, Mr. Biggs has written the following poem entitled, "Freedom Today."

Mr. Speaker, under the privilege previously granted me, I hereby insert Mr. Biggs' poem into the Record. I believe this layman's views truly represent the majority opinion of Americans in this country:

FREEDOM TODAY

(Written to support our President's Vietnam policy and in rebuttal of peace groups action, by Otto C. Biggs, Benton, Ill.)

What are you doing for your freedom today?
 Much as the youngster so innocent and small
 Who, while trying to escape a Communist life
 Was willing for liberty; to give up all.
 Living without freedom, he would no longer stay

Under a dictator's rule that came his way.
 He knew not of pleasures nor of fun,
 Only most dreadful acts the Communists had done.

His desire to escape was far too great
 To let threats of death make him wait.
 To leave the horrors of his life behind
 Was forced to escape without kindred or kind.

One day he ran 'til out of breath
 Then by Communist guns was shot to death.
 What are you doing for your freedom today?
 When it is little or nothing at all,
 Would you be willing to replace this lad
 Who was trying to cross the Berlin Wall.
 Diligently learn well from this lesson at hand
 And you'll willingly make sacrifices that freedoms demand.

What are you doing for your freedom today?
 Much as a curly haired young Cuban lad!
 Who lost all the liberties he once knew;
 Also was robbed of a mother and dad.
 To escape despotic rule of a bearded gloat;
 Left his country in a leaky old boat,
 He no longer enjoyed freedom in Cuba today,
 From a communistic system tried to slip away.

He drifted and prayed on an ocean blue;
 Trying to reach freedom and start life anew.
 With freedom gone, rather than sit idly by
 He would find it again or valiantly die.
 While drowning he had one thought in mind
 To give up all or freedom to find.
 What are you doing for your freedom today?
 When, "I am not doing anything," you say,
 Remember this Cuban lad's plight; which could be

Yours too soon; was not too far away.
 You could live someday; with tyranny at home!

If you support others' freedom, as your own.
 What are you doing for your freedom today?
 Much as our brave boys in South Vietnam,
 Who are fighting the Cong's forays; and trying.

To stop a Communist tide, while they can.
 A sergeant crawled through the muck and mire
 And pulled wounded buddies from a sniper's fire.

After a medic was wounded in the head:
 Tended the wounded; tried to revive the dead.

Another lad threw himself on a deadly grenade.
 By men like these, our freedom is saved.
 Many other examples of valor can be told,
 Of others sacrificing for the freedom you hold.

We hate all wars, but this is one,
 That's being fought for sake of human freedom.

What are you doing for your freedom today?
 If deeds show it's little as you can
 Don't degrade the morale of brave lads who,
 Hold up their country's stature in South Vietnam.

If of our Vietnam policy your criticism remains,
 You could be trading freedom for prisoner's chains.

What are you giving for your freedom today?
 Give all to save our country so dear
 From the throes of a dreaded Communist tide,

That will try, every way, to grow nearer.
 Instead of stupid shouting in a silly parade
 Reverence the lad who died on a grenade.
 In place of draft card burners you admire,
 Honor the sergeant who braved machinegun fire.

Don't disagree with our policy in Vietnam;
 Instead,
 Praise a medic, who's wounded in the head.
 Remember, when your desire for freedom is small,
 A lad lost his behind a Berlin wall.

When you think our capitalistic government is bad,
 Recall the plight of a small Cuban lad.
 Today, do for freedom what must be done
 Even if it's fighting under a Vietnamese sun.
 If for freedom you don't give a damn,
 Beginning of its end could be in Vietnam.
 Now, with bowed head and changed heart
 Pray for our policy, then do your part.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a unique period in American history when our military personnel are engaged in a very serious struggle against the forces of Communist aggression but, at the same time, we at home are subjected to the confusion of divisive elements who seek to criticize the policies which motivate the actions of our Armed Forces on the foreign battlefield. I have said unique period in history, not because other wars did not have the same criticism offered by dissenting groups but, because, in the current era, we have the widest possible exposure for this criticism, through a communications system second to none, through public information sources such as TV, radio, and newspapers unexcelled any place in the world.

Of course, the basic reason for maintaining this struggle in Vietnam is to preserve the right of all Americans to speak their minds freely. In this particular struggle, in which we are engaged, it seems as though a vast amount of publicity has been given to those who dissent. However, I am proud to take the opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial written by Mr. W. J. Baird, editor of Signal magazine, the Journal of the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association, which was published in the March 1966 issue. Mr. Baird is also the general manager of the association. I believe he has captured the essence of why we are in Vietnam and why we must win the struggle against the forces of aggression there.

The editorial follows:

VIETNAM

(By W. J. Baird)

Our country, which has been involved in a struggle for the ideals of freedom and justice since its inception, at times finds itself pushed against the wall and into a conflict that makes the headlines and forces us to reassess ourselves and our national goals.

The current situation in Vietnam is just such a confrontation. And, moreover, it is only one of a continuing series of encounters in which any country with a positive ideology, such as democracy, will find itself. Unfortunately, this sort of encounter is most serious because, unlike the constant struggle against injustice and oppression within our own country, we cannot come to grips with the enemy on our own terms or in our own way.

April 6, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1999

coordinator for its efforts at utilizing Federal Programs.

