before in history. It must be clear to anyone familiar with criminal law that many of the accused do not want fair trials at all, if those trials produce justice. What they want is mercy; or if guilty, they want a smart mouthpiece who can get them off on a legal technicality and help them to beat the rap.

Heraclitus reputedly said: "The major problem of human society is to combine that degree of liberty without which law is tyranny with that degree of law without which liberty becomes license."

The emphasis recently has been too much on license. Court of law are courts of justice, not courts of mercy. It is the executive, the President or the governor who by law has the power of pardon. Courts owe a paramount duty to the public. Judges swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of that Constitution states that it is ordained to insure domestic tranquility—that is, order. Without order there can be no blessings of liberty. It is important that justice not only be done but that it be seen to be done. It is not seen to be done when the guilty escape and the innocent walk the streets in fear. When courts, out of mistaken sympathy or for any other reason, refuse to apply the law as courts of justice, then we are approaching the time when there will be liberty and justice for none.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM XVI—A POLICY IN SEARCH OF A GOVERNMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, nothing could more completely reveal the falsity, the farcicality, the feebleness, and the bankruptcy of the administration's policy in southeast Asia than what is happening in South Vietnam.

What is happening there can best be described as a civil war on top of a civil war or a civil war within a civil war.

Americans—allegedly called into South Vietnam by a friendly government—are ordered by our own authorities to stay off the streets of Saigon because it is not safe for them to be out, so great appears to be the hostility of the inhabitants of that city toward the United States. That is in Saigon, not Hanoi.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky—the U.S. anointed leader of South Vietnam, whose one hero is Adolph Hitler—is now attempting to put down by force of U.S. arms the growing protests against his rule.

The press is rigidly censored—the people are not allowed to learn what is going on. Is this the freedom, the protection of which we have sent American boys to fight for and all too often to die?

Twelve years of fumbling folly—12 years of moving inexorably further into the quagmire that is South Vietnam—apparently has not taught successive administrations in the United States that political problems cannot be solved by military might.

Mr. Tom Wicker, in a thoughtful and thought-provoking article in the New York Times, April 1, 1966, entitled "Dilemma in Vietnam" analyzes the unfortunate predicament of the United States in South Vietnam in seeking to build upon the quicksand government of Premier Ky.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wicker's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

DILEMMA IN VIETNAM—UNREST MAY LEAVE UNITED STATES WITH CHOICE: LET KY FALL OR BACK HIM AT ANY COST

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Continuing political unrest in South Vietnam may bring the Johnson administration face to face with a tormenting double question:

Can it afford to let the present military government fall or should it move openly to keep it in power if that becomes necessary? So far, the administration regards the situation as threatening but basically unclear. Officials are not yet convinced there will be a final clash between the military council that has held power in Saigon for 9 months and civilian elements primarily inspired by Buddhist leaders.

So far, it is believed here that the military council will weather the storm. But Washington is perplexed by the council's failure to take stronger action to sustain itself, and it is not forgotten here that it was Buddhist power in the streets that led to the downfall of the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963.

Since Roman Catholic pressures also are being brought on the Government in Saigon, and a distinctly anti-American tone is beginning to emerge from student demonstrations, the possibility that the military council might be unseated is not discounted here.

That possibility is taken seriously enough, in fact, that attention is being given to the question whether the United States could afford to let the Ky government fall. Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky is Premier and leading spokesman for the military council of 10 generals.

There are two reasons why the ouster of Marshal Ky and his military colleagues would be regarded here as far more damaging than any of the succession of government changes that occurred between the Diem overthrow in late 1963 and the capture of power by the military council last June.

The first is that President Johnson and the administration publicly embraced the Ky government at the Honolulu conference in February, proclaimed its leaders as partners in winning the war and rebuilding South Vietnam, and gave strong endorsement to its plans for pacification and other reform programs.

Thus, the Ky government's overthrow, particularly by popular demonstrations such as those going on in Hue and DaNang rather than by a secret coup, would be something of a South Vietnamese repudiation of the United States. That could have strong repercussions on public opinion in this country, in Congress, and among other governments.

It would bolster Communist claims that the United States is the aggressor in South Vietnam, rather than a defender of a country that has asked for assistance against aggression.

The other reason is that the administration believes the reform programs of the Ky government are sound, that at least the major figures in the military council are strongly committed to them and that political stability in South Vietnam is vitally necessary if these efforts are to have any chance of success.

The administration now is committed to the idea that reforms to provide a better life for the South Vietnamese people are a necessary part of the struggle to win lasting control of the populace for the Saigon government. The Ky government is seen here as the best hope, at least for the time being, to carry out such reform.

Thus, the administration is desperately anxious for the Ky government to survive its troubles. They were set off when the Saigon military council expelled Gen. Nguyen Canh Thi, a Buddhist, who commanded in most of the five northernmost provinces, where the demonstrations are now strongest.

An informed source here likened his ouster to a snapping rubberband that had set off the sequence of events.

One source of puzzlement here is why the Ky government did not quickly get General Thi out of South Vietnam after his ouster from the military council. Instead, it allowed him to return to the area where he had commanded, and demonstrations have been going on there ever since.

Nor does Washington understand why the Ky government has tolerated such events as the temporary takeover of radio stations in northern cities by student demonstrators, who then broadcast antigovernment propaganda.

Marshal Ky has threatened to take "very, very strong measures" if the unrest continues, but has not yet done so. This also puzzles the administration, although it is remembered here that when the Diem regime responded with violence to Buddhist opposition in 1963, the effect was only to create even stronger sentiment against the government.

For much the same reason, overt American support for the Ky government would probably exacerbate the anti-Americanism already cropping up in some demonstrations—today in Da Nang, for instance—and further undermine the government's position with the South Vietnamese people.

If the situation reaches the crisis stage, however, the administration would have to answer the hard question whether to move openly to keep the Saigon government in power.

The disadvantages are obvious. The Ky government would immediately be labeled a "puppet" of the United States, any claims it might have to popular standing would be dissipated, and anti-Americanism in South Vietnam would be greatly enhanced. On the world scene, the U.S. position as the defender of an invaded country would be eroded, and congressional critics of the war would be mightily bolstered.

Thus, the administration policy now is to lend the Saigon government whatever moral and covert support and advice it can, in an effort to help Marshal Ky and his colleagues surmount the unrest.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and other Americans in Saigon are working overtime to convince dissident elements that, whatever their problems are now, they are likely to become worse if a change of government is forced at what the administration believes is a critical stage of the war.

Mr. Lodge was credited in reports from Saigon with having helped persuade Roman Catholic elements to tone down a statement of their demands for a civilian government, lest they undermine the Ky government.

The Catholics, a powerful minority, are said to have warned the government not to go too far in appeasing Buddhist demands, however. They threatened open opposition to Marshall Ky if he did not take vigorous steps against the Buddhist-inspired demonstrators.

Marshall Ky, therefore, is caught between conflicting pressures and so is the Johnson administration.

A major question that no one here yet can answer concerns the nature of any government that might succeed the military council. In all likelihood, it is believed here, such a government could be "lived with" and would prosecute the war, despite the setback to social and economic programs that might be caused by the upheaval.

There remains always, however, the possibility that a new government would seek to end the war. And no one here pretends that

the downfall of the present regime would be less than a serious setback to the United States in the larger world picture.

LT. (J.G.) PHILIP OWEN ROBINSON—AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, within a single week last month three young men from Wyoming died in battle. One of the three was Navy Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, of Sheridan.

Several days ago I was in receipt of a copy of the letter that he sent to his father, Owen L. Robinson, the day before he was mortally wounded at Quang Nghi, Vietnam.

This young man's death came very much as a personal loss to Mrs. Simpson and myself. Sheridan has been more to me than just another city in Wyoming. It was there that I met, courted, and married my wife, and I spent a good part of my life in that city. I have known Phil's parents for more years than I can remember and I have watched this young man, who died for a cause in which he deeply believed, as he passed through elementary and secondary school into high school and then to the University of Wyoming. He was a student and a fellow ATO fraternity member while I was president of the university's board of trustees. I know personally the fine man that he was and the potential he held for his State and Nation. He fell in battle along with two other young Wyomingites, Army Pfc. Leonard May, of Medicine Bow, and Marine Pfc. Michael Beck, of Cheyenne. These fightingmen died less than 5 days apart and brought the death toll of Wyomingites in Vietnam to 11.

Mr. President, it is questionable that any war is worth the cost in lives, not because the objectives of the moment are not attained, but because history tells us that the peace achieved at the end of war is so short lived as to vitiate the causes for which the blood was shed. Those who study this war 20 years from now may well say of us that we could neither win the war nor keep the peace. On that we can only make supposition. But of one thing I am certain. Phil Robinson, Leonard May, Michael Beck, those of Wyoming and other States who died before them, and those who will follow, will have died in vain if communism is not driven from South Vietnam.

We are fighting a war in that southeast Asian nation which denies the political context of the endeavor. We have only to read today's newspapers to realize that there are three battlefields involved in the southeast Asian war and a loss on any one of the three can mean a defeat in totality.

The hills and swamps of the shooting war are not the only battlefields on which the war for Vietnam will be decided. There are two other fronts of equal importance—the governmental battlefield of Saigon and the political battlefield of Washington. I have no doubt that American fighting men, freed of the political hobbles which restrain them, could win the shooting war. What causes me the greatest concern is the war in Washington and the chaos in Saigon, neither of which allow us the luxury of a protracted conflict in a nation which is teetering on the thin edge of political and hence, military disaster.

Lieutenant Robinson was a junior officer uninitiated in the intrigues of Saigon or the machinations of high-level, politically oriented military strategy. But his plea that we "open up on the enemy sanctuary in North Vietnam" is being heard more and more and not only from junior officers but by those long experienced in the conduct of war.

I do not know that bombing Hanoi is the answer. Nor would I commit myself to a policy of blockading the harbor at Hanoi. I do know that by some means—perhaps mining the harbor or knocking out the railroad tracks which connect the Communist Chinese mainland to the capital of Hanoi—we must stop repeating the tragic sanctuary blunder of Korea.

I have no desire to see the war in Vietnam escalated to a degree that will trigger a major land war in Asia. But I am firmly convinced that no government has the legal or moral right to send soldiers to fight when policy has dictated in advance of their commitment that they will not be allowed to win. If we can require that our Nation's finest young men fight and die in Vietnam, we must enable them to fight and win—for their sake as well as ours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and I would like to add a few sentences from a letter from the father, who writes from Sheridan, Wyo.

He wrote:

> Phil was a good boy and the whole city is shocked. He was stationed on a communications ship at Norfolk in charge of the code room. A year ago he called and said that he would be home the following week. I asked him what gives and he said, "Dad I've been giving it a lot of thought—thinking of my family and friends and our way of life and decided to do something about it. I think that we had better stop the Communists in Vietnam and not wait until they get to the Montana border."

In keeping with that conviction, he did go to Vietnam and there lost his life.

His father wrote further:

> He had been an adviser to the junk fleet with one or two other Americans—a lonely, risky life. He lived with the natives, ate with them, saw the atrocities of the Vietcong and was completely sold on the Vietnam and their cause. He said, "Dad, this is a young man's war—the boys under 20 are doing a terrific job. He had the greatest of praise for the chopper pilots as he rode with them. He said they know that they are sitting ducks but if there is an American to be gotten out, especially if wounded they go in.

As I recall, he wrote his last letter to his father the day before he died. So there is not only another casualty, but there is also another hero in the cause of the country.

In line with all of this, Mr. President, the first young man from Crawford County, Ill., in the little town of Palestine, who lost his life was Thomas A. Jennings. I was struck by the fact that the casket simply contained these words:

> Thomas A. Jennings, 1945–66.

That speaks a volume, because he was born in one war, and he came to his untimely end in another war this year. That brings the war home to the country. Probably one of the tragedies also is that his father is a retired Army major and was at the services at the time.

So little towns and large towns, but particularly in the small towns, the war comes home to them when one who has lived in the bosom of the community is suddenly snatched out of this life.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that articles and editorials from Wyoming newspapers pertaining to Lieutenant Robinson's death and the death of Pfc. Leonard May and Pfc. Michael Beck, be printed in the RECORD.

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

"AND MAY HE NOT FAIL YOU"—LOCAL MARINE IS KILLED IN VIET

(By Wanda Banta)

"And may he not fail you, his country, nor his mother. Thank you, God."

Holding back the tears, Mrs. Weston Beck, 38, of 147 King Court, read again today the "Mother's Prayer for Her Marine."

Yesterday, Mrs. Beck and her husband, a railroad brakeman, were notified that their son, Pfc. Michael Beck, 19, was killed Tuesday on patrol near Quan Ngni, Vietnam.

Sgt. William J. Moore, Marine recruiter, brought the news to the Beck home, a pink shingled house with a decal on the front door, "We are proud to be a service family."

Only yesterday, Mrs. Beck had received two letters from her son.

One letter read, "I'm in good spirits, feel well, love you, and miss you all."

The other said, "I'm scheduled for a patrol in a day or two and am looking forward to it."

The Cheyenne marine was the second local fatality in the war and the third Wyoming serviceman to die this week.

Weston Beck, a tall, slender, soft-spoken man, said, "Even though I lost my only son, he is still my favorite subject to talk about."

"Mike was a scrapper," he said. "For years, I taught Mike * * * 'son, don't look for a fight but if you have to fight, be there first.'"

He said he felt his son died doing what he thought was right.

Mike was born February 24, 1947, and attended Cheyenne schools. He was an outstanding athlete and received letters in football, wrestling, and track at Central High School. He was a member of the Central High C Club.

The father said three or four times "We have no regrets * * * we believe the sacrifice of our son is necessary." He said, "Others have died and there will be more * * * I'll worry about every one until it's over."

The mother and father both said, "Tell every parent to write their boys * * * letters mean so much to them * * * the kids ought to be reassured."

Mike's dad is a brakeman for the Union Pacific Railroad and has lived in Cheyenne 20 years. He said the thought of Mike used to comfort him on the long passenger runs to Green River.

The boy's sister, Mary, 16, was taking her brother's death hard, the mother said.

Mrs. Beck said, "You don't realize how close you are to your children until you lose them."

The parents said again, "We'll miss him so, but we have no regrets.

Beck was attached to C Company, 1st battalion, 7th Marines, 3d Marine Division, and had been in Vietnam less than 6 weeks. He enlisted last August.

Besides his parents and sister, he is survived by a grandmother, Mrs. Alice Ray, Sutherlin, Oreg.; three uncles, Carl C. Beck, Cheyenne; Don Beck, Denver; and J. Beck in El Jaso, Tex.; and an aunt, Mrs. Margaret Burt, Denver.

Mike's body will be flown home for military services.

Janis Black, Cheyenne freshman at College of Idaho, Caldwell, close friend of Mike's, said today, "I've known Mike since grade school; he was a good sport, an outgoing, fun-loving guy. * * * We'll all miss him."

Janis said that friends of Mike at the University of Wyoming had stayed up late last night in the dormitories at Laramie, talking about their friend.

Cheyenne's first casualty was Navy man Robert Guthrie, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Vern Guthrie, 2217 East 13th, attached to the marines, who was killed on a patrol at Da Nang.

Two other Wyoming men died last week after they were wounded in action in Vietnam.

Navy Lt. (jg.) Philip Robinson, 28, of Sheridan, died aboard a helicopter Friday after he was wounded while on patrol 5 miles east of Quang Mgai city.

Army Pfc. Leonard May, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert May of Medicine Bow, died Thursday when he was shot while on duty with the 1st Infantry Division.

Services are in charge of Wiederspahn Chapel of the Chimes.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Mar. 28, 1966]

A TIME FOR REASSESSMENT

In this election year of 1966, there are signs of restiveness among the American people over the way the Johnson administration is running the war in Vietnam, and over its domestic programs.

Perhaps the people have no one to blame but themselves, for it is with them that the ultimate power lies.

Perhaps, too, the American people desperately need today, as peaceniks march in the streets of our cities and chant slogans calculated to serve the purpose of our enemy, to make a reassessment of their Government and its current conduct of the war against both the North Vietnamese and against poverty; and also to make a reevaluation of their own attitudes.

This past weekend, it was announced that a young Navy lieutenant from our own State had been killed only last Friday in Vietnam. The story of Lt. Philip Robinson, who was 28 years old, is a deeply moving account of dedication to the cause of this country, and of personal sacrifice.

"A year ago in April" said his father, Owen Robinson, "he called us and told us he had asked for a year's extension in Vietnam. He said he had been thinking of his family and his friends and our way of life—and since he was single, he thought he should do something about it."

He said, Mr. Robinson recounted, "that if we were to stop communism we'd better do it there than on the Montana border."

This past weekend, too, Ronald Reagan, a movie and TV actor who is a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor of California, told a meeting in Nebraska: "If our sons are going to be allowed to die for their country, they ought to be allowed to win."

While the story of the death of Lieutenant Robinson was being told, and Reagan was making his speech in Lincoln, Nebr., and thousands of anti-Viet war demonstrators were marching across the country, there was mounting evidence that the real professional military leaders of the United States were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the manner in which the Johnson administration is running the war.

Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the five generals who are top servicemen in the Military Establishment, made it known through all but direct quotation that the Joint Chiefs are concerned over the prospect of an intensification of the war in Vietnam not through a more aggressive waging of that conflict by the United States, but by lack of it.

For one thing Wheeler and the Joint Chiefs have noted intelligence reports indicating a greater buildup of North Vietnamese regular forces in South Vietnam. For another, they also are worried about fuel oil storage sites in North Vietnam that they have not been allowed to bomb.

But President Johnson has subordinated the advice, based on the professional skill and training of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to a civilian industrialist, Robert S. McNamara. Furthermore, under this wholly civilian operational setup, he has subordinated a strictly military concept of the war to a political basis.

Our military analyst, Gen. Ira Eaker, one of our most capable and thoroughly professional combat leaders of World War II, decries this tendency on the part of the Johnson administration in an article printed in an adjacent column today. General Eaker points out that for the first time in the history of this country, we have placed almost total reliance on strategy as well as tactics in the hands of civilians who are amateurs. He might have said, one civilian: Mr. McNamara. This civilian with the possible assistance of the State Department has enunciated the concept that one cannot go too far in war—at least in this war—because it might bring on greater war, a specious theory which overlooks the stark fact that war once commenced must be waged with vigor because the only other alternative is defeat.

As for the American people themselves, they too must come to realize that they are in this as much as the Lt. Philip Robinsons, and the young men who already have given their lives in sacrifice in this deadly struggle, and their families.

It is not enough that these alone must bear the brunt of saving our way of life, as Lieutenant Robinson recognized as his duty. We all must bear the common burden.

In so doing, let us dispense with the belief that we can have business as usual; that we can simultaneously fight wars of poverty and wars of liberation of the oppressed; wars of economics at the same time we are fighting wars for freedom. Let us discard the notion that all we need worry about is material comforts at home while young men like Lieutenant Robinson are fighting and dying for us 8,000 miles away.

In short, let us get to the guts of the Vietnam matter, now—wholly, totally, and with singleness of purpose, through whatever may have to be done—including a sacrifice on the part of some people of seeking forever to win elections by keeping everybody happy.

[From the Cheyenne, Wyo., State Tribune, Mar. 31, 1966]

DO NOT FORGET

"Here dead lie we because we did not choose to live and shame the land from which we sprung."—A. E. HOUSMAN.

"The bravest battle that ever was fought;
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the map of the world you will find it not;
It was fought by the mothers of men."
—JOAQUIN MILLER.

The returns are coming in faster than ever from Vietnam. Yesterday it was Michael Beck; 4 days earlier Philip Robinson; the day before that Leonard May.

Three Wyoming boys have yielded up their lives in a war far from their homeland, within less than a week's time. Michael Beck is the second casualty of the war from our town; the first was Robert Guthrie.

What can we say to the parents and families of these?

In our own incompetent, dumb, and uncomprehending way, we can say we are sorry; that we are saddened, and weep with them over their loss.

That is the very least we can do.

We can tell them—and especially the mothers and wives—that we share with them in a modest way, their bereavement.

It will not help very much, but it may a little.

We can tell them that these are the men who were made men far ahead of their time; and who further than that have rendered the ultimate contribution to their fellow man, and to their country.

They join a legion of Americans that stretches back to the war of 1776; to the likes of the 32-year-old physician named Dr. Charles Warren who stood in the ranks at Bunker Hill on a hot June day and yielded up his own life that there might be an America.

Or men the stripe of Davy Crockett and a rag-tag band of beardless youths and middle-aged men who perished in the Alamo in a similar battle fought 130 years ago this very month—then on a foreign field, against a despot and tyrant.

Or the 600,000 men, mostly youths, who gave their lives in the most terrible war of this Nation's history, from Bull Run through Antietam, Shiloh, Gettysburg, Stone Mountain, Appomattox.

Or the Indian Wars that covered some 30 years and ground that we presently live on, in comfort and security.

Or San Juan Hill, San Mihiel, the Argonne, Bataan, the Battle of the Bulge, Pork Chop Hill.

More than three-quarters of a million men have died for the America we know today, in battles here and far away; on our home ground, in France, Germany, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Iwo Jima, the Philippines. In Korea and now in Vietnam.

Vietnam probably will get worse before it gets better; and there will be more dread messages.

But let us say that whatever comes we must not falter and turn away, if only for these who already have given the last ounce of their devotion to America.

They fought for an America that may not really exist except in their hearts and minds.

But if the ideal was theirs, it is for us the living to perfect that ideal.

It is now no question that they have measured up to the greatest heights of any man, be he President or average citizen. They now are tested in time.

The question before us, the living, is: Do we measure up to them?

Let us not forget that we must seek to merit their faith, every day that we live, forever more. For the Michael Becks, the Phil Robinsons, the Bob Guthries, the Leonard Mays and all the rest, of this war and those before.

Do not forget.

"God rest the dead, our honored dead,
Who died for you and me;
And bless him for his faith and love,
And for his bravery;
"The one who gave his all for us
Upon the battlefield,
Because he had convictions
Because he would not yield.
"He is the hero in the hall
Of everlasting fame
Where no one in the realm of God
Has any greater claim.
"For he laid down his life for us,
And who can offer more
To serve his God and fellow man
On any sea or shore?"

(From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, Mar. 26, 1966)

LIEUTENANT ROBINSON LOSES LIFE IN VIETNAM

Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, 28, son of Mr. and Mrs. Owen L. Robinson, 10 South Linden, died March 25 in Vietnam, and becomes the first Sheridan man to lose his life in that conflict.

Lieutenant Robinson graduated from Sheridan High School in 1956. He attended Sheridan College and later graduated from the University of Wyoming. At one time he worked for the city during the summer.

Mr. and Mrs. Robinson received word while in Cody. A U.S. Navy officer drove over 300 miles to get the word to them there, and the death was confirmed by a telegram from Vice Adm. B. J. Semmes, Jr., chief of naval personnel.

It said: "I deeply regret to confirm on behalf of the U.S. Navy that your son, Lt. (j.g.) Philip Owen Robinson, U.S. Naval Reserve, died on March 25 * * * as a result of hostile fire received while on patrol 5 miles east of Quang Ngai City, Republic of Vietnam. Your son died aboard a helicopter en route to an aid station with a Navy doctor in attendance. Your son died while serving his country. Please accept my most heartfelt sympathy in your great loss."

The Robinsons said today they had received a letter from Phil last Friday stating he would be out June 9 and wanted to stop at Hong Kong on his way home. He also said 400 mines were being planted around his area so he felt safer.

A year ago in April, his parents revealed, he called from Norfolk and said he would be home in a week, said he had asked for a year's extension and that he had asked for Vietnam. He said he had been thinking of his family, his friends, and our way of life, and since he was single felt he should do something about it.

In all his letters, the Robinsons report, he said he liked the people and was a firm believer in their cause. He said that if communism is to be stopped it would be better to do it there than on the Montana border.

"So he died fighting for his convictions," his parents said today.

His body will be flown to San Francisco and will then come by train to Sheridan. No definite time or date for services has been set as yet, but burial will be in the Masonic circle at Sheridan Municipal Cemetery.

Lieutenant Robinson was born in Janesville, Wis., March 23, 1938.

He belonged to Masonic Lodge 43, Sheridan Scottish Rite, the Methodist Church, the Elks Club, and was a member of ATO, a university fraternity.

Surviving are his mother and father, two sisters, Anne Sidwell, Sheridan, and Lynn Gustafson, Oneonta, N.Y., and seven nieces and nephews.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after conferring with the other member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 127 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The resolution probably has 35 or more sponsors. The reason for calling it up by unanimous consent, even though it has not cleared the full committee, is that on April 9, which is a few days hence, we will observe Sir Winston Churchill Day because it is the third anniversary of the date when the bill was signed which conferred upon him honorary citizenship.

I am advised that in the garden of the British Embassy a very impressive statue of Sir Winston Churchill will be dedicated.

The House of Representatives, I believe, will pass the joint resolution today also. I believe it timely and appropriate that we do likewise. In the terms of the joint resolution we ask that the President proclaim that day as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in January I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 127, which would authorize and request the President to declare April 9 of each year as Sir Winston Churchill Day.

Forty of my distinguished colleagues joined me in cosponsoring this resolution, demonstrating quite clearly the wide and strong support for such a tribute to perhaps the most outstanding man of the 20th century.

It has been my earnest hope that this measure could be passed before next Saturday. That will mark the third anniversary of the act which made Sir Winston the first honorary citizen of the United States.

It would coincide also with the unveiling of a magnificent bronze statue of Churchill at the British Embassy.

A most notable occasion would become even more significant if the dedication of the statue could be the first anniversary of Sir Winston Churchill Day.

I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN, and the distinguished Senate majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, for their interest in this measure and their invaluable assistance having the resolution taken up on the floor today.

Once the Senate passes this resolution, it is very likely that it can also be approved by the House. Congressman BYRON ROGERS, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee which handles such legislation, would like to see this taken up on the House floor as soon as possible before the Easter recess.

I would like to express my appreciation to Congressman ROGERS and to the many persons who have expressed an interest in this legislation.

And, of course, I also want to thank the many cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 127 for their support.

The many distinguished Senators who cosponsored the resolution are GORDON ALLOTT, Republican of Colorado; BIRCH BAYH, Democrat of Indiana; ALAN BIBLE, Democrat of Nevada; DANIEL BREWSTER, Democrat of Maryland; QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat of North Dakota; HARRY BYRD, JR., Democrat of Virginia; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican of Kentucky; PETER DOMINICK, Republican of Colorado; SAM ERVIN, JR., Democrat of North Carolina; PAUL J. FANNIN, Republican of Arizona; ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska; FRED HARRIS, Democrat of Oklahoma; PHILIP HART, Democrat of Michigan; VANCE HARTKE, Democrat of Indiana; ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican of Nebraska; DANIEL INOUYE, Democrat of Hawaii; LEN JORDAN, Republican of Idaho; ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat of New York; TED KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia; THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican of California; EDWARD LONG, Democrat of Missouri; WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington; EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota; LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana; JACK MILLER, Republican of Iowa; FRANK MOSS, Democrat of Utah; GEORGE MURPHY, Republican of California; GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat of Wisconsin; CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island; WINSTON PROUTY, Republican of Vermont; WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia; DONALD RUSSELL, Democrat of South Carolina; HUGH SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania; STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri; STROM THURMOND, Republican of South Carolina; JOHN TOWER, Republican of Texas; JOSEPH TYDINGS, Democrat of Maryland; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat of Ohio; ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 127, and, without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 127

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 9 of each year, the anniversary of the conferring of honorary United States citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill, is hereby designated as "Sir Winston Churchill Day." The President is authorized and requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of

Washington will provide money and set standards to serve these needs, but it should not attempt to control every step in the process, leaving nothing to local imagination or initiative.