Consider the fact that the Federal Government offers over 200 programs relating to education alone, over a dozen relating to mental retardation. A formalized coordinator for use of these programs is really a must for your rational development as a community.

In finding a coordinator or a coordinating committee, you have a special asset which you must utilize. Besides New York University—which has cosponsored this conference—you have four other universities in the 23rd District, and one more adjoining.

You are fortunate in having these resources. These institutions can be the focal point of your effort at identifying and making full use of all Federal programs. With their help the first aspect of your relationship as a community with the Federal Government—the question of money and whether and how it will be used—can be adequately developed.

But your relationship with the Federal Government is not just a question of money. You have a broader responsibility to complement the Government's commitment of money with a commitment of personal effort.

In education, for example, it is a responsibility to know what our schools are doing, to devote individual and political efforts to improving them to developing new practices for the education of our children when the old ones do not work.

In housing, it is a responsibility to realize that programs for low-income housing will not accomplish all they can unless you take the leadership in site dispersal—unless you lead the community to accept the idea that low-income families should be able to live outside the ghetto, the old slum if they want to do so.

In the fight against narcotics addiction, it is a responsibility to realize that all the treatment facilities that money can buy do no good unless the addict can be convinced that there is reason for him to try and rehabilitate himself—reason for him to want to rejoin a society that he thinks has no use for him.

In large part, these responsibilities of personal effort are responsibilities to the poor.

We know our rights. We know when those rights are abridged. And we know how to redress our grievances. But the poor often do not have the tools to protect their interests in a complex world.

The poor are often cheated in the education they receive in the housing they live in, in the job opportunities available to them.

Just look at the disparities within the Bronx itself. Here in the 23d Congressional District, in 1960, the median income was \$3,400. The average adult had completed 13.4 years of school, the unemployment rate was 4.2 percent and 9 out of 10 housing units were sound. In the 22d District just next door in the South Bronx, the median income was \$4,300, the average adult had completed 13.1 years of school, 7.2 percent of the labor force was unemployed, and 1 out of 4 housing units was unsound.

So if we are to succeed in the process of neighborhood development for the future, we must help to develop neighborhoods not just for ourselves, but also for those who cannot speak for themselves, who do not know what claims to present.

We must insist not only on high standards of education for our own children, but also for those who do not know how to assure their children the education they need.

We must build better housing not only for our own families, but also for those who live in the ghetto. And if those who live in the ghetto are ever to achieve full participation in our society, we must be prepared to take steps to give them a free choice of where they want to live. We must pass and enforce fair housing laws for those who can

afford to live outside the ghetto. And, since the vast majority of those who live in the ghetto cannot afford to live elsewhere, we must be ready to engage in true metropolitan planning of low-rent housing, in building new towns with sections devoted to low-rent housing, in short, in a commitment to true desegregation throughout our metropolitan area.

This is the broadest aspect of your relationship with the Federal Government. For all of the programs to improve the lives of Americans will never achieve their goal without the day-to-day commitment and participation of people like yourselves.

But the very fact of your conference today—and your willingness to discuss frankly the problems and programs on which the future of the Bronx depends—shows that you do understand Pasteur's observation, that you are prepared for the workings of chance, for the challenge of the future. Chance does favor those who are prepared. I think you will be prepared.

Horton Supports Benefits for Postal and Retired Federal Employees—Cites Adherence to Guideposts

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 14122, the Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966. While I have gone on record in support of a pay increase for Federal employees beyond the 2.9 percent level provided for in this bill, I nevertheless concur in the judgment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as to the desirable level of a pay increase at this juncture in our economy. The decision of the committee to stay within the wage guideposts established by the administration is a wise one, considering the rapid expansion and careful measurement that is presently going on in the U.S. economy.

While an increase of 2.9 percent in postal and other Federal salaries is not optimum in respect of the goal of comparability between service in Government and in private industry, the bill before us holds many benefits for Federal employees. In addition to regular salary rate increases, there is provision for more liberal uniform allowances, increased Government health benefit contributions, wider coverage of overtime pay provisions for postal supervisors, increased allowances for reimbursement of special delivery messengers, salary protection for postal employees with seniority, and other important fringe benefits.

Also included in this bill are important benefits for retired Federal employees and their beneficiaries. Most important among these is a provision for recomputation of retirement benefits for persons who retired between April 1948 and October 1962 and who elected to provide surviving spouse benefits by taking reduced annuity payments. Although no retroactive increases will re-

sult from this section, many retired persons in this category will start receiving higher annuity payments as recomputed under the 1962 formula.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure not only because of the benefits it contains for present and retired Federal employees, but also as an example to the Nation of the workability and the desirability of controlling the rate of increase in pay scales, and additionally, price scales in an effort to hold down inflationary pressures in the economy.

Isotopes and Their Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission approved an addition to the Isotope Development Laboratory at the Savannah River plant in Aiken County. This will be a great step forward in expanding and utilizing the peacetime aspects of atomic energy. This is a development of major significance.

The following editorial recently appeared in the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle, that outstanding newspaper serving this area:

ISOTOPES AND THEIR FUTURE

Strong and authoritative support for expanding current research into means by which the atom can be utilized to greater advantage in peacetime pursuits is being provided by members of the American Nuclear Society, who honor Augusta by their presence here.

While few laymen will understand the technical aspects of the Society's local meeting, to which some of the most distinguished scientists in the world are discussing developments in the field of radioisotopes, none should fail to appreciate the significance of what these men have to say as it may apply to the future of the Savannah River plant.

In light of recent Atomic Energy Commission approval of a proposed \$2 million addition to the Isotope Development Laboratory at the Savannah River plant, we think they will find highly encouraging statements made by Joseph Masurek of the AEC's Division of Isotope Development, and by W. P. Overbeck, director of the Savannah River Laboratory.

The former said as the climax to a speech Monday, that the SRP Laboratory was a "major national resource that we can put to work to contribute to the development of the isotope and radiation industry."

Mr. Overbeck pointed out that only the big reactors at Hanford, Wash., and Savannah River can provide radioisotopes in the quantities needed. What he did not have to tell his colleagues, but which the general public may not know, is even though SRP now has the reactors necessary to turn our radioisotopes, the irradiated products they produce must go through further chemical separation processes before being utilized by industry, agriculture, medicine, and in the myriad other ways foreseen for them in the future by atomic scientists.

Construction of the laboratory additions at SRP, in the judgment of the AEC facilitate this work and will enable U.S. scientists to probe deeper into the mysteries of the atom and to expand its peacetime uses. It also is

When faced with the aggression that has been demonstrated by Communist forces in southeast Asia, a nation has no choice but to make decisions now, to commit itself to a course of action—undesirable as it may be. Unfortunately, too, such a situation forces upon our Nation the necessity of taking the limelight, of being scrutinized, of being open to criticism and calumny from both well-intentioned—and in some cases, not-so-well-intentioned—onlookers.

But Americans must bear in mind that while the war in Vietnam is a messy and most unpleasant affair it is not the first time nor the last time that we will find ourselves committed to an expenditure of national resources and manpower which seems so utterly unrewarding. War is an unrewarding task. At best the outcome is the opportunity for men and women to rebuild their lives, to live in peace and work for a continuation of that highly elusive state.

Far too many Americans are experiencing this conflict as a rude awakening. They seem not to have realized that their freedoms and privileges have always been in a tenuous state and always will be. Right must be constantly reasserted, freedoms exercised and privileges earned—often at painful expense. Sometimes, our freedoms and privileges are inextricably linked with those of others; although this may be difficult to realize when those people are halfway around the world from us.

Our Nation and our leaders are neither omniscient nor infallible. Their thinking and reasons are often unclear to us. As President Johnson has pointed out, "Political uncertainties often obscure our underlying purpose. Our own failures as men—politicians and generals, diplomats, and reporters—cause us to question the wisdom of our course."

Yet wisdom does not lie in refusing to choose, even when all the alternatives are unpleasant.

Our leaders have made a choice to dedicate our Nation to making a stand at a particular time and place when they feel it is imperative. At some point in a relationship between a people and its leaders, faith must come in. To question the wisdom of a course of action and to suggest alternatives is one thing. To work completely at cross-purposes cannot be excused by naivete alone. How much easier it is to argue with your countryman than with someone who shares little concern for your way of life. And that confrontation can come soon enough, so easily.

Our Nation has committed itself to certain ideals which at times lead us into situations we would not have chosen. Nonetheless, commitments honorably made must be carried out. Awareness of the risks of delaying to make a stand in order to preserve a precarious peace, forces us to act.

At such a time in our Nation's history, Americans must have faith not only in their leaders but in themselves—as a people vitally concerned with freedom and justice for themselves and for others.

Faith, however, does not imply a blind loyalty. It does require loyalty based on the confidence of the honorable intentions of a Nation long dedicated to freedom. It does not rule out a constant reexamination and reevaluation. A path that is not clear today will be more so tomorrow only if an effort is made to clarify and to seek solutions. This is the task in which every American is involved.

Those of us who are a part of the military-industry team concerned with providing the communications-electronics support to our civilian and military leaders are perhaps more aware of our duties and responsibilities at such a time than is the average American. Aside from our occupational concern, however, we are citizens who must demonstrate to our fellow Americans the vitality of our

dedication. I have faith that the members of this team are fully displaying the brand of loyalty that constantly inquires and examines but remains strong in support of ideals and of the leaders we have chosen to serve.

The Driver Education Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the current hearings on automotive safety underway in the other body have happily awakened the American public to the great tragedy of death and injury carried out on our highways every year. Those hearings have gone far in pointing out the irresponsible attitude of our automobile manufacturers in stressing styling and speed over safety in auto design.

In the upcoming April 20 issue of the Nation magazine Mr. Edward Tenney reveals another of the unfortunate hoaxes perpetrated on the citizens of this country. Under the title "The Driver Education Myth" Mr. Tenney notes that driver education courses in our high schools have not accomplished the objective which the sponsors claim. Beyond that he contends that the automobile industry's callous desire for advertising and promotion are the true motivating factors in its support of these education courses.

To all those truly interested in reducing the senseless slaughter of thousands of Americans each year through automobile accidents I recommend this article:

DETROIT'S MICKEY MOUSE: THE DRIVER EDUCATION MYTH
(By Edward A. Tenney)

For the past 25 years, the auto industry has declared its love for mankind by urging the school system of every State to put a stop to "the senseless slaughter on our highways." The means to this end is driver education, and millions of dollars are spent annually on its promotion. Despite the lack of any real statistics, the industry, which includes organized tourism and auto insurance, sturdily proclaims that among graduates of driver ed, accidents, injuries, and death on the roads are reduced by 50 percent and more.