Yet the States and localities are poorly organized to do their part, and the existing systems for sharing Federal revenues are unwieldy and outdated.

It is the task of creative federalism to foster new institutions at the grassroots level and develop new fiscal arrangements so that State and local governments can become true partners with the Federal Government, and not merely little brothers.

WATER POLLUTION AN EXAMPLE

One presidential aid, aware that this explanation is a bit fuzzy, cites the administration's water pollution bill as an example of things to come. A single State cannot clean a river. A regional agency with jurisdiction along the river's entire course is necessary. Therefore, the bill withholds funds from any State whose Governor has not promised to join an interstate body having power to force compliance on those who can control sources of pollution.

"We are saying, 'You put together an organization of counties, cities, towns, and States, and we'll give you the money to clean your river,'" explains the White House assistant.

An example of new revenue-sharing ideas is found in the administration's recent proposal for rebuilding urban hospitals. Previous Federal assistance has been funneled to the States through Hill-Burton grants and loans. It has gone primarily for construction of new hospitals under a formula that guaranteed help for rural States with low per capita incomes.

But it did little for the larger cities, where most of the Nation's obsolescent hospitals are located. So early in March the President sidestepped the Hill-Burton program with a new grant-and-loan plan geared specifically for old hospitals that need new equipment or a general rebuilding. It is tailormade for big cities and it is generous in financial terms, even by the standards of the American Hospital Association.

A TREND SYMBOLIZED

The break with tradition in aiding hospitals symbolizes a trend in several other Great Society programs proposed or enacted in the last 15 months. The drift is away from across-the-board grants-in-aid and toward programs that are directed, through Federal standards, straight to points of greatest need.

Elaborate and specific guidelines bind the antipoverty program, demonstration projects in cities, and educational funds for children of low-income families. Even the school milk and lunch programs, Mr. Johnson suggests, should go only to those children who need them, not to every child that enters a schoolhouse door.

The shift to tighter Federal restrictions means less authority for Governors. States participate in the new programs primarily in conjunction with other States through such associations as the Appalachia Commission or the proposed regional river commissions. The Governor who had wide latitude in determining where an interstate highway went in the 1950's will have no such authority in a clean river project of the 1960's.

The confusion and disagreement over trends in federalism are nowhere better revealed than in the cities demonstration program. A key figure in this plan for rebuilding central cities is the Federal coordinator, the man who would be assigned to pull together Government programs at the block level.

His role is viewed by administration designers as one of creating more initiative, dynamism, and variety in local development plans. But local officials are wary of potential czardom.

"Already, proposed coordinators of Washington's handouts to metropolitan areas are being hailed as Federal 'mayors,'" charges Michigan Gov. George Romney, who has described a "new centralism" in which power flows to Washington as Federal money comes to the localities.

Aware of this trend, such Governors as John Connally, of Texas, and William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, far apart in distance and political philosophy, have voiced identical complaints: that they are not given a loud enough voice in the development or operation of Federal programs.

Connally has traveled to Washington to keep his hand in the Camp Gary Job Corps. Scranton complained that the Federal Government keeps talking about cooperation without seriously seeking State advice.

Many share California Gov. Edmund G. Brown's lament that "while an increasing number of government services are administered under joint State and Federal auspices, the Governor is brought into the policy-making discussions * * * only infrequently, informally, and haphazardly."

NEW INSTITUTIONS NEEDED

A key element entering into any discussion of creative federalism is the need for new institutions, and White House officials speak of both public and private institutions. In the public sector, examples are obvious: the river commissions, metropolitan planning organizations encouraged by the carrot of financial aid and the rural development districts proposed to do what separate country towns cannot.

Applying creative federalism to the private sector is more difficult. Officials speak of drawing universities into cooperative research centers with the magnet of Washington money. Or they talk of semipublic corporations formed to do what private business alone cannot afford.

One test of the new approach, they say, is coming soon in the development of a prototype of the supersonic transport aircraft. Private industry alone cannot foot the bill, sometimes put at $50 billion, for an SST program running from initial research through the first generation of 200 planes.

But the Government wants to avoid a permanent subsidy of the sort that threatens to engulf it in connection with the maritime industry. Federal officials now are trying to work out an arrangement with manufacturers before entering the prototype stage next year.

"We are looking for some arrangement in which we can give them the money to get over the hump, help them with information and then get some of our money back," one official said.

Such innovations in either the private or public sector would be critically reviewed in Congress, which is normally skeptical of fundamental changes. But there is evidence of growing concern.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, citing the critical absence of coordination in Federal grants-in-aid and the local governments' shortage of skilled planners and managers, is on record in behalf of two fundamental reorganizations. He wants a National Council for Intergovernmental Affairs established in the White House and extensive Federal help in training local personnel.

What creative federalism really means is still anybody's guess. Mr. Johnson apparently is not sure himself, for in his state of the Union address he announced that "a commission of the most distinguished scholars and men of public affairs" would be created to "develop" the new concept.

There is little doubt, however, that the President expects it to be a major contribution of his years in the White House.

GROWING DISSIDENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the face of the endemic political division and deterioration in South Vietnam, I would like to bring two items which recently appeared in the New York Times to the attention of my colleagues. Last Sunday James Reston wrote on the "Myths and Realities in Saigon." He emphasized that an effective war against the Vietcong depends upon a cohesive Saigon government which does not now exist. He feels the recent demonstrations at least have exposed the reality. In an editorial the next day the Times said Prime Minister Ky's effort to smash opposition in Danang, and thereby possibly precipitate another civil war, is the application of military power to what is basically a political problem. Because of this, "a change in government in Saigon is clearly going to be necessary."

I ask unanimous consent that these items by printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1966]

WASHINGTON: MYTHS AND REALITIES IN SAIGON

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 2.—The latest political agitation in South Vietnam, with its undertones of rebellion and anti-Americanism, gives the impression of a new and particularly vicious crisis, but this is misleading.

It may be a crisis—though it can undoubtedly be handled—and it is vicious, but it is certainly not new. The demonstrations of the Buddhists and the students against the Washington and Saigon Governments are not transforming the situation but only exposing it. They are not changing the political fundamentals, but merely reminding us of what they are.

THE ANCIENT PROBLEM

The nub of the American problem from the beginning of this adventure was the fragility of the political base from which we chose to operate. The present Saigon Government is a coalition of military warloads.

The Prime Minister in Saigon, General Ky, never really had control over the South Vietnamese military commander in the 1st Corps area, General Thi, whose domain bordered on North Vietnam.

The present difficulty arose from the fact that the Prime Minister, General Ky, tried to prove that he had control over the whole country. President Johnson summoned him to a dramatic conference in Honolulu. He outlined a very sensible program of social and agrarian reform for South Vietnam with which General Ky agreed. President Johnson treated General Ky as the leader of all of South Vietnam, knowing this was not true but hoping he could make it true if he said so, but it didn't work.

It is too bad. There should be social reform and there should be a powerful central government in Saigon that could bring it about, but there isn't. General Ky tried to prove that there was. Inspired by all the publicity and flattery of Honolulu and all of the Johnson-Ky photographs, he tried to eliminate his rival in the 1st Corps area, General Thi, and the trouble started.

BUDDHISTS AND STUDENTS

The Buddhists and the students took to the streets in support of their deposed local leaders. The protests spread from Da Nang in the 1st Corps area to Saigon. The U.S. Consul in Da Nang, Samuel B. Thomsen, had to urge Americans, including the 50,000 U.S.

to widen its contacts with the rest of the world? Is it the West that is isolating China or is it China that is isolating itself?

CHINA ISOLATED

The United States did not isolate Red China from the Soviet Union or from Indonesia or from Cuba; they isolated each other. The United States didn't isolate Red China from Algeria, or from Yugoslavia, or from the African nations which have expelled Peking's diplomats. China isolated herself by her own actions. It isn't the United States which is blocking an exchange of American and Chinese newsmen. We have been trying to bring this about for years. Red China blocks it.

Would Peking accept an exchange of ambassadors with the United States? There is every evidence that it would not, except on its own terms. For example, Peking forced General de Gaulle to withdraw the French Ambassador from Formosa before it would accept recognition from France. Is the United States to allow Peking to decide the countries with which we are to have diplomatic relations?

UNACCEPTABLE CONDITIONS

Does Peking want to join the U.N.? We don't know and it seems to me the U.N. should find out. So far Red China has laid down wholly unacceptable conditions: Formosa must be expelled; the 1950 U.N. resolution citing Red China as an aggressor in the Korean war must be rescinded and the United States named the aggressor instead; the "imperialist nations" and their "puppets" should be removed from the U.N.

If a two-thirds majority wants Red China in, why shouldn't they make it quite clear that nobody is going to be expelled and on that premise invite Peking to take a seat? Such a course will, at least, show whether the U.N. is keeping Red China out or whether Red China is keeping itself out.

Peking's self-isolation doesn't mean that we should not try to bring it into wider contact. It does mean that it will take a long time to do it, almost certainly into the next generation of Chinese Communist leaders. Like Stalin's Russia, Red China apparently needs to picture the United States as a big enemy in order to justify the massive repressions of the Mao regime. A U.S. policy of containment and contact makes sense.

MORE BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure resumed its hearings on invasion of privacy. We took testimony on a number of problems, ranging from governmental invasions of privacy to industrial espionage in the drug industry. Apparently, our subcommittee was not the only one concerned with this serious problem. My good friend and colleague Senator RIBICOFF took testimony from Mr. Ralph Nader on the activities of General Motors. And even the State Department was involved in tracking down American citizens as they traveled abroad.

Max Lerner has written a most informative article on this subject. His opening sentence expresses my feelings, when he says: "Snoopers, snoopers, everywhere." I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, the article by Mr. Lerner which appeared in the Evening Star on Tuesday, March 29, 1966.

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

THE PATH TOWARD A DOSSIER STATE

(By Max Lerner)

Snoopers, snoopers, everywhere. Doubtless it is sheer coincidence that three major cases of snooping, in three widely different fields, should have hit the headlines at the same time. But in the America of 1966 rather than of 1984 the effect is too eerily big brotherish to be shrugged off.

All three have broken here in Washington. One was a case of industrial espionage and involved the highly artificial price structure of the drug industry. The head of a firm of industrial sleuths, working for a drug manufacturer, told a senatorial subcommittee that he had planted a spy in a wholesale drug company to discover whether he was cutting his prices to retailers.

The second was an admission by the head of General Motors, before another Senate committee, that this giant company had spied upon a young Washington lawyer who had written a book that is highly critical of cars as containers for human beings, and which attacks them as death traps.

Third was the disclosure that at the request of the FBI, the State Department had asked the embassies in Paris and Moscow to place a Harvard professor of history under surveillance.

I am sure that somewhere in each case somebody thought he was doing the right thing. I am also sure that these are not isolated cases. Industrial espionage is widespread; massive auto corporations, with a big investment in current models, are tempted to protect their investment by less than open methods; the State Department now tells us that it is a common practice, and that hundreds and even thousands of Americans have been treated with this extra attention.

Shades of Adam Smith, who saw the system of business competition as "nature's simple plan." Shades of Jefferson, who was convinced that the crucial value in the young American republic was the jealous safeguarding of the right of criticism. Shades of Justice Holmes, who spoke of the "dirty business of wiretapping" and had the old-fashioned sense of honor and openness that gave him a healthy dislike for snooping in every form. The fact that these things are done commonly and on a big scale does not make them more attractive but less.

Of the three cases I find the sleuthing of Americans by U.S. embassies abroad the most disquieting. The target was H. Stuart Hughes, a teacher and scholar of distinction, who has taken some naive political positions in the past but probably not any more so than many other American intellectuals. One doesn't have to agree with Hughes in order to believe that his political positions are no justification for shadowing him when he goes on a research assignment to Europe.

It appeared at first that the passport division of the State Department had issued the surveillance order on its own, without a request from any agency. Then it turned out that the FBI had sent through a request. Perhaps it's more consoling for the shadowed person to know (if he ever discovers it) that the surveillance of him is pursuant to a request from a Government agency, and that everything has been done in proper form. But bureaucratic order doesn't help much if the principle itself is a highly doubtful one.

While saying that it has been common practice for years to shadow Americans abroad, the State Department was unable to cite the legal authority under which it is done. I suppose the answer is that it is not a legal but a practical problem. At a time of war, whether cold or hot, there are agencies whose tasks it is to guard U.S. security. They keep a watch over certain men within U.S. jurisdiction, and when they go abroad the vigil presumably continues.

There may be no real answer to the problem. The FBI and similar agencies would feel crippled if they could not ask for surveillance of people they suspect. But the trouble is that there is no way for the rest of us—the Nation as a whole—to form any judgment of how responsibly or irresponsibly those suspicions have arisen, how and why a particular man is chosen for shadowing, by whom and on what grounds the decision to make the request is reached, and what use is made of the harvest of information that is gathered about the suspect.

Can we not, with all our vaunted intellectual resources, contrive some way by which the security of the Nation will be tolerably guarded while retaining one of the prime values of our society:

The right of a person to live his life, well or ill, without benefit of the snoopers?

INTEREST IS BUILDING IN CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the growing interest of the Nation's press in the development of a creative federalism to help State and local governments better meet public needs is both salutary and significant. This interest, of course, is heightened by President Johnson's particular concern with modernizing our Federal system to bring State and local governments into a closer partnership with the Federal Establishment. A very well-written and thoughtful article by William Chapman appeared last Sunday in the Outlook section of the Washington Post entitled "The States as Partners." It highlights some of the thinking of Presidential assistants, State leaders, and others on this important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chapman's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STATES AS PARTNERS—L.B.J. WANTS THEM TO COOPERATE WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUT NOT AS LITTLE BROTHERS

(By William Chapman)

In city halls and State capitols, ears are cocked apprehensively toward the White House these days for answer to a widely discussed question: "What is creative federalism all about?"

It is a common but enigmatic phrase that President Johnson has employed for nearly 2 years in speeches and messages touching on the Federal, State, and local governments. To interested visitors, the President has spoken of it in stirring terms, declaring, "It means we've got to get this country ready for the year 2000."

The guests usually go away as uncertain as when they entered.

More positive guidance is expected this spring when Mr. Johnson is to deliver a special message on the issue and appoint a study committee to spend 2 or 3 years surveying the broad fields of Federal-State relations. For the present, White House aids and independent observers offer only some clues as to what they think the President is thinking. Their description goes like this:

The Federal Government is bound to grow larger and more powerful as States, cities, and towns turn toward it for help in providing everything from sewers to jet airports.

soldiers in Da Nang, to keep off the streets, and even American officials and Congressmen were advised to cancel their proposed trips to Saigon.

All this proves is that the political situation is unchanged, and that the propaganda of Honolulu has not prevailed over the power and tradition of Saigon. There is no cohesive national spirit in that nation for the simple reason that there is no nation.

It is still a tangle of competing individuals, regions, religions, and sects, dominated by a group of military warloads, representing, different regions, an army without a country, presiding over a people who have been torn apart by war and dominated and exploited by Saigon for generations.

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

No doubt American power will be able to sustain the central government of General Ky in the present crisis, but the more power we use, the more American domination will be resented. This is the dilemma. It has been there from the beginning and the latest political struggle has merely brought the facts to the surface.

The basis of American intervention in the beginning—and even of the official American thesis now—is that we are in Saigon to support a "government" and a "nation" against external aggression, which that Government and nation must win or lose primarily by themselves, but there is no Saigon Government that can govern, and no South Vietnamese "nation" in our understanding of the word.

ENDS AND MEANS

Meanwhile, the war goes on, unaffected so far by the political turmoil, but there is a basic problem still unresolved. Washington is still counting on a cohesive Saigon Government that does not exist. It cannot count on effective political or military action by the South Vietnamese and it is not prepared to produce the political and military manpower to take their place.

In short, the administration in Washington has not adjusted to the facts. It has not brought its ends and its means into line, It has accepted the ends of the "hawks"—destruction of the enemy's forces—but not the means, and it has accepted the ends of the "doves"—a negotiated compromise—but not their means, negotiation with the Vietcong who are doing most of the enemy fighting.

So Washington is in trouble. It is relying on myths and the only consolation of the present political demonstrations is that they are at least exposing the reality.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1966]

VIETNAM: WAR WITHIN WAR

Premier Ky's threat to smash dissidence in Danang and Hue by flying in troops from Saigon raises the danger of military clashes with local forces that could precipitate a second civil war in South Vietnam. It is the application of military force to what is essentially a political problem. And the use of American planes and weapons for this purpose—despite the claim that American troops will not be requested—makes it vital that Washington call a halt to this dangerous adventure.

A change of government in Saigon is clearly going to be necessary. The question is not if, but when—and how—a representative civilian regime can be established. Although he has only been in office 7 months, Premier Ky already has overstayed by 5 months the time predicted for him by former Ambassador Maxwell Taylor.

President Johnson's Honolulu embrace who obscured the Conference's real purpose—to generate a new program of social reform—weakened rather than strengthened Premier Ky's position and made recourse to anti-Americanism a logical move for his political competitors. An attempt to perpetuate Premier Ky in his post to save face for Mr. Johnson would only tar him further as an American puppet.

A new political balance has to be struck in Saigon. What is most important is not its exact nature but that a new balance of political forces should emerge—and that it emerge in as orderly a fashion as possible. The crisis in South Vietnam is not a popular upheaval calling for panic moves; nor has the Vietcong taken over Danang and Hue. What was in progress, until this past weekend, was essentially a Cabinet crisis, accelerated by the dismissal from the military directorate of its most powerful member, the northern commander, Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi. The street demonstrations, even if somewhat infiltrated by Vietcong agents, were traditional maneuvers by organized factions seeking to influence the outcome. The first need is not to "restore" Saigon's control of South Vietnam's northern provinces—a control it has not been able to exercise for many weeks—but to come to terms with the political problems.

This, Premier Ky now promises to do by calling a national political congress of all factions to select a constituent assembly. The makeup of the constituent assembly is the critical issue between the Saigon directorate and the militant Buddhist faction led by the Hue monk, Thich Tri Quang, whose stronghold is also in the northern provinces. Tri Quang insists that the new constituent assembly be drawn entirely from local and provincial councils to which last year's elections returned predominantly Buddhist elements.

It is a mark of Premier Ky's political ineptitude that the formation of this assembly, planned last year and promised for February at Honolulu, was not completed before the dismissal of General Thi—and that General Thi then was permitted to return to Hue. The crisis illustrates again the extent to which the United States is becoming Saigon's prisoner. The American Embassy was not consulted or even informed of General Thi's dismissal until the military directorate had taken its fatal decision.

Premier Ky's decision to send troops to Danang appears also to have been taken without consultation. Before the situation gets further out of hand, the strongest influence must be exerted to resolve the Saigon struggle by political means.

REA YOUTHFUL PRIZE WINNERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each year the Farmers Union in Oklahoma sponsors a Washington trip for its members and for youth winners of an essay contest in the State. Always, the group is an interesting one and I enjoy visiting with its members.

One of the winning essays this year was by Steve Powell, of Altus, Okla., who discussed how 4-H Clubs promote community living. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD. A second essay by Kirk Castleberry, Ninnekah, Okla., stresses the benefits for farming as a good way of life provided by the Farmers Union and by rural electric cooperatives. I also ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD.

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

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Steve Powell, Altus, Okla.)

I am 15 years old and I do not know exactly what a community is. What a community means to me might be something entirely different than to you. Webster doesn't define it as to size, but says it is a group of people having common organization or interest. So, if this is true, all of Oklahoma could be considered a community, but whether it be all of Oklahoma, western Oklahoma, Jackson County, or a small community in Jackson County, my organization—the 4-H Club—it is the same in principle wherever 4-H Clubs are found. It is its purpose to first develop the person. While the person is being developed, we do like my grandmother does when she is baking a cake. We throw in a pinch of incentive, a dash of leadership, and a large helping of citizenship. Placed in the oven of community life to grow for a few years, soon we are "done" enough to take our place as responsible citizens in our communities. While we 4-H members are still cooking, we are definitely making a contribution to community living. We represent free enterprise in miniature. We voluntarily joined our community 4-H Club. No one forced me to join or dictated which club I should join. I voluntarily selected my own projects. The success of 4-H Club projects depends upon the time and energy that each member puts into them. Upon the successful completion of our porjects, we usually receive some kind of award as the fruits of our labor. This is true of any community. It is no better than the people who live there and no community progresses unless much effort and leadership is put forth. The awards I receive are mine and mine alone. I do not have to share them with those who have been lazy and less diligent. With this kind of training, the community we live in will be in a position to go forward and be a better place to live as a result of my organization, the 4-H Clubs.

I am disturbed by the comments older people make, but mostly I am disturbed about uninformed people, some of them professional peddlers of gloom and doom, who shout to the housetops the American family farm and rural communities are being wiped out. I am disturbed to hear some of them describe American farming as our greatest problem. And I hear some of these same people caution us young people to stay away from, or get out of farming—that it's not a good life, that it's too risky. For years the Farmers Union has promoted and encouraged family farms. All of us will agree that a family farm today is much larger than a family farm was 20 years ago, and that our communities do not have the same boundary line they had 20 years ago, but as we 4-H members view this situation this is a sign of the times, it denotes progress and we want to be a real part of this progress of the changing time. Our 4-H Clubs have geared their programs and projects to the changing time just as the Farmers Union has had to do too. Let us further compare the objectives and goals of our two organizations. Farmers Union means many things to hundreds and thousands of men, women, and young people. But each and every activity, whether on the local or national level, has a single purpose. The single purpose of Farmers Union or the 4-H Clubs is a strong family relationship, in a strong agricultural community, in a strong America. It all comes back to the family, the most important unit in Farmers Union, also the most important to 4-H Club work.

Strength for your organization or my 4-H Club comes through knowledge. That is why your Educational Department of the Farmers Union is so important to your overall program and this is why 4-H Clubs were first started and this is why they are stronger today in every community than ever before. And every member of the family is important to your organization. Our 4-H Clubs members believe that it is not guns, missiles, and atomic power alone that keep our great country strong and free. We believe that

local people and local communities that are interested in local affairs contribute more to a strong economy, a better way of life, more opportunity for us young people than any other factor. I know this is all true: for the Farmers Union of Jackson County has and still is taking a real interest in us 4-H members both with their time and money, for I have been the recipient of their efforts.

Yes; we are very much alike: Farmers Union means summer camps, National and State conventions, local action and entertaining meetings, international exchange programs. This is our program, too. So with the same program, Farmers Union and 4-H Clubs can continue to hold hands and move forward in our communities promoting a better living for all. The spirit of our 4-H Club is reflected in the prayer of the Saint from Assisi: "May I seek not so much to be served, as to serve others."

FARMING GOOD WAY OF LIFE

(By Kirk Castleberry, Route 2, Neimkah, Okla.)

Say, have you ever bathed in a cramped, cold sided, No. 2 wash tub? If you have, I shall have little trouble convincing you that the rural electric cooperatives promote good community living.

First, I'd like to take you on a mental visit to my grandfather's pioneer Oklahoma farm. His day began before sunrise when he rose, and built a fire in the kitchen range. When the worst chill was gone, Grandmother rose, and cooked breakfast while he went to the barn, and fed the cattle, and horses by the light of a kerosene lantern. After breakfast, grandfather harnessed his team and was in the field by sunrise. He came to lunch at 12 and was back in the field by 1 where he stayed until sundown.

Grandmother canned the family's food and ironed with flat irons heated on the wood range. She washed on a washboard, and made clothes on a treadle machine by the light of a flickering kerosene lamp.

Their only sources of power were their animals and their muscles.

But a great change was coming. On May 11, 1935 President Franklin Roosevelt, by Executive order, created the Rural Electric Administration.

When Congress provided funds, it hoped private utility companies would use this low-interest money for rural electric development, but they thought it wouldn't pay. Their lines served 30 to 50 customers per mile. The rural system would average three. So the farmer lived in the "dark age" from 10 to 20 years longer.

Then the Farmers' Union which had strongly supported the REA, suggested forming rural electric cooperatives. Farmers long had been looking to this organization for leadership in (1) beneficial farm legislation; (2) complete insurance coverage; (3) cooperative cotton gins, wheat elevators, creameries, and gas stations.

So, when this trusted organization suggested farmers borrow money from the REA and construct their own electric lines, they listened.

Each of these rural electric cooperatives is a local, independent enterprise whose primary purpose is to furnish dependable, low-cost electric service. Each is owned and governed by its users through an elected board of directors. These directors hire a general manager. He hires and supervises other employees. At the annual meeting the customer-owners discuss and vote upon current problems and chart courses for the coming year.

Those who accuse the REC's of being socialistically owned and supported by the Government are uninformed of their true nature.

On the farm more than 400 uses of electricity are known. It is pumping water for rural homes and stock tanks. Electrified dairy farms produce more pure milk than ever before. It irrigates fields, augers grain, runs hay elevators, and furnishes power for all farm shop tools—welders, solderers, saws, and drills.

Many farm families are enjoying all-electric kitchens including freezers, ranges, garbage disposals, and dishwashers. Clothes are washed and dried indoors; electric heat and air conditioning are being added to farm homes each month.

The REC's also provide many benefits to the local, State, and National communities. Competition is Oklahoma's greatest guarantee against unreasonable electric rates.

Seven hundred million dollars have been spent in Oklahoma towns by REC customers on appliances. Motels, restaurants, filling stations, and drive-in movies using REC electricity have added to our State's economy.

No environment can be more pleasant than the farm community. Farm families work together to understand and solve each other's problems. Farm children share the work burden, contribute to the budget, and develop an early sense of responsibility toward both.

Farm people have a strong appreciation of nature. They experience, yearly, the joys of seeding time, sprouting crops, and the fulfillment of harvesting. Farming is a good way of life made much better by cooperatives like the rural electric and Farmers Union.

And I think, beyond doubt, I've proven to you the REC does promote good community living.

COLUMNISTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the April 1, 1966, issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson entitled "Columnists Under Investigation."

During the past several weeks these writers have written several articles outlining questionable transactions which allegedly involve a Member of the U.S. Senate, and that Senator has officially asked both the Justice Department and the Senate Ethics Committee to investigate all of these charges and announce their decision to the public.

In fairness to the man being charged, this investigation should be conducted thoroughly and promptly.

If the charges are false the man has a right to have his name cleared—and if they are true then the Ethics Committee should so notify the U.S. Senate.

But as this investigation proceeds, let it be remembered that the No. 1 job is to establish the accuracy or inaccuracy of the charges. After this has been done it will be time enough then should there be a question as to the manner in which the information was obtained.

I repeat, the question here is not how did Mr. Pearson get the information, but is it true or false?

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

COLUMNISTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

(By Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson)

A funny thing happened to us the other day at the Justice Department. We were called down there by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and were told we were under criminal investigation on a charge filed by Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, of stealing documents from his files.