Our children will become good, safe motorists, the theory goes, by taking this course at 13 in States which issue the adult license at 14. In other States, the course is given the year before the children become eligible for licenses. And it instills in its students such excellent vehicular manners that parents, relatives, and friends learn safety by example. The child driver soon converts father and mother from their driving sins, and thus traffic prudence will spread until our whole society becomes immune to preventable accidents.

For the gist of the driver ed doctrine is that accidents do not happen; they are caused. Good people are rewarded by being safe; bad people are punished by suffering accidents which crush, kill, mutilate, paralyze and, on occasion, leave the evildoer idiotic for the remainder of his days. Those

who die are memorialized in a pamphlet entitled: "The Dishonor Roll," published by an insurance company.

Teachers and students alike recognize that this pseudo-religious talk and teaching is silly. There are various nicknames for driver education. It is called the "Mickey Mouse Course" because the safety movies show Mickey Mouse sprites tempting drivers to do good or evil things. It is sometimes called a "gut" course because it makes few demands upon intelligence, and a "frill" because it is said to be an ornament dangling from the regular curriculum.

But whether Mickey Mouse, gut, or frill, driver ed commands the respect neither of the faculty which teaches it nor the children who are taught. No responsible scientist in our out of high school or college, no important figure in any part of the country, no leader of integrity or eminence, asserts that the course as presently taught from one end of the country to the other has any ascertainable effect upon the death rate, or upon the accident rate, or upon the violations rate or upon the character for good or evil of the children who take the course. According to Dr. Leon J. Goldstein of the Division of Accident Prevention in the U.S. Public Health Service: "No conclusions can be drawn as to whether driver education is or is not effective."

The endlessly repeated statement that it reduces accidents and injuries by 50 percent is patently false, as the statistics clearly show. Although many millions of our children have now been "immunized" against preventable accidents, and although these millions now saturate the driving population in the 15-to-24 age group, the record of this group shows no substantial improvement. In the decade 1952-62, according to figures of the National Safety Council, the 15-to-24 group increased the number of us which it kills per 100,000 from 38.5 to 39.7. In the 25-to-44 age group the rate declined from 24.8 in 1952 to 22.5 in 1962. In other words, the group which had less exposure to driver ed improved more. The teenagers became deadlier by the year. In 1958, they (7.2 percent of U.S. drivers) had 12.5 percent of all auto accidents; in 1962 they (7.1 percent of the whole) had 14.7 percent of these accidents. Nationally, 6 percent more of us were killed in 1962 than in 1961, and again 6 percent more in 1963 than in 1962. We boosted the number of dead by motor accidents from 38,091 in 1961 to 43,400 in 1963. In a period when driver ed should have been pushing the number of deaths steadily down, they were going up steadily.

The most startling illustration of this tendency is to be seen in Michigan. The State has long boasted of its semicompulsory driver ed law which issues adult licenses at 16 to children who have taken the course. Children not so taught cannot obtain licenses until they are 18. Each year the State receives a medal and citation because it enrolls 100 percent of its potential child enrollment. Michigan once boasted of its intention to have the best traffic record in the Nation: "The State which is first in autos should also be first in safety." In the years 1962-63 motorized deaths in Michigan rose from 1,529 to 1,857. The national rate rose 14 percent in that time; Michigan's rose 20 percent.

Among a good many close observers of safety the impression grows that the Mickey Mouse course may actually be one cause of the increase in traffic deaths. The American Legion Magazine has published a substantial study of teenage death and accident rates which compared States with much driver ed against States which had little or none. The latter had lower rates. A report by the Texas Board of Insurance shows that, of the insured group studied, those who had been exposed to driver ed had 12 percent more accidents than those who had not.

A2002

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 6, 1966

Why, in the face of such evidence, do the propaganda drums continue to boom for driver ed? Why does the old myth that traffic deaths and injuries are reduced by 50 percent continue to appear in the press? Why is it that when a school board calls a special meeting to consider dropping Mickey Mouse, the room is jammed with his ardent admirers, armed with charts and pamphlets to show how large are the cash savings to everyone, how wonderful is the decline in juvenile delinquency?

Actually there is no mystery. Those in the safety business know that driver ed is a branch of consumer ed; and that though the value of driver ed may be unproved, that of consumer ed is beyond question. The motor car needs to be made into a status symbol at the earliest possible age. Every leader in auto insurance, in auto making, in auto selling, in trucking, in tires, and in dozens of associated businesses, including the National Safety Council, the American Automobile Association, the National Education Association now knows, or ought to know, that the propaganda for driver ed goes on, not because it has any detectable power to save lives, but because it is the cheapest kind of advertising. It pays off by getting adult licenses into the hands of children.

Twenty-five years ago the leadership of this massive industry may have believed that a genuine scientific discovery had been made and that it really might give as much as 50 percent immunity against traffic accidents. Perhaps these industrialists really felt that money spent on this alleged discovery was genuine philanthropy. Time would tell—meanwhile they were certain that they would be tapping a great new market.

Driver education really put the children on the road by giving them licenses, by dispelling the fears of their parents, by making the auto a teenage status symbol. Thus as driver ed expanded so did the sale of cars, gas, oil, tires, insurance, motel rooms, and accessories.

But now that time has shown that children are not immunized to any discernible degree, one might suppose that the leadership in this industry would acknowledge the fact and act accordingly. Quite aside from injury and death, it is common knowledge that access to cars harms children intellectually by diverting their attention from their studies, morally by exposing them to the unchaperoned temptations of liquor and love, socially by developing superiority complexes, economically by keeping them in debt, physically by depriving them of exercise. If General Motors, Ford, Chrysler would now stop sending fleets of new cars into the schools such fall by way of their dealers, school boards might send the old cars to the junkyards and stop exploiting the children.

But only an old-fashioned American idealist would really expect any such responsible leadership from the automobile industry. Having, perhaps, unwittingly, sold a bill of goods in the name of safety and having persisted in selling it for the profit, having thus established a reputation as a lover of safety and a protector of youth, the industry is in a tight spot. If the facts became known, Detroit might be accused of callous disregard for the welfare of American boys and girls—and that, to put it mildly, would be bad public relations.

General Motors appears to recognize the spot on which it so gingerly sits. It has undertaken an immense advertising campaign on the theme, General Motors Is People. This almost idiotic slogan appears inspired by the desire to make people believe that a warm heart beats deep in the corporate bosom, that GM is really concerned with the general welfare.

Many safety-minded people remember how many General Motors was when in 1956 it outsold Ford. That was the year when Ford emphasized safety and GM dazzled the public

with chrome and charm. As GM boasted later, "Ford sold safety, but we sold cars." Some observers hold GM primarily responsible for the failure of American auto makers to produce a safe car, one designed to "package the occupant." Such a car, we are told, can be built and really might reduce deaths and injuries by 50 percent in 10 years' time if its principles were universally adopted. But such a car exists only on the drawing boards of the safety engineers.

Instead of joining with Ford in 1956 in an intense competition to see which corporation could produce the stronger, safer car, GM sold charm, speed, and danger, and shortly thereafter put on an advertising campaign for Driver Ed with the slogan: "The Cars Are Safer. The Roads Are Safer. The Rest Is Up to You."

We are told that the removal of driver ed from the schools would drastically reduce the number of drivers and produce a recession so intense as to trizzle your hair. Children, it is true, are great consumers of second-hand cars, and assist greatly in the process of dynamic obsolescence—i.e., they drive them into the ground or smash them into scrap. But the removal of driver ed from the schools would produce no recession provided the auto industry awakened to its own responsibility. This responsibility is, first, to put on the market a full range of models designed primarily for the safety of the occupant. And, second, the responsibility is to educate the people to use them. If the leadership accepted this obligation, the National Safety Council, the National Education Association, the American Automobile Association would fall in line and a real safety movement would get underway.

Kangaroo and Horsemeat Imported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Are You Jumpy These Days?"

That article indicated that kangaroo meat had been imported and sold in considerable quantities as ground beef. Also, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out some time ago that horsemeat had been imported and sold as hamburger. Many skeptics at the time found it difficult to believe that such could happen in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the people of this country from unfair importation of food and fiber. The jobs and health of our people are being jeopardized and undermined by imports from low-wage countries.

The following article appeared in the Washington Post, March 25.

SEVEN MEN ARE INDICTED IN HORSEMEAT SALES

PITTSBURGH.—A Federal grand jury indicted seven men on the grounds they imported, relabeled, and sold 10 million pounds of horsemeat as boneless beef in Baltimore and other cities. Agriculture Department officials estimated that the operation netted a million dollar profit.

A U.S. attorney's office spokesman said the meat was imported from Mexico, relabeled at a processing plant at Large, Pa., and then sold to processors. He said substantial

amounts of the meat were recovered in Cincinnati and Philadelphia as well as in Baltimore.

The Ky Legend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, while others have written many foolish columns about the crisis in Vietnam, a few columnists like James Wechsler of the New York Post, have consistently made good sense.

One of Wechsler's most sensible columns appeared in yesterday's New York Post. Wechsler points out that superpatriotism and face saving have produced deluded press reports and foolish policies.

James Wechsler's column of April 5 follows:

THE KY LEGEND

(By James A. Wechsler)

In the aftermath of February's Honolulu conference, columnist Joseph Alsop wrote that "all sorts of signs indicate that this is a war that can be won—perhaps a lot sooner than most people imagine" if "the President is willing to wage war in earnest." Roscoe Drummond cheerfully reported that the Vietcong were being badly beaten in the field.

Premier Ky appeared on Time's cover of February 18; he had "showed himself eloquent and honest, astute and independent, and above all a man who cared passionately about the defense and welfare of his nation." The magazine observed that "in the year since President Johnson promised to defend South Vietnam with the full weight of U.S. arms, morale has improved measurably." Under Ky, "largely silenced were the quarrels between Catholics and Buddhists, the demonstrations of students, the simmering discontent in sections of the armed forces." So said Time, repeating an oftold tale.

Now it is less than 2 months later, and the euphoria of the Honolulu rendezvous is replaced by the bleak descriptions of South Vietnamese internal strife and Ky's desperate countermeasures. For the moment the war with the Vietcong is virtually forgotten; Ky is at war with his own forces and there is an atmosphere of paralysis and confusion in Washington.

One Washington correspondent who is a faithful exponent of the doctrine of Johnsonian infallibility wrote yesterday: "The need for knowledge about Asia, not only Vietnam, is tremendous." This may be the understatement of the year.

The haunting question is how the administration could have been persuaded to identify its fortunes so totally and unconditionally with the Ky regime in the face of so many warning signals.