This raises a very important point. If it is a crime for newsmen to seek evidence documenting charges of corruption against a U.S. Senator, then the press must give up one of its important functions and Senators will remain a sacrosanct body, able to expose others regarding deep freezes, mink coats, vicuna coats, and Bobby Baker's conflicts of interest, but immune from exposure themselves.

For it is almost impossible to prove indictable facts regarding a Senator, or for that matter any official, without using evidence obtained from the inside.

Furthermore, using inside evidence is one of the chief ways the FBI and most law enforcement agencies operate.

It would have been impossible for instance, for the FBI to secure evidence on the Ku Klux Klan in the Liuzzo murder case without having an FBI agent inside the Klan. Almost every week the FBI pays money for inside information. So does Internal Revenue. Many of the tax convictions in the United States result from inside information.

There is a law on the statute books providing remuneration to tax informers; and Congress appropriates the money for the FBI to pay for inside information.

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

As it happens, we paid no money and stole no documents. We did talk to former members of DODD's staff who were motivated by the highest interest, namely the public's right to know when a U.S. Senator delivers speeches and performs chores for a foreign agent; when he deposits in his personal account thousands of dollars contributed to his election; when he accepts valuables from companies he helped in regard to Government contracts; and when he charges both the taxpayers and private organizations for trips he makes around the country.

The Attorney General's investigation also raises an important point regarding senatorial "theft" or use of unauthorized documents.

We asked Mr. Katzenbach, for instance, whether he had investigated Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, as to how he obtained the documents which he publicized in the Bobby Baker case. Obviously they were obtained from Government employees who believed in the public's right to know.

The Attorney General said he had not investigated Senator WILLIAMS.

We also asked whether he had investigated Senator DODD's possession or possible theft of the Otepka papers. This was the famous case where DODD, as vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, was personally involved with obtaining State Department files.

The State Department considered this theft. For on September 23, 1963, it charged Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Evidence Valuation Division of the State Department's Office of Security, with violations of 13 regulations by giving confidential information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

CHAMPIONED THEFT

On November 5, Otepka was dismissed. Later that day, Senator DODD denounced the State Department, warning that if Otepka's ouster "is permitted to stand it will become impossible or exceedingly difficult to elicit any information from employees of the executive branch that bears on * * * wrongdoing by their superiors."

Katzenbach said he had not investigated DODD in connection with the alleged theft of the Otepka papers.

Other important Members of Congress have used documents obviously obtained from sub rosa Government sources, most of these critical of the executive branch—Senators JOHN

prime weapon needed to bring about a reduction in accident frequency and severity. We do not need more Federal encroachment in safety matters in noncoal mining. What we need is an enthusiastic and deeply ingrained safety consciousness in top management; a firmly supported educational program for all employees in safe working habits; and continued and vigorous efforts to personally recognize and stimulate each employee's interest in safety through awards programs, frequent safety meetings, and by sustained instruction in accident prevention."

Mr. Goodwin admits that some States need to improve the position of local inspectors, eliminate out-of-date laws, and improve State controls over health and safety in the mines. Why for the past 20 years have many of the States lagged in this vital matter? Why is the threat of a Federal statute required to have the States do what they should have been doing all along?

The record for this period shows that more than enthusiasm on the part of management is required to bring about a reduction in accident frequency and severity. For anyone to advocate otherwise is to fly in the face of reality.

In the December 1963 issue of the Mining Congress Journal, an article by James Boyd states as follows:

"We must acknowledge that all mines do not live up to safety standards that are well recognized, and that there are no means by which the industry itself can enforce compliance; hence, some public authority with enforcement powers is necessary. We firmly believe that these powers should remain with the State or local authorities. Enlightened management recognizes that both the human and the economic considerations require strict attention to safety standards, and by far the majority of mining administrations enforce within their own operations standards which are more stringent than can be feasibly set by law. There are only a few who do not live up to these standards and whose accident rates give rise to the clamor for Federal enforcement powers."

Some operators realize that all mines do not live up to safety standards. There are no means by which the industry can enforce compliance on itself.

Many of the corporations engaged in metallic and nonmetallic mining are cooperating with the Bureau of Mines health and safety programs at this very moment.

The following statement on page 58, House hearings on mine safety, 87th Congress, reveals the following:

"Mineowners are indebted to the U.S. Bureau of Mines for its data on accidents and recommendations for their prevention. The Bureau employs competent engineers and obtains trustworthy data in rendering its service."

The attempt to augment this excellent and necessary activity with Federal inspection saw the operators retreat to State inspection and statutes as the better approach to mine safety.

If they have such great respect for the Bureau staff on an educational basis, why the resistance when an inspector is given the authority to see that all mines are made as safe as they can humanly be made?

The very nature of underground mining makes it a dangerous industry in which to operate and to work.

You cannot have too many involved in safety, be they State or Federal agencies, or private associations. The operators admit they can't enforce compliance.

The attitude of the Bituminous Coal Operators Association is in marked contrast to the metallic and nonmetallic operators of the American Mining Congress. In a paper delivered by Mr. George C. Trevorrow, safety director of the association at the American Mining Congress mining show, Las Vegas, Nev., October 11–14, 1965, stated as follows:

"Top management of most of the larger coal companies insist on a strong safety program at its mines. This attitude is reflected in every case in a low number of injuries and a low injury frequency rate. Part of this insistence is due to the increasing sensitivity to public opinion, but mainly because its representatives have learned that a safe coal mine is an efficient one and that a good safety program is just good business. In many of these companies the top management insists on getting reports of all mine inspections, reports of the investigations of injuries and those of any unusual occurrences in or about the mines. Such management obviously is kept informed of the injuries occurring at the mines. It follows with this careful scrutiny that inspections and investigations are carefully made; the supervisors are anxious to keep substandard conditions found on these inspections to a minimum; and every reasonable attempt is made to prevent recurrence of injuries."

The task at hand is such that State inspection where it is experienced benefits from contact with and the work of the Bureau of Mines inspectors, as the operations in coal have proven. This trend has not diminished, for they look to the Bureau of Mines for guidance and information.

Progress in this effort for mine safety legislation in the metallic and nonmetallic mines has been painfully slow, but there has been progress none the less. The fact that this act, H.R. 8989 is before the subcommittee is evidence as to that.

If the need was not there the legislative efforts to secure mine safety legislation would have faltered back in the 84th Congress and come to nothing. The need was there. The hearings of the 84th, 87th, and 89th sessions of the Congress bear out that contention. The 24-month study by the Department of the Interior as authorized by Congress made a major contribution to mine safety, when it provided the vehicle for the introduction of a mine safety bill sponsored by the administration.

The House reported out a good bill. H.R. 8989 can become a better one, if amended as has been proposed.

We hope this subcommittee will be able to report favorably on H.R. 8989 with the suggested amendment to section 13 of the act, and that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will vote its approval of this much-needed legislation in the vital field of metallic and nonmetallic mining.

I thank you for the opportunity you have given me in presenting this statement.

RULES OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND IN VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, every American who is a member of the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, is issued a very important document, entitled "Nine Rules for Personnel of U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam," immediately upon his arrival in Vietnam.

I believe this document speaks rather eloquently of our fighting men in Vietnam who are involved not only in warfare but also in the very important task of bringing about better understanding and improved relationship between our people and the Vietnamese.

I wish to share with my colleagues the nine important rules issued by our command in Vietnam to our service personnel.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this document be printed in the RECORD.

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

NINE RULES FOR PERSONNEL OF U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The Vietnamese have paid a heavy price in suffering for their long fight against the Communists. We military men are in Vietnam now because their Government has asked us to help its soldiers and people in winning their struggle. The Vietcong will attempt to turn the Vietnamese people against you. You can defeat them at every turn by the strength, understanding, and generosity you display with the people. Here are nine simple rules:

1. Remember we are guest here; we make no demands and seek no special treatment.
2. Join with the people. Understand their life, use phrases from their language and honor their customs and laws.
3. Treat women with politeness and respect.
4. Make personal friends among the soldiers and common people.
5. Always give the Vietnamese the right-of-way.
6. Be alert to security and ready to react with your military skill.
7. Don't attract attention by loud, rude, or unusual behavior.
8. Avoid separating yourself from the people by a display of wealth or privilege.
9. Above all else you are members of the U.S. military forces on a difficult mission, responsible for all your official and personal actions. Reflect honor upon yourself and the United States of America.

"PA AND MA AND L.B.J."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in times such as these, when many of us feel the tenseness of the war in South Vietnam and the pressure of domestic problems of inflation and taxation, it is helpful to sit back and see the lighter side of life.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the April edition of Nation's Business. The article is entitled "Pa and Ma and L.B.J." with the subtitle, "Or How To Become a Casualty in the Government's War on Poverty." It was written by Jim Comstock, editor of the West Virginia Hillbilly of Richwood, W. Va.

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

PA AND MA AND L.B.J.

Pa had no sooner climbed out of the truck which he'd thumbed a ride in when he hollered at Ma to get him the foreign country map and find out where poverty was a President Johnson had just declared war on that country and expected every man to do his duty, and Pa was preparing to do his but he wanted to know where the place was and how to get there.

Fiddlin' Clyde, who sat in the parlor a-strumming his guitar, quit humming the song he had just composed called "I Left My Baby Depressed in the Mountains," or "I Want to Hold Your Handout." He allowed Ma needn't worry none about no geography because he knew where Poverty was. It was in Kentucky. He knew because he heard the Great Society social worker say if anybody wanted to find Poverty in West Virginia, they ought to have a look in Kentucky first. Fiddlin' Clyde ain't called Fiddlin' Clyde because he plays the fiddle but because he fiddles around with the guitar. And he always makes songs about what Pa is thinking about.

certain sections of the act. The amendment postpones, until 1 year after the date of publication in the Federal Register of mandatory mine health and safety standards, the power of the Secretary to issue a notice to a mine operator requiring the abatement of a violation of such a standard or to issue an order of withdrawal and debarment of persons from a mine where the Secretary finds an imminent danger of death or serious physical harm exists. These powers of the Secretary of the Interior cannot be exercised in any State within less than 90 days after the adjournment of the next regular session of the State legislature which convenes after the date of publication of the mandatory standards in the Federal Register.

The extent to which this amendment will postpone the effective date of the Secretary's powers to issue abatement notices and orders of withdrawal and debarment will depend upon the timelag between the enactment of the act and the designation of mandatory standards, as well as upon the timing of legislative sessions in the individual States—particularly in those States whose legislatures meet only biennially.

During 1966, 26 States will hold legislative sessions. The remainder of the States do not have a regular legislative session scheduled until 1967.

To illustrate what would be presumably an extreme possibility for postponement of Federal enforcement power: Assume an 18-month lag between the date of enactment of the act and the date of publication in the Federal Register of the mandatory health and safety standards which the Secretary must develop in consultation with advisory committees. With a State legislature meeting biennially which does not convene until 18 months after the Federal Register publication date, with a session lasting 4 months, a total of 43 months, or 3 years and 7 months would elapse between the date of enactment of the act and the date at which Federal inspectors would acquire the authority to issue notices of abatement or orders to withdraw and debar persons from mines where an immediate or imminent danger of death or serious physical harm is found to exist.

The purpose of delaying the effective date until 90 days after the close of the next State legislative session is to give the State legislature the opportunity—if it decides to avail itself of the opportunity—to look at the mandatory standards designated by the Secretary, take action to pass any new legislation that may be required for establishment of a State inspection and enforcement plan to be presented for the Secretary's approval, and to appropriate the money that will be necessary in order to have the State plan carried out to the Secretary's satisfaction. An approved plan has to "provide for the development and enforcement of health and safety standards * * * which are or will be substantially as effective * * * as the mandatory standards" designated by the Secretary. It is not unreasonable to require that a substantial amount of time be given a State, after it has learned what these mandatory standards are to be, in which to decide whether it wishes to develop and finance a State plan embodying substantially as effective standards.

Safety is one field of endeavor where needless loss of time in its execution, can be disastrous.

Section 13, especially (d), will delay the effective and timely implementation of H.R. 9989. It creates a no man's land between the Secretary of Interior and the several States. Delays, and indecision would be the order of the day. Instead of expediting health and safety for the miners it will serve to hamstring this objective.

With the States having recourse to judicial review as to the actions of the Secretary, the specter of frustrating delays is all too apparent.

The record as developed over the past decade leaves little to hope for as far as bringing about some degree of effective and uniform health and safety measures on the part of the States.

We respectfully refer to page 167 of the hearings on mine safety, before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, for a detailed statement as to the failure of the States to improve their mine safety codes, if they have them, and bring some degree of safety to the miners through thorough inspections and training. Report No. 606, 89th Congress, 1st session, House of Representatives, on pages 4, 5, and 6, sets forth the many and various failures of the several States, as related to mine safety in the metallic and nonmetallic mines.

We strongly urge the subcommittee to review the hearings that were held before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, pages 34–56. These individual reports are facts that cannot be ignored and reveal the terrible inadequacies of State mine enforcement and inspection.

The record will show that many of the States are reluctant to appropriate adequate amounts of money to insure enforcement of their mining codes by their State safety agency or department.

There is no assurance that under section 13 the States will make any effort to provide these funds, preferring to let well enough alone, and let the Secretary of Interior take over all these functions.

The gap between the legislative session of the State legislatures and the one given over to appropriations would only serve to confuse and delay the putting into being the health and safety measures that are needed now—not 2 or 4 years from now.

Since its inception over 50 years ago, the Bureau of Mines has had as one of its main objectives the promotion of health and safety practices in the mining industry. This aim is being accomplished through safety education, first aid training, technical consultation, and safety inspection of mines including specific recommendations for eliminating or minmizing hazards. The Bureau staff is ready to assist in every possible way to prevent injury in mining operations.

The responsibility for mine safety in the metallic and nonmetallic field should be given to the one agency that has experience in mining. The Bureau of Mines has that experience and knowledge.

The Bureau is carrying out the inspection and enforcement of health and safety standards in all the coal mines of the Nation, employing more than 14 miners. That responsibility was given in the 82d Congress under Public Law 552, the Neeley-McConnell Act. This subcommittee referred favorably a bill, H.R. 3584, dealing with small coal mines to the standing committee on Labor and Education in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

H.R. 3584 gives the Bureau responsibility for carrying out various provisions relating to health and safety.

This bill has been favorably voted on by the Senate.

The responsibility for Federal action in health and safety activities has been established in many fields. Some of the more objective examples of this are such Federal activities in atomic energy, coal mines, inspection services of the Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Act, and the ship inspection service.

All of labor, therefore, recommends that section 13 be amended as follows:

"SEC. 13. The Secretary shall provide that the major responsibility for administering the provisions of this Act shall be vested in the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior. The Secretary acting through the Bureau shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this Act; and to prescribe powers; duties and responsibilities of all officers and employees engaged in the administration of this Act: *Provided, however,* That to the maximum extent feasible, in the selection of persons for appointment as mine inspectors, no person shall be so selected unless he has the basic qualification of at least five years practical mining experience and in assigning mine inspectors to the inspection and investigation of individual mines, due consideration shall be given to their previous practical experience in the State, district, or region, where such inspections are to be made."

This amendment will make for a more effective and efficient mine safety law.

The opposition to this mine safety legislation come from some of the operators. Why are the operators opposed to Federal inspection by qualified inspectors of the Bureau of Mines? Is it because a safer operation would cost more to operate? We respectfully refer this subcommittee to pages 171 and 172 of the hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, 89th Congress, as regards industries position on this attempt to secure some legislation relating to the miners in metallic and nonmetallic mines.

The American Mining Congress has stated that seven in a hundred underground metal miners can expect to be killed at work in a working lifetime.

The Bureau of Mines reports that for metals alone the period 1963–64 there was a sharp increase in fatalities in 1964 to a total of 59, 13 more than in 1963. Nonfatal disabilities also increased to 3,745 in 1964, compared with 3,485 in 1963.

In October 1965 at the American Mining Congress Convention held at Las Vegas, Nev., Mr. Sidney S. Goodwin, vice president, the New Jersey Zinc Co., stated as follows:

"You may or may not be aware of the fact that several of the States, particularly Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and New Mexico, have brought revisions either in their laws or their regulations to improve the position of local inspectors; eliminate out-of-date laws; improve State and local controls over health and safety matters in the mines. Others are already developing plans for similar action in the months ahead. These actions are fine examples of the type of steps that need to be taken in all our mining States if Federal policies are to be avoided. The task remaining in the States becomes apparent if one takes the study of the Interior Department, with respect to State laws and their adequacy, at its face value. This report would indicate that most mining States have laws today which the Federal Government considers adequate. The remaining States have no direct mineral safety laws or they are considered inadequate from the standpoint of meeting standards which the Federal Government believes should be attained.

"Under the terms of the House-passed bill, it is provided that safety control and enforcement of standards could be turned over to those States having laws which provide for inspections and enforcement and for adequate personnel to accompany this task. I would also like to point out that with or without this type of legislation the industry still feels that management should seek to strengthen the laws at the local level; to improve the effectiveness of the agencies administering them; increase emphasis on safety education and training, which is the

forts to enable parents of their country to raise a family responsibly, we make a tragic error when we do not fill the vacuum, when we do not give all the assistance the country requests because it is in this field that we can make the greatest strides.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to express complete agreement with the Senator from Maryland, of whose bill I am a cosponsor. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Mr. PEARSON. Madam President, in a speech in this Chamber on March 29, 1966, I proposed that the appropriate officials of the administration be invited to appear before an appropriate congressional committee to explain the administration's current policy of indirect price and wage controls.

I argued that this was necessary for two principal reasons. First, despite the fact that the administration is engaged in an extensive price-wage fixing, the full intentions of the administration have never been fully identified and the techniques have never been adequately explained. Indeed, the administration has deliberately attempted on numerous occasions to obscure from the American public its intentions and its methods.

Second, a policy of indirect price and wage controls is very likely to result in numerous inequities and various groups in our society are likely to be forced to make sacrifices not demanded of others.

Madam President, full and open debate on this extremely important public policy which affects the vital interest of every individual in the group can no longer be delayed. Therefore, I had delivered to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, a letter requesting that this committee initiate hearings on the administration's indirect price and wage control policy.

This is the same procedure now being followed in the House of Representatives seeking to find some definition of not only policies but the methods.

Madam President, I want to emphasize that I am not calling for imposition of mandatory controls at this time, nor am I saying that indirect controls should never be used. However, I am saying, and most emphatically, that because the decision to engage in indirect price and wage controls constitutes the making of a public policy of greatest importance, these decisions and their justifications must be subject to free and open debate. The Congress must be provided with an adequate explanation from the administration and must have the opportunity to approve, or reject, or modify the operation of this policy.

Madam President, these are the facts. The administration has been applying price and wage controls without any expressed consent of the Congress, and it is applying these controls, as far as I can determine, without any standards or rules of Government intervention and without adequate consideration of their overall and selective economic impact.

In this connection it would appear that the only rule or guideline that the administration is using is simply to apply pressure at those points where its enormous powers can be used most effectively. Thus, prices in some industries and businesses have been rolled back while other prices have advanced rapidly. For example, while there have been price roll backs in aluminum, copper, steel and cigarettes, there have been price advances in such key areas as chemicals, plastics, TV tubes, gasoline, newsprint, and rubber tires.

Some labor contracts have resulted in wage increases that are within the 3.2 percent productivity guideline while other wages have gone beyond this 3.2 percent increase.

In my statement of March 29, 1966, I expressed the concern that the administration's undercover war on inflation was resulting in economic inequities particularly in agricultural, and I identified several areas in which the administration had acted to force down farm prices.

Farm prices are indeed falling but there is absolutely no assurance that this is going to have any anti-inflation effect. Thus the result of these actions may well do nothing more than reduce the farmers' already slim margin of profit.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, apparently took pleasure last week in announcing the decline in farm prices. As William M. Blair reported in the New York Times of March 31, 1966:

> It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

I am just as concerned about inflation as Mr. Freeman, but I see nothing that is pleasing about the decline in farm prices. It is particularly disturbing to me that as farm prices are falling, the farmers' cost of production is rising. The Department of Agriculture report which showed a turndown in the prices received by the farmer also showed an increase in prices paid out by the farmer. Thus, the parity ratio dropped from 83 in February to 82 in March. The price cost squeeze on the farmer is cutting deeper and deeper.

Madam President, the farmers' economic position has been weakened and the Administration is confidently predicting that farm prices wil continue to fall. In an article published in the Washington Post of April 3, 1966, John Schnittker, Underscecretary of Agriculture, predicted that farm prices will drop another 10 percent in the near future.

The administration can make these predictions with confidence because it has the power to force such a rollback. But Madam President, the farmers and the Congress want to know if the administration can also keep the lid on prices paid by farmers and also if lower farm prices will ever mean lower retail food prices.

I see no evidence to date that suggests that either of these will occur. Mr. Freeman has expressed the hope that lower farm prices will be reflected in lower retail prices. But the experience of past history is not at all encouraging on this score.

Last Friday the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] expressed the belief that recent administration actions in milk price supports "have been carefully tailored not to assure fair returns to the farmer but to avoid any actual increase in consumer prices."

This appears to be the case not only in regard to milk but also in regard to other agricultural products. Farm prices are frozen or rolled back while farm costs continue to rise and consumer prices continue to move upward.

In my statement of March 29, 1966, I pointed out that the rollback in cattle hide prices did not prevent a subsequent increase in shoe prices. But several days after major shoe companies had announced major price increases the Secretary of Agriculture was quoted in the Christian Science Monitor of April 1, 1966, as saying "the housewife should be able to save on a pair of shoes as a result" of the administration's drastic export limitations on skins and hides. This is exactly the type of thing that makes it vitally important that the administration's indirect price and wage control policy be brought into the open and submitted to full and searching debate. The Congress must be an active participant in this debate. It is imperative, therefore, that congressional hearings be initiated as soon as possible.

Mr. PEARSON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR CHURCH, OF IDAHO, ON AMERICAN BROADCASTING SYSTEM PROGRAM "FROM THE CAPITAL," FEBRUARY 7, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, during the recent hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Relations, several members of the committee showed a lively interest in the proceedings. One of the most attentive and discriminating of my colleagues has been the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. Many of his statements are already in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of a television interview of Senator CHURCH on February 7, on the American Broadcasting System, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[Excerpts for the American Broadcasting System program "From the Capital," Feb. 7, 1966]

Guest: Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho.

Correspondents: Keith McBee and Irv Chapman.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator CHURCH, what helpful things, affecting the Vietnam war, do you

think can come out of this Honolulu conference.

Senator CHURCH. I hope that greater emphasis will be given to the economic and political side of the war in Vietnam as a result of this conference. I think that an intensification of the war, given the circumstances, is also inevitable; but I would hope that it does not take the form of broadening the war front or widening the war front in Vietnam.

Mr. MCBEE. Does it not take some of the senatorial heat, and accompanying press coverage off of the administration at this particular time?

Senator CHURCH. Well, it may have that effect for the next few days because naturally and properly, the President is the principal focus of the news, and the coverage he will receive in Hawaii will be very thorough and complete, but I think the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, which are meant to continue considerably beyond that time) will get the attention that they ought to get, and I am not concerned on that score.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Senator CHURCH, on his arrival in Honolulu the President said as part of his remarks, "There are special pleaders who counsel retreat in Vietnam, they belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." Do you think this is the way the President regards his critics on Capitol Hill, you among them?

Senator CHURCH. I would not think so, because I do not know of any here on Capitol Hill who have advocated retreat in Vietnam. If there are any, they are very few and far between, and I certainly am not one. He may have been referring to some of the demonstrators who have gone very far in protesting the war. I would think that he did not have in mind responsible critics, because if it were his purpose to silence responsible criticism, this would be the stiffling of freedom right here in America, and I cannot imagine that the President would have anything like that in mind.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Well, in answering reporters' questions at the White House, after he announced on Friday he was going to Honolulu, he seemed to refer to your hearings as "a show." Do you think the criticisms being made up here are falling on deaf ears?

Senator CHURCH. I cannot say what the President's attitude may be in that respect. I should think, however, that he would be interested in the inquiry that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is making and that this would form a part of his continuing appraisal of the situation. I should not think that he would want to isolate himself in the White House with a certain coterie of handpicked advisers, all of whom reflect his own opinion about the war; and for that reason I would hope that he would give serious attention to these proceedings in the Senate committee, and any other proceedings here on Capitol Hill that are directed toward a thorough examination of the premises that underlie the war and the objective, the ultimate objective that we have in mind out there.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Senator CHURCH, do you think the President is carrying out what obligation he has, to answer these basic questions that are being raised himself, as opposed to making exhortatory speeches about the war effort?

Senator CHURCH. I think that it is a part of the evil of war, I suppose you could say, that the further a country becomes embroiled, the greater the degree of emotion. It is natural enough, we have got 200,000 boys out there now and it is becoming increasingly difficult to take a dispassionate view of the war; and the larger the American military commitment becomes, the greater the danger becomes to the country; and the longer the casualty lists grow, the more difficult it will be to remain unemotional about the war. I should think this would be perhaps the highest responsibility of the Presidency; to set the tone that will permit us to continue to be objective and rational about American policy in Vietnam.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator CHURCH, do you think that the President had any recourse, from a military standpoint, but to resume bombing North Vietnam?

Senator CHURCH. I think that from a military standpoint the resumption may have been indicated. The question of how long the suspension should have been continued was not a military one but a diplomatic one. Obviously, the bombing has failed to achieve the military objectives that were once proclaimed for it. It has not cut off the continuing supply of the Vietcong from the North. It may have harassed the supply lines, but obviously they have continued and in fact the Vietcong has grown very much stronger during the period that the bombings have been underway, so that the military objectives of the bombing have not succeeded. I think that by reinstituting them we merely want to commence again the kind of harassment that makes the supply routes more dangerous and more difficult.

Mr. MCBEE. Well, is it because of the danger of Red China, do you think, that heavier bombardment is not being employed and populations are not being destroyed?

Senator CHURCH. Well I think that there are several reasons for this. In the first place, North Vietnam is a rural country. We could strike the cities, we could destroy Hanoi, and we could destroy Haiphong, their major port. But if we destroyed their cities and all their industry this amounts to less than 10 percent of the total production of their economy, and the government in Hanoi could resort once again to the countryside and the resistance would continue, so this will not, I think break the back of Hanoi. It will not force them to the negotiating table. It will not accomplish what we hope to accomplish; namely, a political settlement of the war in Vietnam. On the other hand, it could intensify their determination to persist in the war, and it could, of course, increase the danger of a Chinese decision to come down. We have to remember, our memories are not to be so short as to lead us to forget our experience in Korea when the Chinese did come down after we had reached a certain point in the extension of that war northward toward the Chinese frontiers. I think there's a plate-glass window up there somewhere—we don't know exactly where it is, but if we continue to expand the dimension of the war northward, at some point we're going to break that window, and when we do, I think we can expect the Chinese to respond as they responded in Korea, when they poured down over the Yalu River with 600,000 men.

Mr. MCBEE. Senator, do you ever have a feeling that the inclination among some of the U.S. military now is to take on China now, to bring them in if possible, before they have atomic delivery capabilities?

Senator CHURCH. Well, I would hope that this is not seriously intended by the military. I cannot say whether there is any advocacy within the military itself of such a policy. But I remember about 15 years ago when there was considerable argument on behalf of a preventive war against the Soviet Union, and it was said then that we will either have to fight the Soviet Union now or later, it is better to fight her now than later. I am glad that counsel did not prevail 15 years ago, and I think that the same counsel ought not to prevail now. I cannot imagine a war that would involve a greater tragedy for the United States, that would involve a larger number of casualties, and that in the end would lead to such frustration as a war with China. No nation in history has managed to conquer China, are we now going to undertake what all other countries have tried and failed to do for centuries and centuries in the past? People who think that a war against China will merely consist of sending a few bombing planes over and destroying her nuclear plants are just deceiving themselves and the country. That is just the opening overture in such a war. Eventually, the only way that China can be conquered is for land armies to invade and occupy China. This means conquering an area larger than any other in the world, save Russia; and a population of 750 million people in a body to body confrontation. Now, I do not know anything at the present that requires us to engage in such a holocaust, and I would certainly hope that rational leadership will prevail against any counsel, if it does exist, to extend this war in Asia to the point where we find ourselves engaged against China on the opposite side of the world. I cannot believe that this is intended by the administration. I am certain that the President is endeavoring in every way possible to keep the war in Vietnam within manageable limits.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Senator CHURCH, if our objective in Vietnam is a political settlement, could we promote that objective by recognizing Vietcong as an agent at the bargaining table?

Senator CHURCH. I think that the only way we are likely to get to the bargaining table is by engaging the Vietcong directly in preliminary talks that might lead to a political settlement.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Right now?

Senator CHURCH. I think that the sooner that this is done, the better. I know of no war that has ever been settled without engaging the combatants, and obviously the Vietcong is the largest single element in South Vietnam against which our forces are now deployed.

Mr. CHAPMAN. But the thing that we are fighting against is the domination of South Vietnam by the Vietcong. Now shouldn't any role for the Vietcong be a concession we make during the negotiating process and not in advance of it?

Senator CHURCH. Of course, and I think that this country would oppose, and certainly I would oppose, any settlement that delivered over South Vietnam into the control of the Vietcong. I am merely saying that the Vietcong need to be engaged in conversations with other non-Communist elements in South Vietnam, looking toward the possibility of establishing some form of interim regime which would restore order and supervise the conduct of elections that could ultimately determine the political character of the regime in South Vietnam.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Well, Hanoi is making this as a sticking point at this time, we must recognize the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, as the spokesman for South Vietnam. Do you feel that if we did come some way toward it that Hanoi might not point some other sticking point because of their feeling that they can't conquer South Vietnam?

Senator CHURCH. There is no assurance that the Communists will come to the bargaining table under any circumstances. But it would seem to me it would be unrealistic for the United States to overlook the people who are principally engaged in the war in South Vietnam against the Vietnamese that we support there. I do not think that the United States as a government can open up conversations with the Vietcong. But I do think that the Vietnamese who are involved against the Vietcong should be encouraged to open up conversations to determine whether or not some basis can be found for a political settlement in South Vietnam which would of course be consistent with the commitment that we have made to the Saigon government. I think it is unrealistic to assume that we are likely to get to the conference table by going over the heads of

the people who are themselves involved in the battle and who are each day dying in large numbers, and to assume a posture that permits us to talk only to some other government, whether it be Hanoi, or whether it be Peking, or Moscow. I think that is the least likely way to reach the conference table.

Mr. McBEE. Do you think, sir, the Saigon government can talk independently to the Vietcong, apart from Hanoi?

Senator CHURCH. I think that definitely, that there are non-Communist elements in South Vietnam that should be encourged to open up conversations, preliminary conversations, in the hope that this might lead to a more formal conference at which all elements could be represented. I should think that this might permit Hanoi then to back up the Vietcong, while we backed up the non-Communist elements and would put neither side in the position of appearing to be backtracking upon pledges made. The problem that we have in South Vietnam, our determination not to backtrack on our pledges, is similar in ways, I suspect, to pledges that it has made in support of the Vietcong. Therefore, the best way to reach a conference is to engage the fighting elements in the field. Suppose during our own revolutionary war that the British had taken the position that they would deal only with the French, and not talk at all with George Washington? The French had more troops at Yorktown than Washington had continentals. Obviously, it is not realistic to expect negotiations to commence which do not involve the principal participants in the fight. And yet, up till now this has been the American posture.

Mr. McBEE. Do you think, sir, during President Johnson's peace offensive there was a serious breakdown or lack of liaison with Saigon? Marshal Ky said that certain of the military might attempt to overthrow him at any moment, there was very little notice given to the Saigon regime that the President was about to conduct this worldwide peace offensive.

Senator CHURCH. Well, that I really am not competent to say. I do not know what notice was given to Saigon, I do know that the Saigon government is dependent entirely upon the United States for its sustenance, for a long time it depended utterly upon us for our money, now it depends on us for our men. If it must depend upon us to fight its war, then I think that we ought not to be handcuffed in our efforts to reach a satisfactory peace.

Mr. McBEE. On the other hand, sir, might you infuriate the Saigon regime by treating them as something of a junior partner in their own country?

Senator CHURCH. I am sure that the President has not done this, and the very fact that he is now conferring with the chiefs of the Saigon regime in Hawaii, confirms, I think, all of the recognition and all of the prestige that the President of the United States can give to this regime.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Senator CHURCH, I gather that your basic point of view on the way to settle the Vietnam war is attuned to your feeling that we have exaggerated the impact of communism within the revolution that is going on there, as elsewhere, and that we have really no right and certainly no wisdom to go in after every revolution, including this one, because there are Communist elements or even a possibility of Communist domination. Is that your point of view?

Senator CHURCH. My point of view is this: I think that the United States has an interest in doing all that it can to discourage the spread of communism in the underdeveloped world. I think, however, that American military intervention more often than not may turn out to be less of a deterrent to the spread of communism than a stimulant.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Is that true in Vietnam?

Senator CHURCH. I am afraid in Vietnam that our decision to convert the war, more and more, into an American war, pitting hundreds of thousands of white Western troops, imported from the opposite side of the world, against Oriental troops in the Orient makes the war appear to many Asians to be an attempt on the part of a Western nation to reassert political control over the affairs of an Asian country. Now, we know this is not our intention. But the important question is: How do the Asians see it? And I am afraid that the reason that Mao Tse-tung is so much opposed to the settlement of this war and so anxious for the war to continue is not because he thinks that the Hanoi government can defeat the United States of America, but because he feels that the continuation of the war will assist China in her larger interests in Asia and will have more effect in spreading communism elsewhere in Asia than a negotiated settlement would have. I think it is a great misfortune that we did not better appreciate Mao Tse-tung's view of this war some years ago. I think he has ensnared us in a trap which he obviously feels serves China's interest. We must remember in this part of the world that after two centuries of colonial experience, the thing that is most feared by Asian people is Western imperialism, not communism as such; and in the lands that I have visited, many of the lands in this region of the world, it is capitalism, not communism that is the ugly word. Because they haven't known our kind of capitalism, they have only known the kind that was associated with their old colonial experience. So when we move into South Vietnam with a large Western army, this permits the Communists to say that the government we support is merely a puppet of Western imperialism. It permits China to pose in the role that she most wants to be accepted in among her Asian countries. Namely, the role of champion of Asia for the Asians. And it helps to identify communism with the one nationalist aspiration that dominates the feeling of most people in Asia, it helps to identify communism with the effort to expel Western imperialism or colonialism from Asia. Now that is a losing cause, I think, and that is the reason why Mao Tse-tung is so anxious to see this war continue.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Senator CHURCH, in a quarter of a minute, how do we prevent Thailand from becoming another Vietnam?

Senator CHURCH. The best way is by not permitting the Thai Government to become accusable of being another puppet of the United States.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Thank you for being with us on "From the Capital."

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY JOHN S. KNIGHT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that four excellent editorials written by the distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. John S. Knight, be printed at this point in the RECORD. Mr. Knight is one of the most experienced and knowledgeable observers of the American and world scenes today. He is also one of those unusual publishers who writes editorials which give to his newspapers an unusual interest and zest.

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

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 13, 1966]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK: NATION SEES IN VIET POLICY ARBITRARY DISPLAY OF POWER

(By John S. Knight)

It is often said that Lyndon Baines Johnson is a complex and baffling individual.

This understatement was never more clearly illustrated than in the President's actions of the last 2 weeks. Prior to the recent Honolulu Conference, Mr. Johnson was wooing the doves of peace by insisting that we wanted no more than an honorable truce in Vietnam.

The President also urged that the Vietnam war be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council for discussion and possible U.N. action.

By these moves, Mr. Johnson clarified our position and won world approval as he skillfully placed responsibility for continuance of the war on Hanoi and Peking.

Yet 1 week later, the scene was shifted and the President spoke from another stage.

This time he was in Honolulu where he assured Premier Nguyen Cao Ky and Chairman Nguyen Van Thieu that the United States is irrevocably committed both to the defense of South Vietnam and a social revolution designed to solve its problems of hunger, ignorance, and disease.

Furthermore, the U.S. military buildup in Vietnam will double this year and may increase to 600,000 in 1967.

"The road ahead," said the President, "may be long and difficult. But we shall prevail."

General Ky and his entourage were greatly encouraged by these pledges, as well they might be. They had succeeded beyond their most optimistic expectations.

So there you have it, stroking the ruffled feathers of the doves one week and sharpening the claws and beaks of the hawks on the next.

As James Reston has said so succinctly: "The President has recently been giving the impression that he is not following a clear strategic policy, but that he is thrashing about, rejecting peace offensives and then trying them, stopping bombing and then starting bombing, rejecting the U.N. and then appealing to the U.N., sending Vice President HUMPHREY to brief Asian leaders on the Honolulu conference which he did not attend—all in an atmosphere of restless experimentation and self-righteous condemnation of anybody who differs with him."

My own analysis is that President Johnson—ever the strong and prideful one—is showing marked impatience over our failure to achieve significant military victories in Vietnam.

And so, unlike the Government of France which gave only limited support to their forces in 1954 and saw them fall at Dienbienphu, President Johnson is prepared to rout and defeat the enemy without regard to the size and cost of our commitment.

In a word, the President characteristically rejects any thought of failure. If and when the United States sits down at a negotiating table, it will be on Johnson's terms and because he is the victor.

No, I don't think the President is running a bluff. He will continue to talk of peace, but his implacable determination to make war unrewarding for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese seems now to be an indisputable fact.

Where all of this rapidly escalating involvement will lead is a matter of conjecture. Entrance of the Red Chinese, as in Korea? A rift with Russia? Nuclear war? Who really knows?

What a shocking thing it is that the small involvement which began as economic assistance with a few hundred U.S. advisers

in Vietnam more than 10 years ago has now proliferated into major war.

What irony it is that South Vietnam's "free and democratic society"—the very essence of authoritarian rule—is now to be transformed by our wealth and resources into a flowering paradise of democracy where no one hungers or dreads the state police.

What a tragedy it is that thousands upon thousands of American boys will die in Vietnam because of the incalculable blunders of our leadership, both past and present.

Only now and far too late are we hearing any debate on Vietnam. The handful of U.S. Senators who dare to question Government policies are treated by the President with studied contempt.

So at least it is clear that the President has assumed all responsibility for the conduct of the war. The Hubert Humphreys, McNamaras, and the Rusks are but the echoes of his desires.

The people wanted a strong President and, in this respect, he has not disappointed them.

For what we are witnessing today is the most arbitrary exercise of power within the memory of any living American.

CAPSULE COMMENT

Prime Minister Harold Wilson's valiant efforts to salvage the pound from devaluation may be thwarted by a strike of the National Union of Railwaymen unless the government yields to wage boosts which far exceeds its 3.5-percent guidelines.

(NOTE.—The United States gave Britain massive financial aid on assurances by Wilson that excessive union pay demands would not be countenanced. Yet, here at home, Lyndon Johnson's good friend, AFL–CIO President George Meany, has consistently scorned the President's anti-inflation efforts.)

Huey Long, the Louisiana kingfish, was ahead of his times.

A Presidential commission (Johnson's) now thinks a Government check should go to every American family whose income falls below $3,000 a year. This is called a negative income tax, but the idea is basically the same as Huey's which was to take the money from one man's pocket and put it into another's. The cost? Only a trifling $20 billion or so, about one-third of what we pay for national defense.

President Johnson's new foreign aid approach is to be concentrated on countries that "are not hostile to us and give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves."

This is welcome realism, but don't count upon seeing it happen.

Contrary to general belief, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired) did not advocate the holding of enclaves in Vietnam to the exclusion of all other alternatives. It was Generals Gavin and Matthew Ridgway who persuaded General Eisenhower not to commit U.S. forces to Indochina when Vice President Nixon was urging that course in 1954.

In his memoirs, General Ridgway said this: "When the day comes for me to face my maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing, the carrying out of some hare-brained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened, I would add the Indochina intervention."

Yet it did happen, less than 10 years later, when there were no longer any Gavins or Ridgways with the courage to oppose the civilian "generals" in power.

A Washington newsletter reports that Federal officials are trying quietly to figure out some way of pumping more money for economic development into the "have-not" nations.

With Vietnam, negative incomes taxes and the Great Society, it takes an optimist to believe we will have any left.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 20, 1966]

PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK: VIETNAM DEBATE LATE BUT GRAVELY NEEDED

(By John S. Knight)

ANSWERS, AT LAST

The Senate hearings on the war in Vietnam are providing the American people with sorely needed information on the background of our involvement and the possible perils which lie ahead.

For the first time, we are getting both opinion and fact from competent authorities who have either dealt with the problem at firsthand or whose long experience in the military and diplomatic fields enables them to see a local war in a global context.

This is not to say that the revelations are new. Newspapers and magazines which are dedicated to the principle that an informed public governs best, have faithfully portrayed each and every development leading to our present position in southeast Asia.

And yet, despite millions of words, pictures, maps, interpretation, and editorial comment, the Vietnam picture has remained unclear and imprecise.

TRUTH, NOT THEORY

Thoughtful discussion is often obscured by simplistic theories which appear logical enough if not carefully examined. Thus we have the "win or get out" school of thought, the "victory" squad led by Barry Goldwater who now charges President Johnson with "groveling" before the enemy, and the "Nixonites" who favor "doing more" but stop short of advocating all-out war.

We have seen, too, the superpatriots who would deny the right of dissent and who appear to believe that any citizens who question the wisdom of our course are cowardly and lacking in patriotism.

So it was a good day for our country when Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, decided to stage a full-scale review of the Vietnam problem in an unrelenting search for truth.

SENATE WAS SILENT

The hour is late, as Senator FULBRIGHT has conceded. Even as the peril mounted, the august Senate was meekly bowing to the President's will when it should have been challenging the wisdom of his policies.

Only Senators GRUENING, of Alaska, MORSE, of Oregon, MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, CHURCH, of Idaho, MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, MANSFIELD, of Montana, CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and GORE, of Tennessee, expressed either their reservations concerning Vietnam policy or their opposition to it.

Since no Republican member of the Senate could find his tongue there was no major debate on Vietnam in what was once called the greatest deliberative body in the world.

The information which might have been brought to the American people several years ago was tragically delayed as the administration literally smothered all opposition with optimistic and meaningless official pronouncements on how well the war was progressing.

A DEBT WE OWE

But late as it is, the Fulbright committee is now tearing away the veil of secrecy and performing a notable public service for the country.

The televised hearings have produced a needed challenge to the administration, a diversity of views from eminent authorities and a broader comprehension of the total situation.

It has been a long, long time since both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the majority leader have been at odds with the President on major policies.

Mr. Johnson is known to be downright angry with Senator FULBRIGHT and quite disappointed in Senator MANSFIELD, a calm and persuasive man who always reasons but never rants.

Both Senators accept the President's displeasure philosophically and hold true to their convictions.

We owe them a debt of gratitude for placing the national welfare above considerations of friendship and party loyalty.

PERSONALITIES

Senator WAYNE MORSE, the most relentless critic of administration policies in Vietnam, is a former dean and professor of law who was first elected as a Republican but later switched to the Democratic Party.

He is a strong supporter of the United Nations and believes the United States is acting in violation of international law. Senator MORSE, a confirmed maverick, is a blunt and merciless questioner who often dilutes his effectiveness by resorting to extremism and overstatement.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, a Rhodes scholar and former university president, has a mind which "encompasses everything." He has been critical of U.S. intervention in both Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

An ideal presiding officer, Senator FULBRIGHT is ever courteous, a disarming interrogator, and a convincing low-key speaker.

He and President Johnson have been longtime Senate friends.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, son of the famous or infamous Huey, has been moving up in the Democratic power structure and serves as acting majority leader in the absence of Senator MANSFIELD.

He is a stanch defender of Johnson's policies, an arm-waving orator who said last Wednesday that he "swells with price when he sees Old Glory and prays he shall never see a white flag of surrender."

Senators KARL MUNDT and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER are conservative Midwest Republicans who have generally supported the administration on Vietnam but appear to be thinking of how the Republicans can capitalize on an unpopular war in 1966.

Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, is known as the "owl" in a mixed cote of doves and hawks. The Senator is well respected for his fairness and judicial temperament, as is Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, who was Adlai Stevenson's Vice-Presidential running mate in 1952.

General Maxwell Taylor, former chief of staff for American forces in Europe, U.S. commander in Berlin, and the 8th Army's commander in Korea, is an articulate exponent of administration strategy in Vietnam where he served as our Ambassador for 15 months.

The McNamara-Taylor reports of several years ago on the war's progress proved to be extravagantly optimistic.

George Kennan, long a career diplomat and former Ambassador to Russia, and Yugoslavia, is credited with inventing the "containment" concept of dealing with Russia.

Mr. Kennan, now with the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., fears we are on a collision course with Red China, does not favor withdrawal from Vietnam but vigorously opposes escalation of the war.

Gen. James Gavin (retired) rose from private to lieutenant general, served in World War II, as paratroop commander and later as President Kennedy's Ambassador to France.

The general supports a holding concept in Vietnam and sees great peril in widening the war. He believes, as do many military experts, that Vietnam is a poor staging area for a major conflict.

PAT-ON-BACK DEPARTMENT

The National Broadcasting Co. is to be complimented for carrying live coverage of the Senate hearings when the other networks were taking care of the soap and detergent commercials.

A high-level CBS decision to suspend live coverage of the hearings produced the resignation of Fred Friendly, president of CBS News, who said the decision "made a mockery" of the network's crusade to obtain broadest access to congressional debate.

The ruckus, with its attendant adverse publicity, quickly got CBS back on the sound track, but NBC rates the laurels for public service.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Feb. 27, 1966]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK: GREAT DEBATE OVER VIETNAM HAS SERVED THE NATION WELL

(By John S. Knight)

The great debate over Vietnam is producing some welcome results.

For the first time since our unfortunate involvement began more than 10 years ago, the American public is beginning to understand the full significance of our role in southeast Asia and the nature of our so-called commitments.

It has been the fashion to deplore teach-ins, street demonstrations against the war, and the writings of those who have differed with administration policies.

Yet these protests have served a useful purpose. For there is today a public awareness that the Vietnam problem has many facets and no simple solutions.

The Senate hearings conducted by Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, of the Foreign Relations Committee, brought to the Nation the views of able and scholarly men with wide experience in global relations.

We can be proud that our country is served by Generals Gavin and Taylor, the broad knowledge of former Ambassador George Kennan and the lucid expositions of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

And, with an exception or two, the Senators who conducted the interrogations posed questions which were pertinent and direct.

Whether one agrees or finds fault with individual testimony is not so important as the fact that every American citizen had the rare privilege of hearing a full exposition of the Vietnam war from all viewpoints for the first time since U.S. military participation reached major proportions.

Until the Senate hearings, the objectors to Government policies were held in contempt as being either flaky or downright unpatriotic.

But no such charges could be brought against Gen. James M. Gavin, paratroop commander in World War II and former U.S. Ambassador to France.

Nor did they apply to George Kennan, a former Ambassador to Russia and the architect of our "containment" concept in the cold war with Moscow.

Such men, along with Senator FULBRIGHT and a handful of Democratic Senators who dared to defy the all-powerful Lyndon Johnson, spoke with courage and conviction.

And yet there are some superheated patriots among us who find the Senate "disgusting" and charge the Fulbright committee with "giving aid, comfort, and information to the enemy."

One such is a Mr. Frederick J. Read, of Grand Rapids, who would bring the press, NBC, and the Fulbright committee into court to show reason why they should not be tried for treason.

The Reads and those of his persuasion forget that the purpose of the Fulbright hearings is to enable our citizenry to become better informed on Vietnam and that such a clearing away of misconceptions is vital to a healthy democracy.

The charge of traitorous conduct is unworthy of a reply other than to remind Mr. Read that the United States is not officially at war.

A free nation could not long endure in a climate of no dissent. Only dictators flourish for a time in those unhappy lands where freedom of expression is shackled by the State.

The Fulbright hearings were long overdue. For years, the August Senate sat in silence as administration spokesmen in Washington and Saigon brainwashed the American public with optimistic pronouncements which bore little or no resemblance to the truth.

One need only to recall the fatuous statements by Ambassador Lodge and the McNamara-Taylor reports to President Kennedy to understand how completely we were misled on the progress of the war.

Had it not been for the dissenters, the studied conclusions of Senate Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and the Fulbright hearings, we might still be searching in vain for the truth.

President Johnson, who bridles at opposition in any form, is reported to have watched the televised Senate hearings with avid interest. He should have been pleased since Gen. Maxwell Taylor and Secretary Dean Rusk, reflecting administration policies under merciless questioning, came off very well indeed.

It appears, however, that the President is now harkening to the voices of dissent. At least he senses the need for a clarification of administration policies.

Thus he gave the country needed reassurance in his Freedom House speech by stating that the United States was not caught in a "blind escalation of force" which might lead to a vast conflict with Communist China.

Bill D. Moyers, the White House press secretary, told reporters that the President did not intend the speech to be an answer to his critics or a denunciation of those who disagree.

But had it not been for the critics, it is an open question as to whether Mr. Johnson would have declared himself against a wider involvement with such evident emphasis.

Of course the larger question is whether a wider war can ultimately be avoided since we have ample evidence at hand that "small wars" often lead to major confrontations.

Nevertheless, the President's address provided a partial and long-sought exposition of policy.

The great debate over Vietnam has served us well.

RANDOM NOTES

The administration's reaction to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY'S first statements about bringing the South Vietnamese and indigenous Vietcong into a coalition government is a good example of Potomac confusion.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY ridiculed this idea as akin to "putting a fox in a chicken coop * * * an arsonist in the fire department." But in the Senate hearings, Secretary of State Dean Rusk insisted that the United States would stand for free elections in Vietnam and accept the result. The outcome of such elections could mean precisely such a coalition as KENNEDY originally mentioned.

President Nasser of Egypt, who once told Americans they "could drink sea water" if they didn't like his policies, is at it again. Nasser, who has received millions in American assistance, is now assailing U.S. military aid to Israel and threatens a "preventive war."

Sukarno of Indonesia is another recipient of our favors who never misses an opportunity to blast the United States. We deserve him since the Truman administration encouraged the Netherlands to yield their sovereignty to Sukarno in 1949.

Just before the death of Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz, he warned that Japan will remain friendly to the United States "just so long as that friendship profits Japan."

The admiral predicted that whenever the Japanese feel they can do better elsewhere, they will do it, and that "includes an alliance or trade agreements with Red China."

At some stage, Japan could become a factor in the Vietnam struggle since she is known to be unhappy over the possibility of an enlarged war.

The current agitation in Congress to force safety improvements in automobiles is commendable, but how does one cope with drunken drivers, others with weak eyes, and poor reflexes and car-happy kids who "own" the road?

You can't pad sense into people.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 13, 1966]

THE PUBLISHERS NOTEBOOK: GREAT DEBATE UNCOVERS A GRIM NEW BRINK

(By John S. Knight)

RANT VERSUS REASON

No responsible editorialist enjoys belaboring Government policies merely for the sake of controversy. Unbridled and irresponsible criticism can be as harmful to the national interest as remaining silent when it is being endangered.

The great debate over Vietnam is a case in point. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, is one of the courageous few who has consistently challenged the validity of our involvement in southeast Asia. Yet he often unhorses himself when engaging in ill-tempered bombast.

By contrast, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, is even tempered, judicial, and a model of propriety as he interrogates the witnesses who appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are likewise journalists who rant and fume in columns of lint-picking, captious criticism. They become largely ineffective since they persuade no one, but only harden the beliefs of those who already agree.

Responsible writers of opinion do not lack conviction. But they prefer the use of facts, logic, and analysis to make their case. Not as exciting, perhaps, but decidely more informative and trustworthy.

Being human, both the politicians and members of the press can be arbitrary, capricious, petty, and illogical. Or, they may be fair, objective, analytical and zealously devoted to the search for truth.

The Senate hearings on Vietnam have revealed both the bellicose traits of a few and the even dignity and composure of the many. In journalism, with notable exceptions, the comment has been vigorous and well reasoned.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL

As Senator FULBRIGHT now concedes, the public debate on Vietnam came several years too late. Yet it has been productive if only because the Johnson administration is now aware of the boiling disent and the challenge to its policies.

Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee has provided a badly needed, full-scale review of the Vietnam situation. This has been most helpful to a confused American public which seeks nothing more than clarification of our aims and ultimate objectives.

Within recent days, it has been illuminating to learn that even as we fight an undeclared war in Vietnam, the ultimate goal is the containment of Red China.

Defense Secretary McNamara and Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY have said as much in interviews and appearances before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

So the "little war" of a few years ago which we were told was being fought to resist aggression and protect the liberty-loving South Vietnamese is now a major exercise in power politics.

Walter Lippmann dismisses the notion that China can be contained in Vietnam as "sheer mythology." He asks, quite appropriately, how Secretary of State Dean Rusk and McNamara can believe that they are containing China despite the fact they have alternated the Soviet Union, spread doubt and division in Japan, have no support in Pakistan and India.

"In the realm of great power politics in Asia," says Lippmann, "the United States is playing a lone hand. * * * The true containment of China is possible only as and if her great Asian neighbors, the Soviet Union, Japan, India, and Pakistan, are aligned together or are at least acting on parallel lines."

ENORMOUS RISKS

One does not have to be an alarmist to comprehend the enormity of this undertaking and its inherent hazards.

Yet we inch on and on through the jungles of Vietnam toward a possible confrontation with China, standing virtually alone and with no true insight into the moods of Russia's inscrutable leaders.

To those who decry the Fulbright hearings as meaningless and political, the answer can be made that except for the testimony which they have produced, the public would not today be aware that the United States is back to "brinksmanship" in a stage which would have alarmed even the late John Foster Dulles, master of bluff and bluster in Eisenhower's time.

The erudite gentleman from Arkansas—undismayed over the criticism of his colleagues and undaunted by the President's displeasure—deserves the gratitude of his fellow Americans for a magnificent public service.

Republican leaders, who couldn't find their tongues in the Vietnam debate, are counting upon the war's unpopularity to bring them sizable gains in this year's congressional elections.

Being neither hawks nor doves, they can boast of their support for the President if things go well. But should the war take an ominous turn, the GOP will blame the Democrats. They also have the appeasement issue when and if negotiations begin.

No statesmanship, this; only practical politics.

U.S. SPOTLIGHT ON CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article, entitled "Now U.S. Spotlight Turns on China," written by Frederic Collins, and published in the London Sunday Times of recent date.

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

NOW U.S. SPOTLIGHT TURNS ON CHINA

(By Frederic Collins)

The focus of debate now is shifting to China from the Vietnam war. Senator FULBRIGHT begins public hearings on China on Tuesday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and will extend them over several weeks. There is every prospect that they will come to command attention as serious and intense as those he held on the war itself.