At Honolulu, Ky stubbornly refused to accept the administration's stated position of "unconditional negotiations." There, and on other occasions, he proclaimed his refusal to sit at a conference table with the Vietcong. When one asked a high administration official about Ky's apparent conflict with the U.S. stand, he answered that his rhetoric should not be taken seriously; it was merely proof of his exuberant spirit. Those who voiced fear that he suffered from fantasies of "total victory" were branded perfectionists or defeatists.

So extravagant was the buildup of Ky that many Americans could hardly be blamed

if they assumed that the superman savior of southeast Asia had at last appeared. Johnson himself was reported to have likened the young aviator to Rexford Guy Tugwell in the early years of the New Deal upsurge, and Vice President HUMPHREY seemed to see him as a reincarnation of a young mayor of Minneapolis.

Now suddenly the mask is off; the liberator speaks the ancient language of an Asian strong-arm man—but his repressive truculence merely underlines his weakness.

For many months a certain species of American superpatriot has been decrying the peace demonstrations in our streets as a form of aid and comfort to the enemy. Not all of those protests have been relevant; but the young vigilants who have attacked such processions must now be peculiarly frustrated figures. For there is nothing they can do about the dissidents in Vietnam whose street marchers may herald General Ky's doom.

Young Americans are dying at this moment on that distant front, and all our voices are muted to a certain degree by the agony of the national predicament. Even Senators who have been most skeptical of our preoccupation with military measures are reluctant to say anything that might sound like exploitation of a dark hour.

Yet there cannot be total, submissive silence.

Military voices continue to boast of successes in the field. They reminded someone the other day of Mendes France's remark that the French "never lost a battle in Algeria." I am informed our bombings of North Vietnam are now twice as intense as they were before the pause; what do they avail us in the political crisis of the South?

Reliable Asian diplomats say a primary result of the Honolulu meeting was to reduce internal conflicts among the Vietcong, Hanoi, and Peking; it nourished the cry that Vietnam had become "an American war"—and we are hearing the echoes now.

We have clung to the delusion that only North Vietnamese infiltration sustained the Vietcong. Yet those who have heard Defense Secretary McNamara's testimony say no analysis of his arithmetic of Vietcong strength justifies this bland conclusion.

The answer to our troubles will not be found in the back of any book. The best, slim hope may be the emergence of a "neutralist"—(oh, horrid, word)—Saigon government that can negotiate with the Vietcong. In the judgment of knowledgeable men, such elements do exist. But whether our military and diplomatic establishments are prepared to pursue this alternative remains in deep doubt.

Much may hinge now on the willingness of a proud President to concede that he has been the victim of faulty, simple minded counsel and self-delusion and to acknowledge that not all of those who questioned his decisions were wrong.

The Koreans: Our True Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 6, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last year I had the good fortune to be named as a representative of the United States to go to Korea to attend the celebration of the Korean Armed Forces Day. At that time the Korean Government was in the process of send-

ing over 20,000 troops to assist the Vietnamese in their fight against Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting with Gen. Kim Yong Bae, Korean Army chief of staff, who was visiting here in Washington. He told me that Korea will soon double her commitment to further emphasize their determination that South Vietnam has the right to remain a free nation. This is the type of friendship that Americans understand and appreciate.

Countless instances of valor in action by Korean soldiers attest to their pride, professionalism, and devotion to duty. A close comradeship, beginning in the Korean war, still exists between American and Korean servicemen in Vietnam. This factor alone has enabled the combined arms of the Americans and Koreans to aggressively seek out and destroy their common enemy. The famous Korean Tiger Division and the Blue Dragon Marine Brigade have successfully conducted many separate operations which clearly illustrate the ability of the ROK Army to decisively defeat the enemy on independent missions.

American veterans of Operations Masher, Jefferson, and Van Buren, in which American, South Vietnamese, and Korean troops combined their forces and dealt overwhelming defeats to their Communist enemies, continue to praise their allies as completely dependable, loyal and extremely versatile.

Except for the United States, the Republic of Korea is providing the largest free world force in assistance of the South Vietnamese. I want to make available to all Members of Congress what our true friends from Korea are accomplishing in Vietnam. Mr. Chesly Manly of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, in a story written from Qui Nhon, Vietnam, on March 12, 1966, has given us an eloquent picture of the Koreans in action. I insert his story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN TIGERS ROAR DEFIANCE OF VIETCONG
(By Chesly Manly)

QUI NHON, VIETNAM, March 12.—The United States has a right to be proud of the Korean Tiger Division, which unquestionably is the best fighting unit in Vietnam for this kind of warfare.

The Korean division is a product of American inspiration, training, and support. Its troops wear American uniforms, use American arms and equipment, and eat American rations, supplemented by Vietnamese rice. Almost all of its officers above company grade have had advance courses at Fort Leavenworth, Fort Benning, or other American military schools. Its tactical doctrine is basically American.

But it has added unique Korean tactical concepts and skills, including taekwon do, a combination of Japanese karate and judo, which make the Communist Vietcong fear the Koreans more than they fear the Australians or the toughest American troops.

DISCLOSED IN DOCUMENTS

This fear has been disclosed in documents captured from the enemy. The kill ratio—more than 15 Vietcong for every dead Korean—tells the reason why.