The transfer of interest is general. Official comment, public and private, is beginning to center on China, as is public discussion. The debate on the war has at least temporarily exhausted itself, leaving opinion seemingly still divided between majority support for President Johnson and an irreconcilable minority of opposition, apparently not growing at the moment.

The change in debate reflects the sense of a need to find a policy on China which can be clearly understood by the public and win its support. The curious fact that such a policy does not now exist is explained by the involvement of the China issue in the most vicious kind of ideological politics over at least two decades.

Proponents of almost any course other than uncompromising hostility toward Communist China became the objects of anti-Communist witch hunts. One effect was to drive most China experts out of the government. The administration for that very reason will be hard put to find stars to present its views in FULBRIGHT's hearings, when their turn comes after his witnesses, drawn at first from academia, are heard.

FORBIDDEN SUBJECT

Senator FULBRIGHT, announcing the hearings, remarked that mainland China has been something of a forbidden subject since the days of Senator McCarthy. He hopes the hearings may "give more maneuverability to the Government," induce a "feeling of freedom," and embolden "some people in the administration to change the policy."

That indeed might happen. The four most recent administrations have been hopelessly restricted by the murderous politics of the issue. Ventilation could help a lot.

The quickening discussion is already beginning to produce indications of the kind of policy which might result from full debate. The goal seems to be a formula for the containment of China without either full-scale hand-to-hand war with her or an unending task of military resistance to proxy aggression, as in Korea (including 1 million Chinese "volunteers") and in Vietnam.

Effective peaceful containment could then, under such a formula, provide a climate within which China's fears could be quietened and her aggressive impulses cured by persuasion.

Senator FULBRIGHT might one day find common ground with the administration once more in such a policy, after their long estrangement. He believes the only course open in Asia is an understanding with China permitting neutralization of southeast Asia.

The administration, including its highest officers, scorns this, holding that Communists, or any compulsive aggressors, are not to be trusted in neutralization schemes. But FULBRIGHT counters that if the issue of Chinese and American power is left unresolved, even a total victory in South Vietnam is unlikely to solve very much.

It seems clear, however, that the differences between him and the administration are in considerable part those of timing. The administration thinks it madness to talk now of treating with China or even hoping to. FULBRIGHT thinks it not too early to begin talking about it.

THE FRUSTRATION OF GLOBALISM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Frustration of Globalism," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of recent date.

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

THE FRUSTRATION OF GLOBALISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

The edginess which has appeared recently among the President's principal advisers is a symptom of the frustration which is so pronounced in Congress and in the country. The frustration springs not from any fear that the American forces in Vietnam can be defeated on the battlefield. The frustration springs from doubt that there is any other course still open except to escalate the war without any genuine prospect of ending it. The President is supported in Congress and in the polls because there seems to be no alternative to what he is doing.

Once the President had raised the stakes by investing 200,000 American troops, it made the fight predominantly an American war. He had, as one of his supporters remarked recently, painted himself into a corner.

From the perspective of the White House the pursuit of a military decision could lead to a confrontation with China or the Soviet Union or both. On the other hand, the attempt to negotiate a truce raised inavoidably the question whether President Johnson was prepared to negotiate with his enemies in the field, of whom some 80 percent are Vietcong.

If for the time being we cannot do anything to dissolve the President's predicament we can, at least, make an effort to understand how for 12 years we have slithered and now have slipped into such a war.

In a preceding article I argued that the containment of Red China, which is a necessary objective of our policy, is being grossly mishandled by the President's principal advisers, Messrs. Rusk and McNamara. Their way of containing China has left us without support, and in certain cases with the active opposition, of every great power in Asia. Yet if China is as expansionary as we think she is and must be contained it can be done only by a coalition of great powers concerned with Asia. In the preceding article I said, too, that the egregious result of our policy was hidden from view by a piece of well-circulated political mythology; namely, that the outcome of the fighting in South Vietnam would decide China's foreign policy and the future of the Communist revolution on this planet.

I venture to believe that the root of the Rusk-McNamara misconception of our foreign relations is the myth, propagated since the First World War by the naive and idealistic followers of Wilson, that all sovereign states, whether big or small, are not only alike in their human rights but alike also in their right to exercise influence in the world. I believe this to be a myth which falsifies the nature of things and the facts of life. It has rendered Mr. Rusk incapable of sound judgments in foreign policy.

In the Senate hearings, for example, Mr. Rusk discussed with great moral fervor the conception of spheres of influence in international politics. They were inadmissible, he said. Therefore we could not recognize that China too might claim a sphere of influence. We were too pure for such worldly old things as spheres of influence. But on what grounds we were doing what we have been doing in the past few years in Cuba, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and Panama, Mr. Rusk was too dainty to say.

For a foreign minister to deny that we treat the territory south of us as an American sphere of influence, and that we did risk a world nuclear war to prevent the Soviet Union from entering it, and that we have suppressed revolution in the Dominican Republic on suspicion of the intrusion of foreign Communist influences—all this is so blatantly contrary to the facts that it is regarded everywhere else as extremely crude hypocrisy.

For my own part I know of no serious and educated student of international politics who attempts to deny that great powers will insist on spheres of influence which no other rival great power may enter with its military forces. This is one of the elementary facts which every competent foreign minister keeps in mind. It is a fact, just as the existence of two sexes is a fact.

While the existence of spheres of influence is undeniable, there can be great differences in how the great power exerts its influence.

Historically, there was a revolutionary turning point in the evolution of the concept of spheres of influence when President Roosevelt declared that our Latin American policy would be the good neighbor policy. He did not say that we did not have a sphere of influence. He said that we intended to act within it, not as lords and masters, but as friends and partners with our neighbors. This was the progressive evolution of the classic concept of spheres of influence.

U.S. POLICIES IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Eric Sevareid on the CBS evening news of March 14, 1966.

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

When it comes to the President's conduct of foreign relations, the U.S. Senate has the constitutional right and duty to advise and to consent. When it consents, that's not news. In our 16 years' involvement with Vietnam that is all it has done. But when it advises, that is news. And so, in a way, the biggest story in Washington now is the story of the Senate, specifically its foreign relations committee, more specifically its chairman, FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

Two and three weeks ago, administration officials were privately denouncing the Senator's public inquiry into our Far Eastern policies, conveying to the enemy and the world, they said, an image of the United States as a divided country. Mr. FULBRIGHT made the right answer today; since the country obviously is divided, he said, what was conveyed was not an image, but a fact.

Yesterday Vice President HUMPHREY said FULBRIGHT'S current hearings on China are among the most fruitful procedures now going on. Nobody in power was talking about the Senator that way a while back.

What this means is that FULBRIGHT has won his first objective—to make the administration think far more seriously and deeply about the danger of a condition in which the world's greatest power and the world's most populous power, both armed with nuclear weapons, are scarcely on speaking terms. We have nothing like the means of communication with Peking that we had with Moscow at the most critical moments in Russian-American relations.

The Vice President's remark yesterday that we should try to contain China without isolating her—in other words, do as we did with Russia—is public recognition of FULBRIGHT'S achievement. Now the real authorities on China, and there are several, buried rather deep in the layers of Government, are more likely to be listened to at the top levels. Another signal that Washington wants to get on a new footing with China is the President's decision to let American scholars travel to China—if China will let them in.

All things begin in the mind, including catastrophes. For months, many minds in Washington have been gradually drifting from the idea of war with China as a possibility toward the idea as a probability. The next stage would be expectation. This is what FULBRIGHT has detected and wants to halt.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—COMMENT BY THE BRITISH MAGAZINE "THE ECONOMIST"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, the January 29 issue of the widely respected British magazine, the Economist, contains a perceptive and provocative report from Saigon entitled "Ones Who Wait and See." I should like to summarize the main points in this article because I think that they raise questions that all of us should ponder. They point up to me the subtle contradictions and paradoxes of the war in Vietnam.

First af all, the Economist points out that as more American troops pour into Vietnam, especially as they approach in numbers the size of the South Vietnamese Regular Army, there is a growing risk that the South Vietnamese Army will be looked on as mercenaries. The article notes that while General Westmoreland is reportedly aware of this danger, "statistics are working against him."

The second point the article makes is that the larger the American establishment in Vietnam becomes, the more it dwarfs the Vietnamese Government and the more the suspicion grows "that Vietnam's independence and sovereignty have become a mere shadow."

The third point in the article is that as the war grows in intensity, democracy and freedom become empty words. The generals that have stepped into President Diem's shoes "are telling the people—with the Americans nodding approval—that they cannot indulge in the luxury of a democratic regime as long as the war lasts."

The fourth point is that many Vietnamese are becoming increasingly bitter and indifferent because they see, on the one hand, that if the Communists win, the country will be enslaved, while, on the other hand, the alternative of national independence and freedom "is nowhere in sight either." The article points out that this has led more and more people, including a good many in the South Vietnamese Army, to ask: "For what and for whom are we fighting?"

Finally, the Economist states that after 20 years of war:

The Vietnamese are back where they started but this time with the Americans instead of the French by their side.

Summing up, the article concludes that so far as the Vietnamese are concerned:

National independence and individual freedom seem to be two irreconcilable aims in a country caught in an East-West confrontation which has reached the stage of open—though indirect—military conflict.

As for the United States:

In coming to Vietnam to defend freedom they cannot escape infringing on Vietnam's national independence.

The United States will inevitably "reap the resentment of the Vietnamese people, because, to win the war, they will have to take over the effective direction of the country."

It seems to me that the article is an unusually good analysis of the inevitable consequences of the war in South Vietnam. These consequences are persuasive arguments, as if any more were needed, for hoping that we shall soon be able to move to a negotiated settlement of the war.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article mentioned above be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

ONES WHO WAIT AND SEE

(From our Saigon correspondent)

Too few people are paying attention to something that is going to exercise increasing influence on the course of the Vietnam war. This is the resurgence of Vietnamese nationalism. To French residents of Saigon—many of them ex-members of the French expeditionary corps who have made Vietnam their home—the present political picture is strangely reminiscent of the early 1950's. Attentisme—fence-sitting—is growing among the Vietnamese.

As more American troops pour into Vietnam (they will soon outnumber the Vietnamese Regular Army) and engage the Communists directly in big battles, the Vietnamese Armed Forces risk being looked upon as supplétifs. These were the local auxiliary troops recruited, armed, and paid by the French in the earlier Indochina war, who fought under the heavy moral handicap of being looked upon by their Vietnamese Communist opponents as mercenaries. The American commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland, is reported to be acutely aware of this danger. He is trying his best to correct the impression. But statistics are working against him.

The bigger the American establishment in Vietnam gets, the more the Vietnamese Government is dwarfed. No assertion to the contrary by Vietnam's ruling generals can wipe out the suspicion that Vietnam's independence and sovereignty have become a mere shadow.

This is one side of it. There is another. As the war grows in scale and intensity, democracy and freedom, the two slogans which were so prominent in the last years of President Diem's rule and rallied round them all the forces which were to overflow his regime, have now become empty words. The generals who tossed President Diem out in the name of democracy and freedom speak Mr. Diem's language now that they have stepped into his shoes. They are telling the people—with the Americans nodding approval—that they cannot indulge in the luxury of a democratic regime as long as the war lasts.

Many people, in particular the articulate elements who had turned a deaf ear to the same plea by Mr. Diem now say they have been deceived. Hence the growing bitterness, brooding indifference, and attentisme. The Vietnamese Government and the Americans are shocked by this attitude, just as Bao Dai and the French were in the early 1950's. But even allowing for the undoubted loss of nerve and cynicism of a number of Vietnamese, there is a real moral problem here. To many honest and courageous Vietnamese it looks well-night insoluble. If the Communists win, the country will be enslaved. But the alternative—national independence and freedom—is nowhere in sight either. The question now being asked by more and more people, including a good many in the Armed Forces, whose daily lot is fighting and dying, is: for what and for whom are we fighting?

After 20 years of war, suffering and waiting, the Vietnamese are back where they started, but this time with the Americans instead of the French by their side. The political problem remains unsolved. Perhaps it cannot be solved, for national independence and individual freedom seem to be two irreconcilable aims in a country caught in an East-West confrontation which has reached the stage of open—though indirect—military conflict.

To the Americans too the answer seems unfindable. Whether they like it or not, in

coming to Vietnam to defend freedom they cannot escape infringing on Vietnam's national independence. Mr. Arthur Schlesinger says in "A Thousand Days" that President Kennedy was acutely aware of the dilemma but died before he could solve it. The United States will have expended a great deal of blood and money to save Vietnam only to reap the resentment of the Vietnamese people, because, to win the war, they will have to take over the effective direction of the country. They will have to find a formula that will reconcile the desire for individual liberty with the equal desire for Vietnam to be independent of any great power. Otherwise the war will be very much the "dirty war" so well known to the French—long, bloody, costly, exasperating, and indecisive.

STATEMENT ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on United States China policy prepared by a number of Asian scholars who support in principle the changes recommended for U.S. policy toward China.

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

STATEMENT ON UNITED STATES CHINA POLICY

We, the undersigned, submit the following statement for the consideration of the executive branch, the Congress, and members of the public.

That the formal China policy of the United States has long since been out of date is widely recognized and tacitly accepted even by officials of the American government. Changes in this policy will not solve the major political and military challenges to the United States in Asia, but they can improve the ability of the United States to deal with these problems and reduce the likelihood that a crisis could turn into a major military confrontation.

We believe that the following represent accurately factors on which United States policy on China should now be based:

1. The People's Republic of China with its capital at Peking is a reality of international politics, whose importance to the course of international affairs will grow. There is increasing danger in the isolation of the United States from China and of China's relative isolation from other nations and international institutions.

2. The People's Republic of China is now committed to a policy of hostility to the United States and has made opposition to U.S. policies a cornerstone of its foreign policy.

3. In the immediate future the United States is unlikely to persuade Peking that it is not its most implacable enemy. But the United States can hope to convince Peking that, while prepared to respond when challenged, the U.S. is at the same time interested in exploring areas of mutual interest and normalizing relations wherever possible.

4. The government of the Republic of China on Taiwan will be a member of the international community for the indefinite future, but only as the government of Taiwan, and not as a potential government for mainland China.

5. The major problems for the United States in Asia have to do with establishing stable and mutually satisfactory relations between the United States and Asian national governments, while helping to develop social and economic viability within Asia countries through technical and economic aid programs. Although the problems are intensified by the existence of an expansionist Communist force in Asia, they arise from factors independent of communism itself and must be dealt with in the context of the total situation.

In the light of these principal factors and others, we urge that the U.S. Government adopt the following policies:

1. The United States should cease to use its influence to prevent the admittance of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and other international bodies. In the interests of international peace and the national interests of the United States, the government at Peking should be accepted into these institutions, without conditions posed by us or by Peking.

2. The U.S. Government should announce that it is prepared, while maintaining relations with Taiwan, to enter into negotiations regarding the establishment of full and formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China.

3. The United States should propose to the People's Republic of China an opening of a new phase of bilateral negotiations at which the following items would be discussed: (a) Exchange of diplomatic representation; (b) renunciation of force as an instrument of policy; (c) arms control including problems of the control over nuclear weapons.

4. The United States should announce that it is prepared to accept accredited newspapermen, scholars, and others from the People's Republic of China and call upon the People's Republic to reciprocate. American willingness to accept Chinese visitors should not, at least in the short run, depend on reciprocation.

5. The United States should end its total trade embargo with Communist China and permit the importation and exportation of nonstrategic materials.

We believe that the measures suggested here would only initiate what must be a long and difficult process leading, we hope, to the normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China and a reduction of hostilities between the two countries. We believe, despite the antagonism shown by the Chinese government, that it is up to the United States to try to move the Chinese to a greater acceptance of the principles of coexistence in the emerging world community.

POSITION PAPER: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A CHANGE IN UNITED STATES-CHINESE RELATIONS AND POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to set forth reasons supporting certain recommended changes in U.S. policy toward China. It is hoped that the paper will contribute to a growing consensus within the United States that our China policy should be modified, that our Government should indicate willingness to undertake changes, and that these proposed changes should be debated and discussed increasingly by citizens throughout the country.

There are occasions when policymakers in government are reluctant to embark on a given policy change because they think such a change would not be supported by the public. With respect to U.S. policy toward China it appears that this factor is one of those inhibiting U.S. governmental action. Therefore, it is important through discussion and sober exchange of views, to persuade the Government that there is widespread support for a change in its policy toward China and that the United States, by changing its policy within parameters dictated by its own best interests, can contribute ultimately to an improvement in relations between the two countries.

BACKGROUND

A policy statement was drafted by a small group of scholars concerned with U.S. foreign policy. It was submitted to members of the Association for Asian Studies to learn the views of a group considered among the most knowledgeable about China, Asia, and U.S. relations with nations in that part of the world. The members of this association have varied backgrounds and possess knowledge about different facets of Chinese life or other parts of Asia. Most of them are members of university faculties; some are serving abroad in various capacities. Of about 2,700 who were sent the draft statement, over 300 (11 percent) responded, a much better than the average response to a mailed request for an answer.

The Asian specialists were asked to indicate whether they approved the statement in principle, whether they desired to recommend changes in it, or whether they did not wish to be associated with this effort. Over 85 percent (258) said they were sympathetic with the aims of the statement. Of these 198 were prepared to support it in principle and have their names so designated. (A list of these is available.) The remaining 60 said that they would sign the recommended policy changes if certain modifications in wording or concept were made. Since, in most cases this could not be done without resubmitting the statement to all those who had already signed, these names have had to be omitted. Eighteen respondents said they supported the statement but for various reasons did not wish to sign it. Only 19 stated they did not wish to be associated with the statement because they opposed the proposed changes in United States-China policy; in most cases the opposition was not to the statement in its entirety but to parts of it. Five respondents stated that they did not wish to sign the statement, but gave no explanation of their views.

The large number of signers who are experts in Asian studies is convincing evidence that the changes suggested are grounded in knowledge about China or the surrounding area as well as in recognition of U.S. interests in that part of the world. The general point of view of the Asian specialists, as revealed in comments of those who responded to the statement circulated, is reflected in the following pages. This paper is not necessarily endorsed by the signers of the statement on changes recommended.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The United States has always been opposed to Communist expansionist and aggressive policies. In the past the Government has also refused to deal with Communist governments. We have believed communism to be an antidemocratic force, inimical to the growth of freedom and self-government, and bent on the destruction of those governments whose economic systems were based on a measure of free enterprise and capitalism. At times we assumed that Communist governments wanted to destroy any society or government that was not Communist.

Because of the above considerations the United States waited for 14 years before it established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1933, and then the fact of recognition in no way implied approval of its government or policies, but rather acceptance of the Soviet Union as a government in control of a large population and important territory. After World War II, while the United States never severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, our Government, nevertheless, felt that the Soviet Union had to be contained in what we believed were aggressive and expansionist policies. Today the Soviet Union has given

osophy; James L. Martin, coordinator of non-Western studies.

Miami University, Oxford, John H. Badgley, department of government.

Ohio State University, Dayton, Byron S. Weng, instructor in government.

Ohio University, Athens, John F. Cody, professor of history.

Western College for Women, Oxford, T. A. Bisson, chairman, department of intercultural studies; Robert Brank Fulton, associate professor of intercultural studies.

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Hideo Hashimoto, professor of religion.

University of Oregon, Eugene, Kathleen G. Aberle, research associate in anthropology.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, M. Bronfenbrenner, Graduate School of International Affairs.

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Thomas Hopkins, assistant professor of religion.

Haverford College, Haverford, Holland Hunter, chairman of the department of economics.

Ohio Methodist Theological School, Eastern, Ernest E. Best, associate professor of theology.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Derk Bodde, professor of Chinese; F. Hilary Conroy, professor of history; Leigh Lisker, professor of linguistics; Jonathan Mirsky, oriental studies, Chinese; Donald E. Smith, associate professor of political science.

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Roswell G. Townsend, professor of economics.

Frederick Gaige, Philadelphia.

TENNESSEE

Memphis State University, Memphis, Ram Mohan Roy, department of political science.

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo, Paul Hyer, coordinator of Asian studies.

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Helmut G. Callis, chairman of Asia studies, professor of history and political science.

VERMONT

University of Vermont, Burlington, Horace Briggs II, instructor, department of political science.

VIRGINIA

Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Richard C. Rowland, department of English.

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Richard J. Coughlin, professor of sociology; Maurice Meisner, assistant professor of East Asian history.

WASHINGTON

Eastern Washington State College, Cheney, Charles H. Hedtky, division of history and social science.

University of Washington, Seattle, Paul R. Brass, assistant professor of political science; Charles F. Keyes, assistant professor of anthropology.

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Eugene Boardman, professor of history; Ripley Moor, assistant professor of Indian studies.

CANADA

University of Toronto, Donald E. Willmott, associate professor of sociology.

CEYLON

University of Ceylon, Gananath Obeyesekere, lecturer in sociology.

FRANCE

T. D. Long, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, directorate for scientific affairs, Paris, France.

INDIA

Margaret L. Cormack, Director of Educational Foundation in India.

JAPAN

Hokyo University, Toshio Ueda, professor emeritus.

ADDITIONAL ASIAN SCHOLARS SUPPORTING IN PRINCIPLE THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED FOR UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD CHINA

ARIZONA

Arizona State University, Temple, Guilford A. Dudley, associate professor of history.

CALIFORNIA

California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, Francis V. Catalina.

Stanford University, Stanford, Mark Mancall, assistant professor of Asian studies; Harold H. Fisher, professor of history and chemistry, emeritus; Hoover Institute and Library.

University of California, Berkeley, Chauncey D. Leake, University of California, San Francisco Medical Center, San Francisco.

University of California, Santa Cruz, Bruce D. Larkin, assistant professor of international relations.

University of California, Los Angeles, Michael Moreman, assistant professor of anthropology; Nikki Keddie, assistant professor of history.

Willard P. Norberg, Ackerman, Johnston, Johnston & Mathews, San Francisco.

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu, John Singleton, associate director, international development fellowships and seminars, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West; George H. Gadbois, Jr., associate director, exchange of persons programs, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harvard University, Cambridge, John Fairbank, director, East Asian Research Center; Morton H. Halperin, Center for International Affairs.

Wellesley College, Wellesley, Paul A. Cohen, department of history.

MICHIGAN

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Alexander Eckstein, professor of economics.

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Charles O. Houston, associate professor, institute of international and area studies.

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Romeyn Taylor, department of history.

MISSOURI

University of Missouri, Columbia, James W. Hamilton, department of sociology and anthropology.

MONTANA

Montana State University, Bozeman, Richard B. Landis, assistant professor of Asian history.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, Charlton M. Lewis, department of history.

Colgate University, Hamilton, Kenneth W. Morgan, professor of religion.

Columbia University, New York City, Wayne Wilcox, department of government.

Cornell University, Ithaca, John W. Lewis, associate professor of government.

Union College, Schenectady, Malcolm Willison, assistant professor of sociology.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, John Roger Stemen, department of history.

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Helen-Lee Jones.

A Gutkind Bulling, Philadelphia.

WASHINGTON

Gonzaga University, Spokane, Jack D. Salmon, assistant professor of political science.

University of Washington, Seattle, Marwyn S. Samuels, modern Chinese studies.

TAIWAN

Mark Selden, Taipei.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY AND CHAOS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, since late 1963, when President Diem of South Vietnam was deposed, the political and military situation in that country have seemed to race each other toward the brink of failure and disaster.

For 9 months, we have heard that political stability is being achieved, so the military situation can be retrieved by American military forces. But, in the last week, the political instability and chaos of South Vietnam has reached a new peak. Police, armed and trained by the United States, and apparently some army units, have taken part in demonstrations against the government of General Ky. American air transport has been furnished to Ky's forces to suppress them. If there is such a thing as a civil war within a civil war, it surely is transpiring today in South Vietnam.

A new addition to these demonstrations, and an almost inevitable one, is their tone of anti-Americanism. Visits by White House and Cabinet officials and Members of Congress have to be suspended, so as not to add to the appearance that the country is an American vassal, which unfortunately it is.

But at the same time, the jingoism whipped up by the administration to support the war has been reflected in press editorials calling for a crackdown on dissidents not only by the Government of South Vietnam, but also by the United States if necessary. Obviously, the rationale for what we have done up to now requires that we remain whether or not there is a government in Saigon worthy of the name.

It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that we will remain in South Vietnam irrespective of what happens to its government, because we have made South Vietnam an American vassal, to the shocking discredit and disgrace of our country, as our action will be recorded on the pages of history for future generations to read.

Having sold ourselves the concept that we are in Vietnam to save people from communism, there are no limits to what we can convince ourselves must be done to stay there. We never pretended that freedom and liberty for the people of the south were at stake, because they never had freedom or liberty under their various governments. It is only communism from which we mean to save them—not tyranny, not death, not misery, not destruction, not foreign rule. All these and worse are being visited upon the people of South Vietnam by the combined forces of the United States and General Ky, all as a result of the wrong that the United States has committed in South Vietnam, the wrong action of the United States in supporting an immoral and illegal war and involving itself in bloodletting in a country in which it had

no right to be in the first place. It is all as a result of the policy of the United States in South Vietnam as we proceeded in 1954 to violate our treaty obligations, and, in effect, to help destroy the Geneva accords.

Madam President, that is the sad and sordid record of the United States which is being supported by the present President of the United States. As a Democrat, I want to say that the responsibility rests primarily upon my party, and my party should be held to an accounting by the American people unless my party stops its illegality in South Vietnam.

As we send increasing numbers of soldiers into Vietnam to hunt and destroy the Vietcong and send increasing numbers of aircraft to smash both south and north, we can scarcely avoid a growing animosity among its people for a foreign military power that destroys their country in the name of its own national interest.

We must expect the rationalization from the Pentagon and from the White House that what we do to help put down this insurrection or civil war within a civil war is done because we are satisfied that it is Communist dominated.

The American people will not receive any rationalization from the Johnson administration for the continuation of this butchery in South Vietnam without being told that we are doing it in order to put down communism.

I say that the American people ought to be protected against the loss of their lives from an administration that is using this false rationale in order to justify our illegality in South Vietnam.

We ought to say to the people of southeast Asia: "You are going to run your own affairs and we are not going to kill American boys to support one side in a war that has been a civil war from the beginning." This is being demonstrated so clearly now in South Vietnam for those who are willing to see that what is involved there is a civil war, and some of the characteristics of a religious war, too.

I am one Senator who will never vote to kill an American boy in a war that has any of the overtones and undertones of a religious war. I do not intend to vote to kill American boys in South Vietnam in a contest that has a scintilla of cause-to-effect relationship between Catholicism and Buddhism. This administration cannot deny the religious overtones and undertones that have been involved in this war from the beginning.

Madam President, the absence of any genuine government in South Vietnam for this country to respond to, and the failure of our alliance partners to invoke the SEATO treaty, are instinctively understood by the American people. In my opinion, they explain the widespread attitude of the American people which supports their government, but which also seeks an end to the war by negotiation, by United Nations action, or even by some exclusive knockout blow that would get it over with. It has only been the most recent public opinion polls which have gotten away from the question of whether people simply support their government, for most people will say "Yes" to that, no matter what it does. But framed in terms of whether they would support a candidate for Congress who, in the words of the poll, "says he would try harder to reach a compromise peace settlement in Vietnam," 67 percent believe they would vote for him.

Another poll queried the public on their attitude toward a United Nations arbitration of the issue, and found 2 to 1 in support for that solution, provided the Communists agreed in advance to abide by it.

Pollsters are increasingly commenting on the fact that persons advocating greater use of military power in the South and in the North do so on the assumption that it will bring a quick end to the war.

It is this latter point that the President heavily distorts when he tries to create the impression that "warhawks" are pressing him against his wishes to step up the level of the war. He has even sought to lay the blame for this at the doorstep of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by saying our hearings created more warhawk sentiment in the country.

Far from creating warhawk sentiment, our hearings have convinced many people that our real task in Vietnam is to find a way to end the war; some erroneously feel that a bigger application of military power will do that.

That false impression was planted by the President's own administration when it advertised the bombing of North Vietnam as a means of forcing Hanoi to the bargaining table. Every time the Secretary of State announced that a new application of military power was needed to make someone stop what they were doing, he contributed to the seductive notion that bombs would solve our problems there, if only we use enough of them.

This talk has come primarily from the White House and from the President's Cabinet. I say to President Johnson that the real warhawks are in his own administration. It is the President himself who seeks to deride and belittle those in Congress who seek peaceful solutions in Asia. If there were the pressure he talks about from public opinion to increase the scope and level of the war against his wishes, he would do what every politician does in those circumstances, and encourage the peace wing of his own party to hold hearings, to speak up, to offer alternatives, and in general, to offset unwelcome war talk.

This the President of the United States has not done and is not doing, and I shall be surprised if he ever does it. He has not done it; he has done just the opposite. He has tried to ridicule the speeches, to offset the hearings, and to dismiss the alternatives. The White House displeasure with the peace wing has been made evident on many occasions and in many ways. But no White House displeasure or rebuke was directed, for example, at General LeMay when he suggested bombing North Vietnam into the Stone Age. No rebuke was administered to the White House adviser General Taylor when he urged the mining of Haiphong Harbor, without the slightest basis in international law for that war-hawk proposal. He continues to sit at the President's right hand and continues to give him bad advice, with the result that both Taylor and the President, plus Rusk, McNamara, and Lodge and the rest of the bad advisers of the President, are misguiding this country into a war that will eventually kill Americans by the hundreds of thousands.

These war-hawk views are emanating from the President's personal and official family. The organized strength of that family is brought to bear not against the war talk, but against the peace talk.

I deeply regret this, because I welcomed the Johnson platform of 1964 when he said in his campaign speeches that "we will not go north" and he would not send American boys to fight a war that Asians should fight for themselves.

I am sorry to repeat it again, but I intend to repeat it on the platforms of America from coast to coast, as long as there is any hope for us to stop this American outlawry in southeast Asia.

The American people gave President Johnson a mandate in November 1964, and it was a mandate joined in by millions of Republican voters, as well as Democratic voters. It was a mandate against the Goldwater war policy. It was a mandate for peace. It was a mandate against an escalation of the war. It was a mandate against sending increasing thousands of American boys to be slaughtered in South Vietnam.

The President of the United States has walked out on that mandate. It is his administration that beats the war drums and waves the flag to tatters. Therefore, as I have said before, it is for the people to take account of this administration, and of those running for office who support escalating the war and increasing the slaughter of American men. Those men should not have been sent there in the first place, for the reasons given by candidate Johnson in the fall of 1964. They should be given the protection advocated by General Gavin, General Ridgway, George Kennan, and other recognized authorities, who have recognized the soundness of the enclave approach, as contrasted to the Johnson approach of an expansion of this war that is going to lead to the killing of untold hundreds of Americans in a part of the world where we have no interest.

It would seem evident that the American people must make good on the indications that they would support candidates for Congress who would try harder to negotiate an end to the war, whether through the U.N. or directly with our adversaries.

Is it not interesting that in this civil war, as with any war in Vietnam these days, those Vietnamese who are opposing the tyrant, Ky, are urging arbitration or negotiation of the war through the United Nations or through reconvening of the Geneva Conference?

That is not Communist propaganda, Madam President. That sounds like people seeking to deliver their country from a war that is being conducted by a foreign power—the United States. I am not surprised at the anti-American

sentiment that is characterized by the opponents of Ky.

Madam President, I repeat, it would seem evident that the American people must make good on the indications that they would support candidates for Congress who would try to negotiate an end to the war, whether through the United Nations or directly with our adversaries. I pray they will, for this administration can be checked only by a Congress willing to check it, and that must be provided by the voters.

I close, Madam President, by saying that I think it is exceedingly sad that my Government is supporting such a tyrant as General Ky, the leader of a military junta, whose first reaction to opposition seems to be, "Kill."

We have seen his brutality manifested on many occasions. Now, because he is being opposed in Da Nang by one of the most highly educated men in South Vietnam, a scholar and a brilliant doctor—who points out so clearly that Ky's talk about the Da Nang rebels being Communist controlled, which unfortunately is endorsed by American officials in Vietnam, is not supported by a scintilla of evidence—Ky's response is, "Kill him."

That is the kind of a brute we are supporting in South Vietnam. That is the kind of a tyrant American boys are dying to keep in power.

Madam President, my country cannot justify it. This administration cannot justify it. We have no moral right to send U.S. forces to South Vietnam in support of this brute who has come to control the military junta of South Vietnam.

Oh, I think the rebellion will be put down. But let me warn the American people today, when it is put down, with the use of American arms and American planes—and I suspect also with the use of American power—the headlines will say, "Ky Sustained—Ky Victorious—Stablity Maintained"; and yet the sad fact is that my Government and yours, may I say to the Senate, is supporting a tyranny in South Vietnam, a brutal military junta that has not the slightest conception of the meaning of the word freedom.

That is our record.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, will this position deter, discourage, or contain communism, or does it lower the prestige of the United States, and thereby increase the prestige of communism?

Mr. MORSE. The United States, since it started violating the Geneva accords in 1954, has been creating Communists by the hundreds of thousands in the underdeveloped areas of the world and throughout Asia. The greatest aid communism has in the world is American foreign policy.

The United States, through its military aid, through its support of military juntas, is the greatest aid communism could have. We cannot defeat communism with American bullets, as the Senator from Tennessee has heard me say so many times. We possess the greatest weapon against communism; Bread, not bullets, and the expertation of our system of economic freedom which gives to individuals dignity and self-respect and helps to develop them so that they can develop their own political freedom.

I do not have to tell the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Alaska, or the Senator from North Dakota what is going on in South America. The support my country has given military juntas in Latin America by way of military aid has increased the threat of communism in Latin American, not decreased it.

To the extent that we are being successful in some areas in Latin America, it is in those areas where a democratic form of life is desired by the masses of the people, because they understand it and we have been building it up by preparing the seedbeds of economic freedom of choice for the masses.

That is the way to defeat communism.

But, my country is out on a bloody course of assuming that it can contain communism with bombs and bullets and military power in Asia. We will be bogged down there for decades to come, until finally the American people understand—as the French people came sadly to learn and understand—that we cannot contain Asia with western military power.

Some of us have got to be willing to speak out and take the abuse that goes with it, and have all our motives challenged, including our patriotism.

I consider it the greatest patriotic challenge which has ever confronted me in my 21 years of service in the Senate.

It is my duty and my trust to do what I can to save American lives in southeast Asia. I cannot save American lives in southeast Asia by supporting Lyndon B. Johnson in continuing to escalate America's war in southeast Asia.

Madam President, I am perfectly willing to let history be the judge in my opposition to what I am sorry to say has now become Johnson's war in Asia.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, home rule for the District of Columbia is a subject that has been debated on Capitol Hill and elsewhere for many years. I am hopeful that conferees from the Senate and the House of Representatives can sit down around the conference table at a very early date.

Reasonable and responsible men with conscientious differences of opinion have traditionally worked out legislative differences by the conference route.

Six times since 1949 the Senate has passed legislation to grant self-government to the District of Columbia. With House passage late last year of a charter approach to this question, Congress has come further down the home rule road than ever before in modern history. Therefore, as an eternal optimist, I express the hope that conferees from both bodies can make real progress in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1118) to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the intent of Congress to make available to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia such measure and form of local self-government as they themselves shall democratically establish if such self-government is consistent with the constitutional injunction that Congress retain ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital. In taking this action it is further the intent of Congress to demonstrate its fundamental and enduring belief in the merits of the democratic process by exercising its retained legislative responsibility for the seat of the Federal Government only as it concerns amendments to any charter which might be established under this Act, but not as it concerns the routine municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

SELF-GOVERNMENT REFERENDUM AND CHARTER BOARD ELECTION

SEC. 3. (a)(1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a referendum, on a day specified by it, not later than one hundred days after the date of enactment of this Act to determine if the residents of the District of Columbia want self-government for the District of Columbia. The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The voters of the District of Columbia are being asked in this election whether they want a District of Columbia Charter Board created whose purpose would be to write a charter for the District of Columbia. The charter, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the creation of a District of Columbia Charter Board? ------yes ------no."

(2) In order for the proposition to be approved, a majority of those voting must vote in favor of the proposition.

(b) The Board of Elections shall also conduct an election on the same day as the referendum to choose members of the Charter Board (to be established in accordance with section 4).

(c) Every qualified elector—

(1) who has registered with the Board of Elections, in accordance with section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, for the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section and who the Board of Elections ascertains is still a qualified elector, or

(2) who registers with the Board of Elections in accordance with subsection (d) of this section,

shall be entitled to vote in such election and referendum.

(d)(1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a registration of electors under section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, during a period beginning as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty or less than twenty days before the date of the referendum and election.

(2) The Board of Elections may by regulation prescribe any reasonable method for ascertaining whether a person registered to vote in the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section is a qualified elector. Any such person who it ascertains is a qualified elector shall be notified by mail before the beginning of the registration period established under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(e)(1) Before the beginning of the registration period the Board of Elections shall publish in each of the daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia a list of registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(2) Not later than two weeks before the election and referendum, the Board shall publish and mail to each registered voter a voter information pamphlet which shall contain (A) a statement (not exceeding one hundred and twenty-five words in length) by each candidate for election setting forth his qualifications, (B) an argument for approval of the proposition to be submitted in referendum, and (C) if this Act is not passed in each House without opposition, an argument for disapproval of that proposition. Each argument shall not exceed five hundred words in length. The argument for approval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress who voted for the approval of this Act, one appointed from the House by the Speaker and one appointed from the Senate by the President pro tempore. The argument for disapproval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress, similarly appointed, who voted against the approval of this Act if there were Members in each House that voted against approval of this Act; otherwise such argument shall be written by one Member, who voted against approval of this Act, who shall be selected by the President pro tempore or the Speaker, as the case may be.

(f)(1) In the election of members of the Charter Board, there shall be a number of different ballot forms equal to the number of candidates. The Board of Elections shall arrange such ballot forms so that the order in which the candidates' names appear on the ballot forms is rotated from one voting precinct to the next. The rotation shall be accomplished by arranging one ballot form so that the names of the candidates are listed vertically in alphabetical order and by arranging each succeeding form by placing at the bottom of the list the name which was at the top of the list on the preceding form. The forms shall be allotted to voting precincts by lot in a manner prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Elections.

(2) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliation, emblem, or slogan.

(g)(1) To be a candidate for the office of member of the Charter Board a person must be nominated in accordance with this subsection, must be a registered elector of the District of Columbia, and must have been a continuous resident of the District of Columbia for at least three years prior to the day of the election. The President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall be ineligible for membership on the Charter Board.

(2) To be nominated as a candidate a person must present a petition to the Board of Elections not less than forty-five days prior to the election. Such petition shall contain signatures of at least three hundred registered electors and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable filing fee of $25. The Board of Elections shall determine the validity of the signatures contained in such petition.

(3) Members of the Charter Board shall be elected from the District of Columbia at large.

(h)(1) In the election each voter may cast one vote for each of not more than fifteen candidates. The fifteen candidates receiving the largest number of votes shall be elected.

(2) The Board of Elections shall certify the results of the election and referendum to the President, the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate, and the Board of Elections shall issue a certificate of election to each person elected to the Charter Board.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) If the proposition submitted to the referendum conducted under section 3 is approved, there shall be established an independent agency of the United States to be known as the District of Columbia Charter Board. The Charter Board shall be composed of the fifteen persons elected in the election conducted under section 3. The candidate for office of member of the Charter Board who received the highest number of votes in such election shall be chairman of the Charter Board until the Charter Board selects a chairman from among its number.

(b) Each member of the Charter Board shall be entitled to receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Charter Board, except that (1) a member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not be entitled to receive such per diem for any day for which he is compensated by the United States for his services as such an officer or employee, and (2) no member may receive more than $5,000 in the aggregate for his services as a member.

(c) The Charter Board shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) The Charter Board may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Charter Board, but not in excess of $100 pere diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The District of Columbia government shall furnish such space and facilities in public buildings in the District as the Charter Board may reasonably request, and shall provide the Charter Board with such records, information, and other services as may be required by the Board for the carrying out of its function.

(f) The Charter Board may hold meetings, hearings, and issue subpenas within the District of Columbia. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Charter Board, or any member of the Charter Board designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

(g) Hearings of the Charter Board shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators.

(h)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $300,000 for the administrative expenses of the Charter Board.

(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Elections such sums as may be necessary to conduct the election and referendums authorized by this Act.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the limitations in subsection (b), the Charter Board shall have the power to propose a District of Columbia charter, within two hundred and ten days from the day on which the election and referendum is held under section 3. Such charter shall, if approved in a referendum conducted under section 6 and if not disapproved by Congress under section 7, establish a municipal government for the District of Columbia. The Charter Board may propose a charter only by the vote of a majority of its members, and only one charter may be proposed. A copy of the proposed charter shall be transmitted to the Board of Elections.

(b)(1) The Charter Board is authorized to prepare a charter which may vest in a District of Columbia government complete legislative power over the District of Columbia with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation which are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. The Congress reserves the right at any time after the adoption of such a charter to exercise its constitutional authority to amend in whatever fashion it chooses any charter written pursuant to this Act. Provisions of a charter may provide for subsequent amendment of the charter by the people of the District of Columbia. Such an amendment must be submitted in a referendum. However, such an amendment shall not take effect if disapproved by Congress in the manner provided by section 7(c).

(2) The President of the United States may disapprove any legislation enacted by a District of Columbia government established under a charter approved pursuant to this Act, but his positive assent is not needed for any such legislation to take effect.

(3) The Charter Board may also provide in the charter for the creation of such courts as may be necessary to assume the functions, solely relating to the affairs of the District of Columbia, of any Federal court within the District.

CHARTER REFERENDUM

SEC. 6. (a) The Board of Elections shall submit to referendum the charter proposed by the Charter Board. Such referendum shall be conducted by the Board of Elections, on a day specified by it, not later than forty-five days after the Charter Board transmits the charter proposed by it to the Board of Elections. The provisions of section 3 relating to the referendum conducted under that section shall be applicable to the referendum conducted under this section, except that (1) the registration period shall begin as soon as practicable after the transmission of the proposed charter to the Board of Elections, (2) the arguments respecting approval of the proposition shall be written by members of the Charter Board appointed by the chairman thereof, and (3) the voter information pamphlet shall contain a copy of the proposed charter.

(b) The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The District of Columbia Charter Board has written a charter which, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the charter?

.....yes .....no."

ties prosper, and there is great confidence in the future. We must trace this good fortune to the basic resources of the region—to the good earth, the water, and the hardworking and skilled people on the farms and ranches and in the towns.

We have done more than build—we have rebuilt. We have conserved and developed our resources and made them work for us. We are proud of this heritage. But we know that we can sustain our prosperity only by continued dedication to the principles of sound resource conservation and development.

We know, too, that all is not well with the land and the waters that flow across it. The soil still washes and blows where it should be held secure by vegetation. The streams are polluted with wastes that limit or destroy the value of this needed water.

While we have accomplished much in conserving and developing our land and water resources, we have much yet to do.

In Kansas, soil conservation districts embrace every farm and ranch, and the majority of these districts have signed modernized agreements with the Department of Agriculture to permit broader and more useful development of the rural lands and waters of the State.

Yet, only 34 percent of the needed soil and water conservation work on Kansas farms and ranches has been completed, and at the current completion rate of about 1½ percent per year the job clearly will take a long time to finish.

Of a total of 236 watersheds that need project-type action in Kansas, 40 have been authorized for planning assistance, and of these 21 have been authorized for installation of works of improvement.

These examples are a brief indication of basic soil and water conservation work that remains to be done in Kansas. A similar picture could be drawn for every State, for every State has a great backlog of watershed protection and other conservation work waiting to be acted on. This is a challenge we cannot ignore.

We must move resolutely forward in programs to conserve and develop our soil and water and related resources—to clean our streams and curb further pollution of them; to prevent damaging floods; to save the soil from washing and blowing away; to make the best possible use of our water resources through impoundment and distribution as needed for building sound local economies; to preserve the woodlands from heedless exploitation; to enrich the lives of our people by continuing to make the countryside a more beautiful as well as a more useful place for the benefit of all Americans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8282 which is pending on the important matter of unemployment compensation, is of a good deal of interest to all of us in the House. I have been in contact with a constituent of mine, Mr. Richard H. Barry, a well-known financial and business consultant, who has some ideas pertinent to the revision of this legislation. They are embodied in a resolution from the Fargo Chamber of Commerce, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point for the study of those interested:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Fargo Chamber of Commerce:

1. Is strongly in favor of an equitable system for both employees and employers in administering the mechanics and financing cycles of temporary and seasonal unemployment in the permanent work force as distinguished from part time or occasional workers, and

2. Recognizes the need and advisability to up date the unemployment compensation insurance system from time to time in the light of experience and changing conditions, such as the premise in most States that the employer should pay 100 percent of the cost of unemployment insurance; and

3. Is unalterably opposed to H.R. 8282 in its present form, as it is woefully inadequate insofar as the need for an up-to-date system of unemployment insurance is concerned; and

4. Suggest that the time has come for the Congress of the United States to redefine the following:

4.1 The purpose and scope of unemployment compensation insurance; and

4.2 The respective financial responsibilities of the employer, the employee and the general public to pay the insurance premiums, first for cycles of temporary and seasonal employment of the permanent work force, and second, the much higher cost of insurance programs embracing part time and occasional workers, plus cycles in excess of 6 months; and

4.3 The duties and compensation of the State and Federal administrators of the program, plus the mechanics of how such regulators and administrators are appointed; and

5. Suggest to the Congress of the United States that legislative bills such as H.R. 8282 are frequently drawn and sponsored by civil service employees of the United States Department of Labor giving to them, through the office of the Secretary of Labor, unwarranted and excessive bureaucratic control without sufficient regard for the following:

5.1. The full context of what is in the best interests of the public; and

5.2. For the tax inequities caused the majority of employers; and

5.3. For the excessive financial burdens for the majority of small employers with stable payrolls; and

5.4. For the denial to all employers of effective recourse to the judicial branch of government to establish the intent of the law; and

6. Suggest that the foregoing preamble to the resolution summarizes the attitude of the vast majority of employers in describing their concern with the implications of H.R. 8282 to grant to a few unidentified key employees in the vast U.S. Department of Labor under the guise of authority to issue routine regulations or bring about uniformity, a wide range of excessive control over the rights of employers and in effect making such Federal administrators the sole proprietors of all knowledge; and

7. Suggest that the Federal advisory commissions appointed in the past exclusively by the U.S. Secretaries of Labor to represent labor, business and the best interests of the citizens as a whole have failed to function effectively in that capacity; and

8. Suggest that a specific instance of the failure of a recent Federal Advisory Commission to function for extended periods of time and failure to issue reports at reasonable intervals is shown by the attached letter dated August 2, 1962, from the office of the late Congressman, Hjalmer C. Nygaard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress in its evaluation of H.R. 8282 be hereby urged to take into consideration the foregoing preamble and take affirmative action to have the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint a full-time bipartisan three-man Unemployment Compensation Board of Administration of which the Secretary of Labor would be an ex officio member to deal more knowingly and equitably with the employee and employer in the full context of what is in the best interest of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the following Members of Congress for the State of North Dakota with the request that each of them evaluate these recommendations and if they are in accord with them that they write their colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives encompassing their thoughts on the substance and spirit of this resolution: Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Congressman MARK ANDREWS, and Congressman ROLLAND REDLIN.

FARGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1962.

Mr. RICHARD BARRY,
Fargo, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. BARRY: Unfortunately I am not able to come up with the material you wanted relative to S. 3411 and H.R. 12385, copies of which are enclosed.

I am advised that the Federal Advisory Commission under the Bureau of Employment Security is not functioning at present. The terms of the past members have expired and new members have not as yet been appointed. It is expected they will be named within the next 10 days or 2 weeks at which time I will send you the names. The last report published by this Commission came out in 1954 and is now out of print. I have been put on a waiting list for any new report which may be forthcoming.

This is a rather vague and cloudy reply, but it is the best I can give you under the circumstances. Under separate cover, I am sending you a 1962 Congressional Directory. On pages 516 and 517 you will find the make-up of the Bureau of Employment Security which may give you some information that will be helpful. I am holding copies of the two bills and the information you gave me over the phone for Mr. Nygaard.

Sincerely,

IRENE MARTIN EDWARDS,
Assistant to Congressman Hjalmar C. Nygaard.

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken so often of this matter that I feel a little redundant. However, the issue is too vital, so important to our Nation, that I feel compelled to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the public until something effective is done about it.

My reference is to the need of blockading Haiphong and other North Vietnam ports in order to keep the British and other free world ships particularly from carrying in supplies to the Vietcong. I am happy the Greek Government no

Similarly, the provisions of law relating to the payment of unpaid salaries in the event of the death of a Member of Congress during his term of office are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (c)), and the privileges of participating in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act which are applicable to Members of Congress are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (d)).

In the same way, subsection (e) makes applicable to the District Delegate, and to his office, the provisions of law relating to allowances for stationery, telephones, the hiring of clerical help, and the furnishing of office equipment which now apply to Members of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner. The statutory provisions for congressional office space are also made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (f).

The provisions of Federal criminal law which relate to Members of Congress, to their activities, and to their elections, are also made applicable to the District Delegate. Thus, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act is made applicable to the Delegate's position (subsec. (g)), as are also the provisions of law making it a Federal crime to intimidate voters (subsec. (h)), as well as those punishing the use by Federal employees of influence or authority to interfere with elections (subsec. (i)).

Subsection (j) contains the changes required in existing law to assure that appointment of candidates to the armed services academies from the District would be made by the elected Delegate, rather than by the appointed Commissioners.

SECTION 5

This section contains the definitions which are used throughout the bill, and also a number of miscellaneous provisions which will be important in administering the law. Subsection (a) contains the definitions. Subsection (b) simply brings up to date the provisions of the existing law with respect to the current name of the former municipal court. Subsection (c) changes the deadline date for filing nominating petitions for candidates for local party elections, so as to give enough time for the operation of the new procedure for challenging nominating petitions, established by subsection (d) below.

The new subsection (d) amends the existing District of Columbia election law so as to give the Board of Elections authority to accept initially the signatures on duly filed nominating petitions, but sets up a mechanism by which the petitions can be timely challenged, and the challenges resolved by the Board of Elections, with a right of later review in court. It also provides that the order in which the names of candidates will appear on the ballot shall be determined by choosing lots.

Subsection (e) amends the existing law slightly to clarify the authority of the Elections Board to issue regulations to accept some ballots which have been cast outside the precinct in which the registrant lived—as one example, in the case of a person who was registered in one precinct but on election day is in a hospital in another precinct and is voting as a "shut-in."

Subparagraph (f) changes the existing elections law slightly so as to require that only one of the officials in the polling place will be needed to accompany an illiterate or handicapped voter into the voting booth in order to carry out the voter's directions with respect to recording his vote (present law requires the presence of two officials). The change would also provide that the voter can, if he so desires, have a second official of the Board of Elections to witness the recordation of his vote in accordance with his directions.

Subsections (g) and (h) will shorten and simplify the party "primary" ballots under the 1955 Election Act, by eliminating the election of alternates to the various party officials. The party primary ballots have been widely criticized because of their length and complexity. The elimination of the election of alternate officials will substantially shorten the ballots in a number of cases. At the same time, the alternates can, of course, be selected by the parties themselves, by caucus or other means not involving the use of the citywide primary election machinery. The party officials themselves (national committeemen and women, delegates to the Presidential nominating conventions and when designated by the parties, members and officials of the local party committees) would continue to be elected by ballot under the present election law.

Subsection (i) amends the existing election law to make it clear that if the local political party committee so desires, the party primary ballots may contain presidential preference questions to be answered by the voters. The bill requires that the local party committee furnish the potential presidential candidate with written information to the effect that it is so proposing his name to go on the ballot. At the same time the bill provides a mechanism by which the potential candidate may, if he chooses, remove his name from the ballot without the necessity of stating a reason for his decision in this respect.

The right to have these presidential preference questions on the ballot under the present law has been sharply disputed ever since the act was passed in 1955, and a 1964 court decision cast a further cloud on the authority of the board of elections to permit presidental preference questions under existing law. With this amendment, these presidential preference questions would also replace the so-called party questions. These party questions have been criticized as diluting the powers of the elected party officials to formulate party policies, and also because the questions add further to the length of the ballot.

Subsection (j) would remove an ambiguity in existing election law by establishing a clear deadline for filing the designations of the offices of local party committees to be filled by the party primary elections.

Under the existing election law each candidate on the ballot has the right to have one watcher at each polling place. Subsection (k) would change this arrangement slightly in the light of the length of the party primary ballots (in the 1964 election, for instance, there were over 250 candidates on the party ballots), to give the Board of Elections authority to issue regulations reasonably limiting the number of watchers in each voting place, and reasonably to regulate the scope of the watchers' activities while at the same time preserving their rights to perform their important duties.

Subsection (l) would give the Board of Elections clear authority to declare that duly nominated and unopposed candidates for party office are elected without opposition. The fact that they have been so elected would appear on the party ballot, together with the names of all the candidates who are opposed and whose election is to be determined by the voters. This change will further simplify and shorten ballot forms, without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of the elections under the act.

Subsection (m) changes the method of compensation of the members of the three-man Board of Elections. They are now paid $25 per day while performing their duties. With the enactment of this act there will be two elections in every even-numbered year, with occasional special or party runoff elections to be expected from time to time, thus substantially increasing the activities of the Board of Elections. The amount of time spent by Board members in an election year is substantial, and the changeover to some modest, fixed annual compensation is desirable and appropriate under all the circumstances.

Subsection (n) amends the law so as to give the candidates a period of 30 days after each election in order to complete and file their financial reports. At present they have only 10 days in which to perform this work, a period which is insufficient and unworkable.

Subsection (o) tightens up the enforcement provisions of the present law so as to make it clear that any false statement by a registrant with respect to qualifications for voting will render him subject to penalty, whereas the present act limits the applicability of the penal provision to false statements as to the registrant's residence or voting privileges outside the district. The bill also makes the enforcement provisions of the act applicable to the restrictions on contributions and requirements for reporting expenditures.

Subsections (p) and (q) amend the title, and the first section of the existing law, so as to reflect the fact that the act provides for the election of the Delegate to the House of Representatives in addition to the other officials elected under the existing law.