The Tiger division justifies not only pride in America's achievement in Korea but confidence in its ability to equal that achievement in Vietnam. Veterans of the Korean

war remember what Americans said about the Koreans. They were incompetent; they would not fight; corruption was rampant; their government was rotten, their cause hopeless. Many Americans now say all of this about the Vietnamese.

There were valid grounds for contempt and derision of the Koreans in the early 1950's, but not for lack of faith in their potential, and the same is now true of the Vietnamese today.

The Koreans had been exploited by Japanese imperialism and the Vietnamese had been exploited by French imperialism too long to withstand Communist aggression without American help.

EXPECT 40,000 BY JULY

Now the Koreans are proudly helping the Americans help the Vietnamese. They have 20,000 troops here and another division soon will be on its way. By July the total Korean strength in Vietnam is expected to be 40,000.

Americans hope the second division will be as good as the first. It should be. The Korean force here now includes one Dragon division, based at Cam Ranh Bay, and they are just as good as the two regiments of Tigers.

The hackneyed term "elite" would not be adequate for the Korean units; they can only be described as unique. This judgment in no way detracts from the excellence of the U.S. Marines, the 1st Infantry Division, and other American units in Vietnam.

The 1st Air Cavalry Division has been overglamorized by romantic press service correspondents, whose early accounts said its troops were all jungle-trained pros. Actually its troops were too green to be sent into battle and they have made mistakes, but they are learning fast, as Americans always do.

One American infantry officer here remarked that there is nothing wrong with any of our units that could not soon be corrected by a few Korean advisers. A 1st Division sergeant, driving this reporter from Saigon to An Khe, identified troops in a long line of passing trucks as ROK (Republic of Korea) engineers, and said, "The ROK's are the only people we trust." A U.S. marine officer, when asked about Koreans, said simply, "They're as good as we are." No marine ever said that about any American Army unit.

The Tiger division arrived here a little more than 4 months ago and set up its headquarters northwest of Qui Nhon in an area long controlled by the Vietcong. Since then it has expanded its tactical area of responsibility to 1,200 square kilometers (480 square miles), extending westward to the area of the 1st Cavalry Division, based at An Khe. Highway 19 is secure from Qui Nhon to An Khe and on west to Pleiku, headquarters of the Vietnamese IV Corps area.

In 4 months the Koreans have killed 1,155 Vietcong by body count (the estimated total is 1,273), captured 466, and detained 2,085 suspects, of whom 20 percent turn out after investigation to be Vietcong. Korean casualties in the same period were 74 killed, 234 wounded, and 1 missing.

Since the Koreans arrived 14,000 Vietnamese villagers who had fled from the Vietcong terror to Government refugee camps have returned to their villages in the area. The estimated population of the area is 400,000 of whom 300,000 live in secure and 100,000 in contested areas.

ROAD IS SERENE

This reporter rode in a jeep from Qui Nhon to the headquarters of the 3d Battalion, 1st Regiment, 30 miles north of Qui Nhon on Highway 1. The road had just been opened and secured by the single ROK battalion as part of a combined operation called White Wing, so that supplies could be moved by trucks from Qui Nhon to troops of the 1st Cavalry Division in the Bong Son area.

A2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 6, 1965

The countryside along this road, which had been controlled by the Vietcong only 3 weeks before, was serene.

Men, women, and children were strolling or riding bicycles along the road. Near the battalion headquarters a new hamlet had sprung up, with dozens of shops offering ice, beer, laundry, and barber service to the Koreans.

The battalion killed 210 Vietcong, captured 33, and detained 131 suspects in the road security operation, its part of White Wing. The whole 1st Cavalry Division was credited with only 1,235 killed, 286 captured, and 1,580 suspects retained, and this included all those killed by artillery fire and 1,064 air sorties, the highest number thus far down in a Vietnam operation.

AGREES ON NEED

Major Gen. Myung Shin Chae, 39, the Korean division's commander, agreed with the contention of Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the American commander in chief, whom he admires, that many more troops, both American and Korean, are needed. Their presence is required to destroy the enemy's main force and pacify the country sufficiently for the Vietnamese Regular Army and regional and popular forces to assume the burden of maintaining security. Yet he was not contemptuous of the Vietnamese. They are getting better every day, he said.

General Chae said that his estimate of the need for more troops is based on the continued flow of enemy reinforcements and supplies from North Vietnam. When asked whether a force should be put in Laos across the Ho Chi Minh trail, over which supplies and reinforcements are pouring in from North Vietnam, he hesitated about making specific recommendations. But he said there are many ways to stop them, including destruction of the enemy's warmaking facilities in the Hanoi-Haiphong privileged sanctuary by bombing.

CITES THEIR ADVANTAGE

"If we let them come in, it will be very difficult to conclude this war," General Chae said. "Our failure to stop them prolongs the war. The Communists are using big weapons—75 millimeter recoilless rifles and 81 millimeter mortars. These weapons use heavy ammunition. We have captured much ammunition, clothing, food and medical service, and showing that the enemy's supply is not bad at all. This will be a long war if we don't stop those supplies."

General Chae said that the Koreans, being orientals with many of the customs and traditions of the Vietnamese, have special advantages in this war. It is easier for the Koreans than for the Americans to become friends of the Vietnamese and get information on the enemy from them, he said.

The general and other officers with whom this reporter talked told how the Koreans help the Vietnamese build schools and houses, give them food and medical service, and teach Tae Kwon Do in the high schools. All of this delights the Vietnamese and results in accurate information about the enemy.