SECTION 6

Enactment of the first five sections of this bill would have the effect of converting the present quadrennial election cycle in the District of Columbia to a biennial cycle—that is, there would be two elections in every even-numbered year, whereas at the present time there are two elections only in every fourth year—in presidential election years.

Enactment simply of these first five sections in an election year such as 1966 would raise some operating problems. It takes several months to get ready to run an election well, and funds have to be made available for the purpose.

In order to take care of these initial starting problems, section 6 has been added which authorizes special elections in the autumn of 1966 to elect a Delegate to the House to serve in the 90th Congress, which convenes next January. This section 6 specifically validates for purposes of these 1966 elections all the 1964 registrations (approximately 200,000 of them were made at that time) to the extent that the registrants prove that they continue to meet the qualifications required by the District of Columbia election law.

Section 6 also provides for additional registrations for these 1966 elections, and gives the Board of Elections flexibility in scheduling the dates for the 1966 primary and general elections for Delegate, and for party runoff elections also, if such additional elections prove to be necessary. The section provides a time limit in which the Board is required to complete the installation of the new permanent registration system to replace the present periodic registrations now required. The deadlines prescribed will assure that the permanent registration system will be in full operation for the 1968 elections.

Technical note: The bill has been drafted to meet the codification requirements of the District of Columbia Code and also, in sections 2(a) and 4, the codification requirements of the United States Code.

A CONSERVATION JOB TO DO AT HOME

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, across mid-America the land blooms, communi-

longer permits Greek-flag ships to engage in this trade; so, perhaps we are making progress, even if it is slow.

It has been noted that Soviet Russian vessels are carrying the latest Mig-21's to Haiphong for unloading; one ship we have been informed, arrived just the other day. Yet the propaganda line is to paint the Russians as the "good guys" and the Red Chinese who are presently doing far less for the Vietcong as the "baddies."

While I do not pretend to be an authority on this subject, others are. By unanimous consent, I introduce an editorial from Navy, the official publication of the Navy League of the United States:

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

The question of when or whether the United States should take decisive steps to shut off the flow of arms and war supplies into Haiphong, North Vietnam's biggest and busiest port, continues to gnaw at the Johnson administration.

Pressure for such action has mounted in recent weeks, as American aircraft losses and the number of North Vietnamese regular army troops infiltrating into the south increase. The principal methods advocated are these: (1) bombing from the air; (2) laying of minefields in the harbor, and (3) the establishment of a partial blockade or quarantine of the type ordered by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now a Presidential adviser on Vietnam, told Congress early last month that he believed it was time to do something about Haiphong. He said he throught mining the harbor would be the simplest way to discourage shipping from entering that port.

About a week later, a raft of interpretive stories came out of the Pentagon—indicating that a background session for reporters had been held by official spokesmen—which said that the Joint Chiefs want to bomb some of Haiphong's industrial and petroleum storage areas as part of a general expansion of the air war against North Vietnam.

Several leading Republicans, including Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSON and former Vice President Richard Nixon, have been advocating a blockade of the Communist port. A number of influential Democrats in Congress, Senators RUSSELL and SYMINGTON, for example, also favor such a step.

EXPLOITING OUR FEARS

The thinking behind these recommendations for ending the de facto sanctuary status of Haiphong goes like this: It doesn't make sense to bomb North Vietnam at all if the Communists are allowed to import antiaircraft guns and missiles and the shells and bullets which make the bombing more expensive in American lives and money and increase the casualties among our forces engaged against the enemy in the south.

The administration, however, is fearful that if we attack Haiphong, or blockade it, we might risk a serious crisis with the Soviet Union and/or Communist China. The Russians and Chinese are well aware of this fear and have exploited it. The Russians reportedly have passed the word through diplomatic channels that if we strike either Haiphong or the capital city of Hanoi (also a sancutary) they will have to take some kind of counteraction. The Chinese have said the samo thing publicly. According to a member of the Philippine Senate, who had just returned from a visit to Peking, the Chinese told her that they would feel justified in entering the Vietnamese war if the United States attacked the two big cities in the north.

State Department and Pentagon leaders have played down the heavy military aid the Soviet Union has been giving the North Vienamese aggressor, presumably on the theory that good relations with Moscow should be maintained so that it might, one day, persuade Hanoi that it should come with us to the peace table. As a consequence there has been a tendency on the part of the administration to downgrade the importance of Haiphong to the war effort against us and also to entangle it with the question of bombing Hanoi, for which there is far less pressure.

Accordingly, there must have some red faces in Washington late last month when a copy of a letter purportedly sent by the Kremlin to Communist parties around the world found its way into print in the Western World. Dealing with the Moscow-Peking split, the communication for the first time gave the American people a fairly detailed account of the kind and scope of the military aid the U.S.S.R. has been supplying our enemy. Here is what it said, in part:

"The Soviet Union delivers large amounts of weapons to the DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam), including rocket installations, anti-aircraft artillery, airplanes, tanks, coastal guns, warships, and other items. In 1965 alone, weapons and other war materiel worth about 500 million rubles ($550 million) were placed at the disposal of the DRV.

"The DRV is receiving support in the training of pilots, rocket personnel, tank drivers, artillerymen, and so on. Our military aid is being rendered to the extent the Vietnamese leadership itself thinks necessary."

Figures on the value of Chinese military aid to North Vietnam are not available, but it is doubtful that it would match the Soviet's half-billion dollar annual rate, a rate the Kremlin makes clear may go even higher—Hanoi only has to ask.

BULK OF IT GOES BY SEA

With China and the U.S.S.R. assailing each other so bitterly that some observers believe the two Communist giants are near a complete break, it may be assumed that the bulk of this Soviet aid reaches North Vietnam by ship, through Haiphong. Again, the Kremlin letter referred to above sheds some light. It said:

"The Chinese Communist Party leadership hindered the implementation of the agreement of the Government of the U.S.S.R. with the Government of the DRV on an immediate increase in military aid for the DRV. The CCP leaders did not permit Soviet transport planes with weapons to fly over CPR (Chinese Peoples Republic) territory.

"Then, Chinese personalities also placed obstacles in the way of the transportation of war materiel to Vietnam by rail. Thus, at their request, an additional shipment of military equipment, including anti-aircraft artillery, which is needed so urgently to protect the Vietnamese cities and villages against the United States air pirates, was recently delivered to the Vietnamese comrades. The Chinese authorities refused for a long time to relay the freight, under the pretense that the papers for its transit had not yet been filled out and that they did not know whether Vietnam needs this war materiel."

It is clear that the port of Haiphong is vitally important to the North Vietnamese war effort and that this importance will increase as Soviet and East European Communist aid expands. Militarily, it would make sense to disrupt this lifeline that helps sustain our enemy. We control the sea and the air and could do so. There are, of course, diplomatic and political factors that the President must weigh. But the American people now know, ironically from the Kremlin and not from the White House, how vast the Soviet military aid to North Vietnam is and how necessary Haiphong is to its delivery. The pressure for a new decision by the President is bound to increase further. Should he decide to allow Haiphong to remain a sanctuary, he will have to make a new case. His present one is not convincing.

DISRUPTIVE CCC CORN SALES SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1966, I sent the following letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, calling his attention to the recent policies of the Commodity Credit Corporation which have initiated a potentially disastrous situation in the Minnesota corn market:

MARCH 8, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the face of departmental predictions to the contrary and drastically dropping corn prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation has dumped nearly 175 million bushels of corn on the market since the first of this year. During the past 9 weeks, the Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of about one-third of the total CCC reserve supply.

Can this be the same Government agency which predicted in December that corn requirements this year could "be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts of corn expected to be made available from (Government-owned) stocks"? On December 17, the USDA announced that sales in 1966 would be less than last year's total of 417 million bushels. Nevertheless, in the first 9 weeks of 1966, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold a total which already amounts to 42 percent of the entire 1965 total. In January, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 62 million bushels of corn, compared to only 8.4 million bushels in December. The February total of 140.2 million bushels dumped was the highest for any month in 4 years and more than double the amount for February 1965. The Commodity Credit Corporation seems bound and determined to break their newly established record this month. Last week, they unloaded 72 million bushels of corn.

In 2 days of last week, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 40 million bushels of corn in Minneapolis; nearly five times the amount sold in December on all markets. These sales in Minneapolis were made at 6 to 7 cents under the level of the futures contract in Chicago for March. The closing prices of corn futures after these two days were from 6⅜ to as much as 10 cents below the February 14 level.

Most of the unloaded grain was purchased by domestic users. In February, for example, the Government sold 122.9 million bushels for domestic use and 17.3 million bushels for export. Why has this heavy emphasis on domestic sales occurred during a year when exporters say that total exports will exceed 700 million bushels if the supplies are available at ports, an increase of 130 million bushels over the 1964–65 total.

The answer, of course, is a concerned Government effort to drive the farmer's corn prices down. This effort has succeeded, as it always has. Prices on No. 2 yellow corn in Chicago have dropped since mid-February from $1.33 to $1.27. Prices on corn sold for future delivery on the Chicago Board of Trade closed last Friday at $1.23 a bushel, down 8 cents from mid-January.

It is very discouraging to farmers that, at a time when the parity price ratio shows signs of creeping upward, the heavy hand of the Commodity Credit Corporation would shatter this reviving trend with its dumping practices. It may be that as in the recent cases of actual or threatened dumping of aluminum and steel, the official excuse will be that of curbing inflation. However, someone will have to prove to me how a segment of our economy can be held responsible for our growing threat of inflation when they only receive 80-some percent return on their contribution to our economy.

A better explanation for these recent dumping practices just might be tied in with their timing. This happens to be the time of year that farmers are being asked to sign up for acreage-retirement programs. As some corn traders have suggested, "we can only suspect the corn disposal has the aim of discouraging a large corn acreage this year. This amounts to no less than economic assault being used to force formers into programs which Congress clearly intended to remain voluntary.

I would hope that through your leadership, the House Committee on Agriculture will act quickly to halt this misinterpretation of congressional intent and insure the restitution of the grain market to the supply and demand influences of a free economy.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN.
Member of Congress.

On March 28, I received the following reply from Chairman COOLEY:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1966.

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

DEAR ANCHER: I forwarded to Secretary Freeman your letter of March 8, concerning Government activities in the corn market, requesting of the Department a discussion which might be useful in understanding these activities. I now have a response from Mr. John A. Schnittker, Under Secretary, a copy of which is enclosed, along with a table he supplied.

There seems to be substantial disagreement on what is being done and what is being accomplished. I'd appreciate your comments upon Mr. Schnittker's letter.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We appreciate this opportunity to respond to the inaccurate or misleading statements contained in Congressman ANCHER NELSEN'S letter to you which was forwarded to us for reply.

The Department, in the press release noted by Congressman NELSEN, stated that CCC sales in 1965–66 were expected to be considerably smaller than in the previous year, but, we further indicated that in application of the ever-normal-granary principle, CCC supplies would be offered as necessary to insure an orderly movement of supplies into domestic use and export. This principle involves acquisitions by CCC when supplies are overburdensome and releasing stocks when the market flow is inadequate. The basic objective of the ever-normal-granary and CCC sales policy is that of promoting orderly marketing over a period of years and within a given marketing year. This has been, and is presently the basis for the CCC sales and procurement policy.

As has been the case since enactment of the present type of feed grain program, the Department this season has offered its storable corn supplies for unrestricted domestic use at the market price but not less than the legal minimum, that is, the applicable loan, plus a gradually increasing monthly markup. The markup this season began with 4¼ cents per bushel for October (compared to nothing in past years) and is again being increased by 1½ cents in each succeeding month to reach a scheduled final total of 17¾ cents for July, August, and September.

Thus, the CCC minimum price has a built-in upward seasonal trend and is above the current loan redemption value for producers at all times by a gradually widening difference.

Sales of corn for restricted use, mainly for export, or of nonstorable qualities, have also been available at not less than market price.

The increase in rate of disposals beyond the levels indicated in December is accounted for by several subsequent developments. First, it became apparent by February that total utilization would be larger than initially estimated by nearly 90 million bushels, including an increase of 50 million bushels in exports. The estimate of the 1965 corn crop also was adjusted downward by 8 million bushels and from the feed value standpoint may actually be somewhat lower.

Second, an unevenness developed in the market offerings of corn after harvest accompanied by an uncharacteristic price movement considering the size of the 1965 crop (see tables 1 and 2), partly because a larger-than-usual proportion of the new crop went into storage at relatively high moisture levels, hence was taking more time to get into condition considered desirable for sale by producers. A good many producers also reacted to the somewhat unqualified discussion of growing world food needs by putting off corn sales against the possibility of a big surge later in export demand.

It became apparent by January that if the Department was to carry out its general responsibility of insuring an adequate and reasonably steady supply movement to users, it would be insufficient to limit CCC offerings, as initially anticipated, primarily to get rid of supplies unsuitable for further storage and to meet the needs of the emergency livestock feed program at concessional prices as required by law.

As more was learned about the low quality and high-moisture condition of 1965 corn in the northwest Corn Belt, particularly in Minnesota, it also became apparent that considerable quantities of dry corn from CCC stocks would be desired for blending with the new crop to improve its acceptability in the market. In this connection, it may be mentioned that up to 2 million bushels of CCC bin site corn per week are continuing on offer to local Minnesota buyers to further insure coverage of blending needs.

From now on, however, it seems likely that total CCC disposals will taper off substantially as the movement of corn from other sources normalizes.

Incidentally, the reference to CCC disposals of about 140 million bushels in February being the highest in 4 years for that month is not a very good indicator of the average overall monthly rate so far this season. At only 4.8 and 8.5 million bushels respectively, the recent October and December rates were the lowest for those months in all of the five seasons since the present type of feed grain program began. The November total of 19 million bushels was the lowest for the month in the five seasons with the exception of 1964–65 and at less than 62 million bushels the current January disposals were the smallest for the month except in 1963–64.

We hope that the foregoing deals adequately with respect to the points raised in the letter from Congressman NELSEN.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Under Secretary.

TABLE 1.—*Corn: Receipts at primary markets, by weeks, October–March 1963–66*

Period [1]	1963–64 market receipts [2]	1964–65 market receipts [2]	1965–66 market receipts [2]
Week ended:	*Thousands of bushels*	*Thousands of bushels*	*Thousands of bushels*
Oct. 2	4,253	8,357	4,755
Oct. 9	4,489	6,339	4,769
Oct. 16	7,460	6,710	3,883
Oct. 23	14,115	12,981	4,894
Oct. 30	23,341	18,935	4,986
Nov. 6	22,860	21,826	9,690
Nov. 13	23,490	21,594	14,373
Nov. 20	24,931	17,883	17,386
Nov. 27	14,457	9,678	16,103
Dec. 4	14,909	9,084	14,438
Dec. 11	9,819	6,144	12,600
Dec. 18	6,030	4,986	9,687
Dec. 25	3,437	4,359	5,941
Jan. 1	4,030	2,803	2,912
Jan. 8	6,972	5,067	3,856
Jan. 15	8,393	8,050	6,461
Jan. 22	9,915	8,179	6,960
Jan. 29	9,705	7,676	7,890
Feb. 5	9,310	6,219	7,617
Feb. 12	8,761	7,930	7,871
Feb. 19	6,107	7,897	7,407
Feb. 26	6,034	8,971	7,970
Mar. 5	4,961	7,171	8,818
Mar. 12	4,931	6,266	7,641
Total receipts:	*Millions of bushels*	*Millions of bushels*	*Millions of bushels*
Oct. 2–30	53.7	53.3	18.5
Nov. 27	139.6	124.3	76.1
Jan. 1	173.7	148.9	118.7
Jan. 29	212.7	180.7	146.9
Feb. 26	242.9	211.7	177.8
Mar. 12	252.7	222.1	191.7

[1] Market receipts for week ended previous Thursday.
[2] Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Duluth, St. Louis, Kansas City, Peoria, Omaha, Indianapolis, Sioux City, St. Joseph, Wichita, and Toledo.

TABLE 2.—*Corn, all grades: Cash sales price per bushel at 5 markets, by weeks, October–March 1963–66* [1]

[In cents per bushel]

Week ending—	1963–66
1963	
Oct. 11	124.6
Oct. 18	118.7
Oct. 25	116.6
Nov. 1	115.7
Nov. 8	117.3
Nov. 15	116.5
Nov. 22	115.1
Nov. 29	113.3
Dec. 6	116.5
Dec. 13	119.2
Dec. 20	120.9
Dec. 27	121.8
1964	
Jan. 3	118.2
Jan. 10	120.3
Jan. 17	121.4
Jan. 24	119.9
Jan. 31	120.3
Feb. 7	119.2
Feb. 14	117.8
Feb. 21	117.7
Feb. 28	119.4
Mar. 6	120.3
Mar. 13	120.2
Oct. 9	124.0
Oct. 16	122.7
Oct. 23	120.3
Oct. 30	119.2
Nov. 6	118.6
Nov. 13	119.0
Nov. 20	120.6
Nov. 27	122.7
Dec. 4	123.3
Dec. 11	124.7
Dec. 18	126.6
Dec. 25	127.3

particularly, the watershed and planning phases of the same could be continued.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the statement that I made before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, House Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ARCH A. MOORE, JR., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about several items in the budget proposals for the Soil Conservation Service, and I appreciate this opportunity to discuss them.

One hundred percent of the land units in the State of West Virginia are in organized soil conservation districts. These conservation districts have broadened and changed their activities and assistance as new needs have been encountered by both rural and urban landowners. I feel the current budget recommendations do not adequately reflect these needs. Therefore, I make the following suggestions:

WATERSHED PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

I recommend an increase in Public Law 566 watershed planning funds to $10 million, and an increase of $12 million for watershed construction.

West Virginia now has 36 watershed projects completed, under construction, or in the planning and application stage. I'm very enthusiastic about this program because I've seen the tremendous economic impact they have on the surrounding communities.

For example, in my district, the Upper Grave Creek Watershed at Cameron was completed about a year ago. Last summer there was a violent rainstorm in the upper watershed area. Previously, the farms and community of Cameron would have suffered severe damages. But, thanks to this watershed project, the storm water was "walked down" the tributaries and there was no damage at all.

Local people and soil conservation technicians are now working on a plan for the Wheeling Creek Watershed, where considerable destruction and the loss of one life have resulted from floods in the past few years.

I feel these are the kinds of projects we should continuously try to move forward, not retard. Under the proposed budgetary limitations, new construction starts will be reduced from the current total of 80 per year to only 35 in 1967. This will hurt both the people in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

I recommend an increase in the overall appropriation for conservation operations to $120 million. Part of this increase—$3.6 million—is needed to restore the proposed reduction for soil surveys. These surveys have always been a basic tool of rural conservation planning. More recently, they have proven their value for nonagricultural use by such groups as State highway departments, real estate developers, health departments and planning commissions. Wider use of surveys is growing as West Virginia grows and I am disturbed to see a cutback in an activity so essential to sound land use planning.

Further increases are needed for staffing to provide technical programing and installation services to soil conservation district cooperators—West Virginia's 14 soil conservation districts report a need for a minimum of 35 man-years of additional SCS help. Nationwide, the need is for more than 1,500 additional man-years.

I also wish to urge that the $1,028,000 proposed for assistance in land use planning related to income-producing recreation be appropriated. This is especially important in West Virginia, where we are long on scenery and somewhat short on first quality farmland.

In the past few years, soil conservation service personnel have assisted in establishing a number of income-producing recreational enterprises in West Virginia. Soil conservation districts have also completed a recreational inventory for the entire State. This leadership is helping landowners recognize opportunities for recreational use of their land and water resources to improve their income. Increased Soil Conservation Service assistance is essential to help these landowners arrive at sound decision in planning recreational developments.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A project plan is now being developed for the Little Kanawha resource conservation and development project, which includes Calhoun County in my district. This project has tremendous local support and I heartily endorse it. In fact, I strongly believe there should be more projects like this to help local people plan for the orderly development of their resources. I recommend that the $312,000 proposed for resource conservation and development project planning be at least doubled so as not to curtail this worthwhile program.

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

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

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

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

MILITARY ASSISTANCE—VIETNAM

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, whose national chairman is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, a highly respected authority on military matters, has issued a statement which ought to be read by the greatest number of citizens of this country.

In brief, General Fellers demands to know why U.S. forces, controlling the airspace over Vietnam and the seas bordering that country, continue to fight a sanguinary jungle war and on terms largely dictated by the Communist Vietcong.

The statement follows:

By July 1945 in the war against Japan, the XXI Bomber Command had burned out 66 cities and destroyed many of Japan's greatest factories. In 9 months B-29 raids inflicted 806,000 casualties of whom 330,000 were killed. Prerald evacuations and mass migration after attacks caused a population displacement of 8,500,000 persons. In March the Emperor, watching a Tokyo bombing, had resolved to stop the war regardless of what might happen to him personally.

Near the close of the war MacArthur's medium bombers showered leaflets on some of the cities, warning that before a certain date these cities would be destroyed by the Army Air Forces. The leaflets explained their purpose: to urge families to evacuate and survive, to enable the people to appeal for help so as to learn how powerless the Japanese militarists were to defend them.

After the surrender, evacuees from the cities which had been destroyed were interviewed. Our leaflets had created stark panic. Cities had been immediately and completely abandoned; no lives were lost.

No people were ever more thoroughly indoctrinated to resist surrender than were the Japanese. Two million firstline troops stood ready to defend their shores against landings. Yet bombing and blockade forced these tough warriors to lay down their arms without a single hostile incident. General MacArthur flew into Japan with 1,100 men.

Here then is the pattern to superimpose on North Vietnam. Warn military target areas—mostly supply centers—that total destruction will soon be inevitable. Urge populations in these military target areas to evacuate to designated tropical sanctuaries. Then destroy every military target. Blockade the coastline. Deny munitions and weapons to the enemy; the end will come quickly and long before Red China could intervene. Red China intervened in Korea only when it was known that the Yalu and Manchuria would be sanctuaries. Moreover, Red China is ill-prepared for a major war and Chiang Kai-shek's invasion threat is a deterrent.

Why fight a war of attrition on enemy terms in tropical jungles? Why trade American youth for Asiatic hordes? Military assistance, making full utilization of our fleet and air power, is the only prompt, humane way to end the war.

DIVERSION OF ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 of this year, I cited the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va., as an example of extravagant diversion of antipoverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians. Two days later, March 23, 1966, at hearings on the war on poverty, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, challenged the accuracy of the figures put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by me.

At that time he said, "Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you and through you put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were inaccurate."

On this same day, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] addressed the House and stated that there were misstatements about the cost and expenses of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center contained in my remarks on March 21, 1966.

During the past several days, our investigator, Mr. John Buckley, studied financial aspects of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center, and I can report the figures I used in my presentation were correct and the figures used by the Office of Economic Opportunity were inaccurate.

As I previously stated, the lease for the hotel provides a payment of $7,900 a month or $94,800 a year, and I will be placing a copy of the lease in the RECORD with the amount of rent shown in article

III. All taxes, insurance, utilities, and repairs are paid by the sponsor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. In addition, the sponsor, with Federal funds, transported the Kanawha Hotel's furniture to a storage building at a cost of $2,800.25 and has contracted to pay $4,800 a year for the storage of this property. In this connection, it is noted the sponsor, again with Federal funds, has paid personal property taxes to the State of West Virginia on this stored furniture as well as personal property taxes on accounts receivable the hotel had listed in a previous business property statement.

I initially reported more than $225,000 of Federal funds had been expended to renovate the hotel building. This figure was challenged by the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity who stated the rehabilitation costs were $187,400.

The costs were actually more than $187,400. In fact, they were considerably more than the conservative figure I had used, of $225,000.

Our investigator found $290,026.60 was expended in repairs to the hotel and installation of the equipment necessary to the operation of the Women's Job Corps Center. In addition, a total of $30,586.14 is outstanding in mechanics liens against the property and $24,936.77 was spent on electric heating and plumbing items prior to January 4, 1966, under the item "Maintenance." The total of repairs, equipment installation and maintenance prior to January 4 of this year is $345,549.51. The sponsor has indicated only $187,377.31 has been charged to rehabilitation of the hotel. I submit, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what bookkeeping terms Packard Bell Electronics Corp. and the Office of Economic Opportunity choose to follow, that nearly $350,000 in Federal funds have been obligated to put the rundown hotel in a condition suitable for a Women's Job Corps Center.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the hearings. The gentleman from Minnesota presented his facts on the total amount of money spent to rehabilitate and renovate the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Will the gentleman repeat the amount he stated in the hearings which was contradicted by Mr. Bernard Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. QUIE. I had said that more than $225,000 was used to renovate the hotel.

Mr. GOODELL. The Deputy Director objected. He then flatly said that your facts were inaccurate and incorrect. The true figure was about $187,000 according to Mr. Boutin.

Mr. QUIE. One hundred eighty-seven thousand four hundred dollars.

Mr. GOODELL. The actual figure now developed by the investigator shows $345,000?

Mr. QUIE. Two hundred ninety thousand twenty-six dollars and sixty cents was spent on repairs and installation of equipment, $24,936.77 for electric, heating, and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and $30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics liens.

Mr. GOODELL. In round numbers, $345,000, as contrasted with $187,000 that the Director of OEO said had been spent to renovate this rundown Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Examples of some items which OEO did not include under rehabilitation were the installation of new kitchen equipment at a cost of $36,813.10, permanent installation of air conditioning equipment and ducts, and the installation of window air conditioners.

The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity went to great lengths to show the market value of the hotel in 1965 would have been $438,000 and in 1966, $508,250. He stated they assessed at 40 percent of real value in Charleston, W. Va. On March 25, 1956, the Kanawha County tax assessor advised our investigator that the assessed valuation of property in that county is equal to 50 percent of the true and actual value. He cited chapter 18, article 7(a), section 4, of the 1965 Cumulative Supplement to the West Virginia Code of 1961, which provides that the total assessed valuation in each of the four classes of property shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property. This regulation is contained in West Virginia House bill 499, passed March 9, 1963, a copy of which was obtained by our investigator. I will ask later to have that included in the RECORD.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at this hearing when the gentleman in the well made the statement that the assessments in West Virginia under the law were 50 percent of the appraised valuation. I was also present when the Deputy Director of the OEO said that was incorrect and that it was 40 percent of the assessed valuation. Do I understand the gentleman's statement in the well today is based upon the investigator's report and the citation of the specific law in West Virginia and that he was correct when he said 50 percent of the assessed value?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. There was a court case in West Virginia which lead to a change in the law which prohibits any assessor from assessing less than 50 percent or more than 100 percent, which is the language that I just cited. An examination of the real property connected with the Kanawha Hotel determined that the hotel building prior to occupancy by the Women's Job Corps Center was assessed at $87,000. It was subsequently raised to $115,000 as a result of extensive repairs to the building. In addition, the hotel building occupies two parcels of land assessed at $67,300 and $21,000, respectively. The total assessment of the parcels of land and building prior to the Women's Job Corps Center occupancy was $175,300. Using these figures as 50 percent of the assessed valuation, it might well be claimed the market value of the combined building and land was $350,600. However, reliable real estate brokers in Charleston, W. Va., who were contacted pointed out due to the rundown condition of the hotel they would not have offered more than $250,000 prior to the renovation. They referred to a recent sale of the Milner-Ruffner Hotel building in Charleston on February 1, 1966. They stated this building, although older than the Kanawha building, includes more ground and is located on Kanawha Boulevard, which is the main thoroughfare in Charleston. This building was sold for $200,000. It was noted by our investigator that a large tract of property located directly opposite Virginia Street from the Kanawha Hotel is currently being developed in connection with urban renewal. It was purchased by the Charleston National Bank for $10.50 per square foot within the past 2 years. At this rate per square foot, the value of the Kanawha Hotel land would be approximately $154,402. You can compare this with the $88,300 assessed valuation, half of the $176,600, that was used in the figures as the full and true assessment based on 50 percent. It was noted further in May 1965 the Hotel Kanawha Co. purchased one-twelfth of an undivided sixty-one one hundred sixtieths of an adjoining building for $950. The second floor of this building is being used as classrooms and offices for the Women's Job Corps Center. The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Gibbons, made much of the claimed annual square foot rental cost of something less that $1 and the cost of shelter amounting to $27 per month per enrollee. I submit these figures were based on the rental cost alone, which is $94,800 a year clear profit to the Peyton Corp., while it should be noted the OEO claimed it to be only $90,000, divided by the number of square feet of 100,000 and the number of enrollees in the Job Corps center of 294.

In this regard, the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mr. Gibbons neglected to include $16,000 charged to the sponsor to settle leases of former tenants; $4,800 being paid annually for the storage of the hotel's furniture; $2,800.25 paid to transport the hotel furniture to storage; $7,450 paid annually for real and personal property taxes—including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable—$5,740 paid annually for insurance; not to mention $314,963.37 paid to date for repairs, building maintenance and installation of equipment, and mechanics liens outstanding amounting to $30,586.14, making a total of $477,139.76 which include rent of $94,800. I submit, Mr. Speaker, these expenses should be included when figuring costs and the figures of $1 per square foot and $27 a month per enrollee cited by the Office of Economic Opportunity were deceptive and misleading.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the situation, am I to understand from the facts which the investigator developed, that the Kanawha Hotel, in the opinion of reputable real estate agents in Charleston, W. Va., had a value of $250,000, approximately, when the Job Corps Center went in, and that

"The reverse is the truth," he contended. "It is Red China's hostility and belligerence in its international attitudes and actions that are responsible for its isolation."

He sternly rejected arguments for the recognition of Red China.

"Prime Minister Nehru of India recognized Communist China in 1950. How did his fellow Asians in Peking respond to his being their best friend? They invaded India and left Mr. Nehru a broken man."

OPPOSES U.N. ENTRY

The Minnesotan argued it is an illusion to expect gains from trade relations with Red China. Peking will take what advantage it can get, but give nothing in return, he said.

He took an even dimmer view of admitting Red China to the United Nations, holding that to do so would be a gross violation of the U.N. Charter, and that such an action would be irreversible.

Another China expert, Yale Prof. N. Rowe, told the committee the policy the United States should follow toward the Peking regime is one of "intense and deep hostility."

He said the effect of the China policy hearings is to persuade Communists in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow "of divisions of opinion in the United States that do not exist in fact."

University of Washington Prof. George E. Taylor told the committee the United States must continue to assist South Vietnam and other nations that feel Communist pressure with political programs "backed by force."

Pacific Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in an informative article on American alliances in the Pacific written by Erwin D. Canham in the Christian Science Monitor. He visited Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand before writing his story.

Canham reports:

The American defense structure is not crumbling, it is not being undercut by disaffection.

He added that individual elements—

are not particularly strong but together they represent small powers aware of the problem of survival and the relevance of the United States to their destinies.

Believing that others will want the chance to peruse the contents in full, I offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 22, 1966]

PACIFIC ALLIANCE

(By Erwin D. Canham)

What is the shape of American alliances in the Pacific?

It so happens that on this quick trip. I have touched base briefly at four allies of the United States along its major defense line up and down offshore Asia—Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand. How firm is the line?

Japan realizes its close dependence upon the United States. Yet it is constitutionally demilitarized. It is a tremendous economic force, but not a military force. Yet were Japan to swing, by some tragic mischance, into the Chinese Communist orbit, the world balance of power would be upset.

Japan yearns to enlarge its trading relations with mainland China. Its businessmen, at least, are quite prepared to fish in troubled waters. We may expect closer relations between Japan and China. But of course there is nothing inevitable about Japan's drifting away from the United States. It need not happen.

PHILIPPINES STEADY

The Republic of the Philippines, too, is a close ally. Its leaders are painfully eager to affirm an Asian identity. Filipinos do not wish to be "little brown Americans," in their own self-conscious phrase. Nevertheless, they have considerable realistic awareness of the expansionist thrust of Communist China.

They will stick to the American alliance, although they may become increasingly restive about tactics in Vietnam. And they are actively seeking to build up a new Malayan understanding, involving themselves, Indonesia, and Malaysia. They might help significantly in the stabilizing of southeast Asia. President Marcos gives evidence of strength and leadership.

Australia is growing in population, available mineral resources, industrial strength, and in concern at imperialist pressures to the north. Its decision to increase its commitment in Vietnam is evidence of sober determination.

DRAWN TO JAPAN

Australia is being drawn into closer trade relations with Japan. There is ever-deeper American involvement in the development of Australian resources. Its petroleum, iron ore, bauxite, and a large number of rare but very essential minerals make Australia one of the rich elements—perhaps a rich target—in the South Pacific.

New Zealand, smallest in population of this group of states, has real moral value and a profound attachment to its principles, traditions, way of life. It is a sturdy ally although not a large physical or economic force.

Vital links in the defense line, which I did not visit, are South Korea, Formosa, and Okinawa. The Republic of Korea is naturally a vital anti-Communist force. If it were lost, the defense line would be turned at the Tsushima Strait. South Korea is doing its share as effectively as it can.

Formosa is also a crucial link. However, if the United States ever seeks to alter its present relationships with Peking, the consequences in Formosa would be unpredictable. The future of American relationships with the National Government of China on Formosa is full of problems.

STRATEGIC OKINAWA

Okinawa is strategically central. Japan continuously wishes for an attenuation of the American presence there. Changes are inevitable someday. Yet it is a link that must be maintained, and a major facility in the total American ability to hold the line against an adversary thrust some day out into the Pacific.

Vietnam is a push out from the American defense line. It is a penetration into the mainland, but also a grave burden. It is vital, but if neutralized would not necessarily endanger the American offshore defensive position. If lost to Communist power, it would turn the defensive flank, and other independent Asian states would be in great trouble.

The American defense structure is not crumbling. It is not being undercut by disaffection. Its individual elements—the nations I have just visited—are not particularly strong but together they represent small powers aware of the problem of survival and the relevance of the United States to their destinies.

Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Sammy D. Moyers, a young college student in my district, recently wrote the editor of the Daily Gazette-Mail, of Morristown, Tenn., expressing his views on the war in Vietnam.

Sammy is a junior at Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City, Tenn.

His opinion of the war is very thoughtfully presented, and I would like to insert his letter at this point in the RECORD:

ONLY TRUE SOLUTION TO VIETNAM WAR IS VICTORY

EDITOR, GAZETTE-MAIL: First, I would like to congratulate the editor for his thoughts on the Vietnam war. The things that were written in this newspaper on Sunday, March 6, need to be said and written every day. But, then again, if they are read and passed off as mere writing, they do not accomplish anything. Every free American citizen should read those words and should think about them seriously. If this were done, perhaps some action might be taken. But, many will not. The American public is slowly becoming scared—scared as a young child when he is alone. Why can't Americans face reality? Is America becoming a nation of egotistical idealists who sit back and bask in security while men die?

The only true solution to the Vietnam war is victory. In order to achieve this victory we must first face reality. We are at war. Our boys are dying every day in ever increasing numbers. Defense budgets zoom. Allotments for money and war materials increase with phenomenal speed. Can anyone deny this? But now, I'm speaking in terms of money and material wealth which are not the important things. As implied before, human life is the most important thing.

Why should we sit back and say that this war "stimulates the economy" or "is good for the economy"? What do the mothers and wives of dead American soldiers care about our economy? We can't play big brother, guardian, and the "great provider" to every nation in the world—especially at the cost of American lives. It just isn't possible.

Now, you say, what do we do? We do the only thing that we can do—we win the war. We fight to win, and then we end our obligation. Why should we confine our "hold that line policy"? Why are we fighting if we are not fighting to win? I can remember as a young child the game of war that I played. When someone needed a rest or a drink of water he would yell, "Time out." Many times I have heard: "You can't shoot me here. This is my hideout." Other times I have heard: "You can't shoot a moving target."

Can you remember these things in your childhood? Isn't this exactly what we are doing in our foreign policy today, especially in Vietnam? The so-called "Christmas truce" in Vietnam will do for one example. How can truce be made with an enemy that can't be communicated with? Proof of this noncommunication is that the Vietcong did not keep the truce. The bombing of, or the refusal to bomb Hanoi is another example. How can America win this war if she is forbidden to strike at the enemy's most vulnerable spot? I say that we cannot.

Hartman pointed out. "You don't need measuring equipment to know that we have made much progress," they said. "You need only to think back to as recently as 15 years ago when our air, particularly in the winter, was smog ladened. That situation just doesn't exist anymore on an areawide basis. We still have some trouble spots, such as in low-lying valleys where the wind can't blow away emissions on some days, but these headaches are being tackled and will be cleared up."

The control of air pollution remains a very inexact science, Neel pointed out. "Much work has been done on it in recent years, but much more remains to be done in order to perfect devices and methods of controlling undesirable emissions, such as automotive exhaust fumes."

"But I am very thankful that my home is in greater Cincinnati, where industry itself is taking a leading part in controlling air pollution. Greater Cincinnati will never become another Los Angeles nor Charleston, W. Va., thank heavens."

Industry officials gratuitously wrote these comments when they answered the survey questions:

"We feel all industry should be interested in air pollution and should explore all methods available to reduce or eliminate air pollution of any kind from processes which discharge air pollutants."

"There has been a tremendous improvement in air quality over the last 10 years. Reduction in coal usage and industrial gaseous emissions have been the major factors."

Charles W. Howison, executive director of the Air Pollution Control League, said the gratuitous replies give emphasis to the fact that "industry is taking an active part in a program to establish allowable maximum limits of air pollution. This cooperative spirt has been an important factor in bringing about correction of air pollution problems. Such cooperation on the part of major industries, which are willing to share their experiences and findings with small industries, has been of great assistance to the Air Pollution Control League, and to antipollution law enforcement agencies."

Results of the survey are being computerized for analysis, Neel reported. He said the study, in an effort to add impetus to anti-smog progress, will be made available to the southwestern Ohio-northern Kentucky air pollution survey committee made up of representatives of the U.S. Public Health Service, elected area officials, and industry representatives.

Rural Landowners in Single Texas County Set Conservation Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district of one county is at least half urban in area and predominantly urban in population, but the extent of soil and water conservation work being carried on by landowners is so impressive that I wish to call attention to it.

The Dalworth Soil and Water Conservation District in Tarrant County has 1,573 cooperators. These cooperators own and manage 255,668 acres of land, all of which is covered by updated agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide assistance in carrying out longtime soil and water conservation and resource use programs as outlined in the district work plan.

About 97 percent of the cooperators have basic farm conservation plans prepared on 70 percent of their land with a number of practices underway. Soil surveys have been completed on 326,000 acres, involving a portion of the urban land.

Tarrant County is in the Trinity River watershed and is included in 5 of the 52 subwatersheds of the Trinity River flood prevention project, authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Construction and land treatment in the five subwatersheds are at various stages of completion, but already rural and urban residents are beneficiaries of installed works of improvement that have reduced floodwater damages in a number of areas.

I believe this is an exemplary showing in a county where the urban area matches the rural in acreage and where urban interests and influence in many ways predominate.

It is a tribute to the rural landowners in Tarrant County and the leadership of the soil conservation district supervisors that soil and water conservation programs on the land have increased.

The Nation needs this kind of community initiative in its rural areas. Tarrant County is demonstrating that soil and water conservation work can help to provide the impetus.

John F. Baldwin

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALPHONZO BELL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1966

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation shares California's loss of a great man. JOHN BALDWIN stood a solid example of the perfect Congressman. His integrity was matchless and his ability as a dedicated Member of the House was recognized by all his colleagues of both sides of the aisle.

Indeed, it is appropriate that we acclaim this unusual man who did so much for his friends at home, his native State, and for his country. Those who would follow in his footsteps must be aware of the example he laid down in his own humble and quiet way. This Congress has gained in stature for having JOHN BALDWIN serve in its Chambers.

As a legislator, he was a master. No complication of legislative semantics escaped his thorough and incisive mind. At a time when so many of us find it impossible to remain aware of the ramifications and details of the legislative flood that is before us, JOHN BALDWIN had the capacity to grasp the total picture and develop a clear and reasonable approach.

California has suffered the loss of a great man. JOHN was a close friend and I know of his devotion to California and of his dedication to the good of the people he represented here in Congress. I am certain that God has rewarded his selfless work as leader among men.

Dr. Judd Opposes Softening of U.S. Policy on Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a former colleague, Dr. Walter H. Judd, testified recently before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with respect to our policy in Asia. Dr. Judd is well qualified to speak on events in the Far East in view of his vast experience in China and I respect his opinions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Nat S. Finney, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., entitled "Dr. Judd Opposes Softening of U.S. Policy on Red China." The article, which appeared in the March 29 issue, follows:

DR. JUDD OPPOSES SOFTENING OF U.S. POLICY ON RED CHINA: APPEASEMENT NEVER WORKS, EX-CONGRESSMAN AND MEDICAL MISSIONARY TELLS SENATE COMMITTEE

(By Nat S. Finney)

WASHINGTON.—A former Congressman with more than 35 years' experience in Chinese affairs, including 10 years' continuous residence in China, has put it on the line for his erstwhile colleagues who are interested in American policy in Asia.

Dr. Walter H. Judd, for 20 years a Representative from Minnesota and now a lecturer and expert on the Far East, testified Monday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the behest of Republican Senators.

Dr. Judd noted he had appeared before the same committee 27 years ago to counsel against a soft American policy toward Japan.

"Our Government tried to placate the aggressor," he reminded the committee. "The policy did not lead to peace; it led to Pearl Harbor.

"WARNS AGAINST ACCOMMODATION

"The same general approach to aggression in Asia is being advocated today as on that earlier occasion."

Dr. Judd warned that an accommodation now in Vietnam would waste the fruits of 25 years of hardheaded, realistic policy under four Presidents—policy that has been a notable success.

"Some say that policy has failed. Red China is still there. It is as hostile and as dedicated to world domination by armed force as ever." He conceded that great problems still lie ahead for Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Burma, as well as South Vietnam, Malaysia, and Indonesia.

"But all of them are still free. And who can believe they would have been free and with at least the possibility of solving their problems if it had not been for our firm containment of China?" he asked.

REJECTS POLICY PROPOSALS

Dr. Judd then dealt at length with current proposals for changes in American Asian policy, rejecting them one by one. He emphatically denied American responsibility for the isolation of Red China.

These things are impossible and if someone with some authority doesn't realize this soon America will cease to exist. I challenge all Americans to be serious about the Vietnam war. Forget about your wealth, security, and happiness. Don't place yourself in a make-believe-world. This world doesn't exist and will never exist.

SAMMY D. MOYERS.

South Dakota Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, again this year I have sought the advice and counsel of the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota whom it is my privilege to represent. My annual questionnaire was distributed to all postal patrons in 43 counties, totaling 100,000, and the response was most gratifying.

Many of the questionnaires were accompanied by letters elaborating on issues of special concern to the writers. I have personally read and answered each of these letters, gaining a valuable insight into the various points of view expressed by these constituents. One thing stands out in my mind, and that is how well informed these individuals are on the issues facing this Nation today.

Because I want to share with my colleagues the opinions expressed by the thousands of individuals in my district responding to my questionnaire, I include the results as follows:

Minimum Wage: The first question was this. "Do you favor increasing the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.75 per hour and extending coverage to 7 million more workers?" 70 Percent said "no," 24 percent said "yes," and 6 percent were undecided.

Unemployment Compensation: The question was, "Do you favor federalization of State program with increased cost and increased benefits?" Your answer was most decisive. 85 percent said "no," 9 percent said "yes," and 6 percent were undecided.

Reapportionment: The question was, "Do you favor an amendment permitting States to apportion one legislative branch on other than population basis?" On this the vote was fairly even, with 52 percent voting in favor of permitting one branch of the State legislature to be chosen on a basis of area rather than population, as in the U.S. Senate, while 37 percent opposed, and 11 percent were undecided.

Firearms: The question was, "Do you favor Federal control of sale and ownership of firearms?" On this the answer was decisive, with 76 percent opposed, 17 percent favoring, and 7 percent undecided.

Spending: The question was, "Do you favor reducing spending for nondefense programs in order to meet increased war costs?" This is what the press has referred to as "guns or butter." Here again the answer was decisive; 71 percent said "yes," 22 percent said "no," and 7 percent were undecided. In other words, 71 percent seem to feel that if the American youth must sacrifice to keep the Nation strong that those who remained home should likewise make some sacrifice.

Department of Transportation: The question was, "Do you favor the establishment of a new Cabinet post handling all phases of transportation?" Seventy percent opposed the establishment of the new Cabinet post, 20 percent favoring, and 10 percent undecided.

Taxes: The question was, "Do you favor increasing taxes to meet rising war costs and new spending programs?" Here again your vote was resounding; 74 percent said "no," 19 percent said "yes," and 7 percent were undecided. It would seem from the two questions on spending and taxes that a sizable majority favor reducing expenditures rather than increasing taxes.

Veterans: The question was, "Do you favor a GI bill of rights similar to World War II law for post-Korean veterans?" As was to be expected, 81 percent favored, while only 10 percent opposed, with 9 percent undecided. Actually, the question was moot, inasmuch as the bill had already become law before very many of the ballots had been returned. I, of course, cast your vote in favor of this bill because I was among those who introduced it last year and fought for its enactment.

International "Great Society": The question was, "Do you favor the President's plan for worldwide program against hunger, disease, and ignorance?" Sixty-eight percent said they were opposed to going into a program of providing world medicine, food and education at the expense of the American taxpayer inasmuch as the suggested program does not anticipate bringing other countries in to assist.

Communism: The question is, "Do you favor expanding trade with Communist countries as recommended by the administration?" Seventy-one percent said "no," 19 percent said "yes," and 10 percent were undecided. In other words, 71 percent of the people answering the questionnaire do not believe we can "fight 'em" and "feed 'em" at the same time.

Vietnam: I admit the question on Vietnam was a complicated one inasmuch as we were cramped for space and it was difficult to word the alternatives to give the voter a clearcut expression. However, the question was, "Do you favor increased ground and air action and naval blockade in stepped-up effort to bring peace through strength?" Sixty-seven percent said "yes," 21 percent said "no," and 12 percent were undecided. The alternative question was, "Or immediate negotiated withdrawal?" Twenty-one percent said "yes," 36 percent said "no," and 43 percent were undecided.

Communication From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have received several communications from an outstanding citizen in my congressional district who has expressed his deep and appropriate concern regarding various statements made by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and which appeared in the Defense Digest in February of 1965.

My constituent, Mr. Robert Nelson Taylor, of McLean, Va., feels that this information should be made more easily available to a greater segment of the public, and at his request, I extend my remarks to include his comments in full concerning it:

In a special alert letter of March 9, Americans for National Security called to the attention of their supporters a statement of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara that is so incredible and so shocking it is difficult to believe he ever said it:

"I think it would be a tremendous opportunity for us, economically and socially, to eliminate defense entirely. It would be a social good."

This quotation is published in the Defense Department Digest of February 1, 1965, and identified as an extract from the script prepared for a broadcast interview over a national network on January 4, 1965. Apparently, if anyone heard these words over the air, he was unable to believe his ears. And it may be the interviewer shut them off, or that they were clipped from the tape. But, even though this Pentagon front-office sentiment is frighteningly new to most of us today, the McNamara viewpoint had to be known to the administration 15 months ago—or these words could never have appeared in print.

It should have been apparent at once that the computer-happy whiz kid no longer thought of himself as responsible for our defense but above it all—on "cloud nine"—from which self-construed eminence he might dream up national policy. As to the matter of his brainwashing, it can hardly be argued that a Defense Secretary with a war on his hands could logically or sanely discuss the "burgeoning needs in education, in recreation, in local government throughout our society" that might better be met if we gave up entirely the costly notion of defending ourselves against our enemies.

Perhaps our forces in Vietnam, reported to be short of weapons, short of ammunition, short of protection against malaria, short of underwear and socks—even short of food—are convinced that Mr. McNamara is already implementing his "tremendous opportunity." And perhaps Congress ought to find out. Certainly a man should resign from a job that is distasteful to him—especially when it involves the highest public trust we have to offer—next to the Presidency. If he does not choose to step down voluntarily and if the Commander in Chief does not remove him, then Congress should provide whatever assistance may be required.

And since we are at war—and do not appear to be winning—there is no time for niceties.

ROBERT WILSON TAYLOR.

MCLEAN, VA.

Foreign Aid Undermines International Liquidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the March 29 edition of the Chicago Tribune carries a most significant article by the distinguished Dr. Melchior Palyi, its contributing consulting economist.

In this article, Dr. Palyi points out the disruptive economic stiuation that develops in the world when programs of continuing foreign aid to the underdeveloped nations are carried on. The article indicates a need for a new concept for economic dealings with underdeveloped nations.

Multinational programs operated through the World Bank and the Agency for International Development, as well as through the use of the newly developed Asian Development Bank, are of special significance in this new approach to foreign aid. In our highly motivated efforts to help the less developed areas of the world, we must constantly be wary that we do not unloose destructive forces which might destroy the economy of our own and other highly developed countries.

I am including Dr. Palyi's article with the hope that it will hasten the end to foreign aid grant programs and encourage loan programs keyed to local capabilities and initiative. Dr. Palyi's article follows:

WORLD'S ILLIQUIDITY TIED TO ECONOMIC AID

(By Dr. Melchior Palyi)

The late Prof. F. Benham [London School of Economics] figured out in 1961 that total economic aid to the underdeveloped countries would have to amount to about $83 billion annually in order to raise the average per capita income of their 1.1 billion inhabitants to a modest $200 per year. Five years later, given the lack of progress in the respective countries, given also their population growth and the worldwide rise of prices, it would take nearly an annual $100 billion to accomplish the same result.

Of course, the $200 income per capita of these backward nations remains a Utopian goal, invoked for sheer rhetorical purposes. In fact, the donor countries generally, the United States in particular, are in the embarrassing situation in which they cannot even spend all the funds earmarked for economic aid. The president of the World Bank complained in 1964 about the shortage of "sound, economically viable projects * * * from many developing countries," though [he added] good investment opportunities were not lacking.

WOULD BE FUTILE

It would be futile, indeed, trying to find a correlation between foreign aid and investment opportunities in the recipient countries. But there is a very close relationship between foreign aid received and payment deficiencies incurred by the recipients.

In 1964, according to the latest annual deport of the World Bank, the so-called developing countries were on the receiving end of a $9-billion flow of public and private funds coming from the industrial nations of the West. Another $1.5 billion or so had been contributed by the Sino-Soviet bloc, rasing the grand total to about $10.5 billion—roughly equal to the deficits in the same countries' 1964 current accounts with the outside world.

The data about the payment balances of the undeveloped areas are known to be somewhat less than 100 percent reliable. Even so, the near-coincidence in the size of the two figures—the current payment deficiencies and the volume of capital import that covers them—is very remarkable.

TELLS ITS FUNCTION

It discloses the principal function of foreign aid, providing the means by which the undeveloped countries pay for both: for the excess of their imports over their exports, and for servicing investments and obligations to foreigners. For example, external debt service payments on public and publicly guaranteed debt alone amount to about $3.5 billion a year, and keep rising. Such international indebtedness is largely concerned in 11 countries.

Selected debtors: Public debt outstanding, 1963 (end of year)

[Billions in U. S. dollars]

India	4.0
Brazil	2.3
Argentina	2.1
Mexico	1.6
United Arab Republic	1.3
Pakistan	1.2
Turkey	1.1
Yugoslavia	1.1
Israel	.9
Chile	.9
Colombia	.7
Total	17.2

Source: World Bank Annual Report, 1964–65.

The current payment deficits we are discussing recur year after year and show no sign of abating. They constitute the source and the hard core of the international liquidity problem.

TEN BILLIONS NEEDED

Almost $10 billion were needed in 1964 to take care of these deficits; the more than $10½ billion actually received (including short-term commercial credits) did the "job" and permitted the recipients as a whole to increase slightly their monetary reserve holdings of gold and foreign exchange. But the consequence is that a gap is torn in the American balance of payments which carries the lion's share of the burden.

Our gold losses and the vast accumulation of foreign-owned dollar claims are in turn at the root of the global insecurity that expresses itself in the disappearance of gold into private hoards and in recurrent pressure on the dollar.

The world will never get rid of the global liquidity shortage—as long as some 70 "poor" nations spend more than they earn and the "rich" countries accept the obligation to pay the difference.

Efforts Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's efforts to provide additional protection for the American consumer "are both timely and warranted," the Houston Chronicle declares in a recent editorial.

As the Chronicle points out, the President urges new laws which would provide for truth in packaging, truth in lending; and would give the Food and Drug Administration more power to police drugs, cosmetics, and health hazards in other products.

Since this timely editorial deals with a subject of importance to the American public, I include it in the RECORD where others may see it.

LET'S HELP THE CONSUMER

Renewed efforts by President Johnson to gain action in Congress on measures which would provide some additional protection for the American consumer are both timely and warranted.

In a message to Capitol Hill the President urges new laws which would provide for truth in packaging, truth in lending; and would give the Food and Drug Administration more power to police drugs, cosmetics, and health hazards in other products.

Bills covering packaging and lending have been stalled in Congress for more than 5 years. In the interim shoppers have in many cases found it difficult, if not impossible, to make intelligent purchases because of the odd weights and measures used by the various manufacturers of competitive products.

The old maxim of "let the buyer beware" is no longer reasonable in today's society. Modern supermarkets carry thousands of items and it is both unfair and unnecessary to expect that housewives should have to research the comparative merits and weights of all these goods.

For borrowers it has often been equally grueling and more expensive to learn the true cost of interest paid. And as the President pointed out credit charges are a major expenditure item for the consumer. Last year the total spent for this purpose was $24 billion.

There have been objections to both of these measures from some elements of the business community. Some of the opposition may have a reasonable base, but the goal—to eliminate confusion and deception—does not warrant opposition from reasonable men.

The President does not suggest specific bills to accomplish the aim. Some amendments to pending measures may be advisable, but action should definitely be substituted for inaction.

He does propose bills which would ban toys with hazardous substances, limit the number of flavored baby aspirins in one bottle to less than a lethal dose, make drug companies put safety caps on some patent drugs, and curb distribution of sample drugs by mail which leads to contraband traffic.

The legislation would also require labels to warn consumers against possible injury from drugs and cosmetics. In this regard, it seems that it would also be wise for Congress to consider the possibility of requiring that all prescriptions be labeled. Some doctors specify that this be done but in most cases prescriptions do not identify the drug and over a period of time it is possible for the patient to become confused over the identity of a prescription.

There have been cases where death has been caused by such confusion. Proper labeling would be another attempt at consumer protection which the President is trying to accomplish.

The National Congress of American Indians Commends the Office of Economic Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, when the economic opportunity legislation was written and enacted by the 88th Congress, one of the great concerns was that the American Indian not be neglected in the war on poverty as he has so often been neglected in the past.