Accurate intelligence is one reason for the extraordinary success of the Koreans. Another reason is that the Koreans, like the Vietcong, rest in the daytime and do their fighting at night. Most Vietnamese units look for the Vietcong in the daytime, before and after the midday siesta. Korean reconnaissance squads are out getting information from Vietnamese peasants during the day, at night the troops go out to set up ambushes for the Vietcong.

TELL THEIR TACTICS

A major difference in Korean and American tactics is that the Koreans, when they first receive enemy fire, immediately attack from two or more directions, before the enemy has a chance to escape. When Americans receive enemy fire they fall back and

call for artillery support or air strikes. Usually, when they finally attack, the enemy has gone.

Twice, during their recent road security operation, troops of the 3d battalion set up night ambushes for Vietcong elements that had been shooting at American helicopters supplying the Koreans. Each time the charging Koreans made all the noise they could with drums, bugles, and their shouted battle cry, Mang Ho (brave tiger), to frighten the Vietcong.

In the darkness, some Koreans disarmed enemy soldiers and killed them with Tae Kwon Do assaults. One Communist, killed in a fight without weapons, had a broken skull and a fractured pelvic bone. The Koreans can break a man's back or neck with the Tae Kwon Do assaults, using their hands, knees, and feet. They killed 37 Vietcong in one of these platoon-sized ambushes and 41 in the others.

The Tiger division is deployed on a widely dispersed company base plan, and each company base is a self-contained unit, designed to withstand an attack by a whole regiment for at least 48 hours. Not one company base has been attacked, and captured enemy documents explain why. The Vietcong admit that their losses would be too great.

The morale of the Koreans is incredibly high. There is strict discipline but mutual respect and comradeship between officers and enlisted men. Compared with the orderly and well-policed military aspect of Korean headquarters areas, Vietnamese army camps resemble slum neighborhoods with a few soldiers in uniform who are home on leave.

It is a thrilling experience to be awakened by the Korean bugler sounding reveille, hear the troops at morning formation lustily singing their national anthem, and watch them work out at Tae Kwon Do drill for 30 minutes before breakfast. All officers and men are in superb physical condition. The sight of them must frighten the scrawny Vietcong out of their wits.

The division's original mission was to defend Seoul, the capital, and officially it is the capital division. To the Koreans, however, it is the Tiger Division. Their emblem is a tiger and they make a ritual of shouting Mang Ho. When an officer passes, a Korean guard salutes by presenting arms and roaring like a tiger.

In 4 months the division has assembled the most impressive booty room in Vietnam. There are truck loads of clothing, digging and cooking utensils, American condensed milk, American antibiotic drugs, booby traps, mines, and eight-pointed steel spikes, two points of which are always up when they are dropped on the ground.

There are hundreds of rifles of French, German, Czech, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and American manufacture. The French rifles were captured from the French by the Vietnamese. The American drugs and condensed milk were captured from the South Vietnamese. The gun collection includes a brand new American M-16, taken by the Vietcong from an American soldier and later captured by the Koreans.

All Proud of Canton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned, I am certain, about the effect that anti-war demonstrations must have

upon the morale of our fighting men in South Vietnam, and I think that the following letter from a Canton, Ohio, marine may be of interest to those who read the RECORD:

ALL PROUD OF CANTON

I am just one of many Americans here in Vietnam. I am stationed with the 1st Hospital Company at Chu Lai.

When the Marines first landed at Chu Lai they made quite a fight for this land. Many of America's young men gave their lives in the fight for what we believe is right and just. I believe it's right, and I am proud to be here.

I am sure no American fighting man wants to be here fighting. None of us want to die, especially at so young an age and so far away from home. But, like myself, I am sure all of us would be willing to give our lives to protect our loved ones. Who knows, if Americans pulled out of Vietnam, the next time Communist aggression strikes it could be on our own soil.

This would result in one thing—the loss of many innocent lives. War is bad enough, but on our own American ground it would be even worse.

The thing that gets most of the men down over here is the lack of support from back home. We don't ask much, just a little support to know the people back home are behind us. It gets rough sometimes eating C-rations, not getting a shower, smoking stale cigarettes. But that's not half as bad as hearing about a group of college jerks walking around with signs protesting U.S. movements in Vietnam.

I am proud to say I am a resident of Canton. My friends over here from Canton must feel the same way. In Canton when a serviceman is home on leave he is at least treated decently. There aren't all types of demonstrations going on to make us feel we're fighting a lost cause.

I can't write to every citizen of our wonderful city, but I can say this: I and every other man from Canton over here thank you from the bottoms of our hearts.

FRANK C. HAUGH, 696-79-53,
1st Hospital Co., FPO San Francisco
96602.

No Inflation in Durable Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 23, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion in Washington and around the country on the whole subject of inflation. I believe inflation is a serious matter and deserves the widest discussion. But I also believe that we Americans have a knack for talking ourselves into problems.

The President has quite properly called attention to the dangers of inflation and I fully support his orders to his subordinates that Federal expenditures be reduced by \$1 billion in the next 90 days.

Reducing the cost of Government is one of the more effective ways to deal with inflation and I congratulate the President for this action.

However, I am concerned that in this broad discussion on the dangers of inflation, we Americans do not talk ourselves into a recession.