

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16639

contain the reason why he has been determined to be ineligible. The written notice will provide a basis for the individual to express dissatisfaction with the agency action. (See IV-6000 re Hearings.)

6. The State plan must provide reporting and other administrative and supervisory methods for obtaining information about whether local agencies carry out the State plan provisions and meet Federal requirements in determination of eligibility, thus enabling the State agency to identify problem areas and take corrective action. (See II-4200, item 3, re State-wide operation.)

THE AIRLINES STRIKE—POLITICS VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an excellent editorial about the airlines strike, which was published in today's New York Times. Clearly, it is high time that the White House actively intervene in efforts to bring this intolerable strike against the public interest to a prompt conclusion. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 28, 1966]

POLITICS VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

The only conclusion possible from Secretary of Labor Wirtz' testimony on the airlines strike is that politics is the chief yardstick the White House applies in determining when the cut-off of an essential service creates a national emergency.

The Secretary's recommendation that Congress scrap plans for an immediate back-to-work law and give "free collective bargaining" another chance was a clear capitulation to the dictates of organized labor. Twenty-four hours earlier, while the Senate Labor Committee held off its hearing at the Administration's request, George Meany had given the White House its cue.

"No danger to the nation's health and welfare and no threat to national defense have been demonstrated," the A.F.L.-C.I.O. president declared. "The air traveling public has, of course, been inconvenienced, but inconvenience is a small price to pay for freedom."

Mr. Wirtz put it differently, but came up with the same answer: Do nothing right away. This a week after President Johnson had declared that the strike was trying "the patience of the American people" and that the time had come for a settlement. Mr. Wirtz acknowledged that the tie-up already has had "a serious, substantial, adverse impact on the national interest" and that its prolongation would bring the country to a "crisis" stage at some point.

Why the nation must wait until the hardship becomes intolerable before Congress acts, the Secretary failed to make clear. Even more obscure was his idea of how "free collective bargaining" can be secured in a dispute that has already been reviewed by a Presidential emergency board. That board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, recommended wage increases that went beyond the Administration's anti-inflation guideposts. The President urged both labor and management to follow these proposals; the airlines not only accepted them, they bettered them. The striking machinists still say no.

Presumably what Mr. Wirtz means by his prescription that Congress send both sides "back to the woodshed" with a settlement deadline is that pressure will now be exerted on management to save the union's face by giving it more money. Such appeasement of labor under White House aegis has been the historic road to instability in

industrial relations and to wage-price inflation. The airlines, as a regulated industry enjoying record prosperity, are in poor position to hold out against what the Administration wants.

The course Secretary Wirtz has charted points more surely to the destruction of "free collective bargaining" than to its preservation.

VIETNAM

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the August 8, 1966, issue of Look magazine carries the views of five distinguished Americans on our present involvement in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that these stimulating views be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM: SUPPOSE THE PRESIDENT ASKED YOU "WHAT SHOULD WE DO NOW?"—FIVE EXPERTS GIVE THEIR ANSWER

(Produced by Leo Rosten)

(NOTE.—We are at war in Vietnam. Whether we should have gotten into it or not is a separate issue. We are in Vietnam. (Americans have always backed their armies with the moral certainty that in our victory *right* would triumph. But to many today, our cause seems stained by doubt. Never, during a foreign war, have Americans debated our national policy with such passion: "Get out. . . Escalate. . . Negotiate. . . 'Hole in' at coastal enclaves. . . Blockade Haiphong. . . Push 'hot pursuit' into Laos" The bitterness of the partisans consolidates the confusion.)

(Look invited in five experts, who hold varying views about Vietnam, to answer this question: "Suppose the President today asked you, 'What should we do now?'" We urged each to reply in the intentionally brief space of 1,000 words—for we sought not a pabulum of agreement but sharp, specific proposals.)

(Here are their answers. Each man presents a program that millions would no doubt support.)

(By Hans Morgenthau, distinguished service professor of political science and modern history, University of Chicago; director, Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy; has served as consultant to the Department of State and the Department of Defense; author of "In Defense of the National Interest," "The Purpose of American Politics," etc.)

President Johnson is wont to ask the critics of his Vietnam policy, "What would you do if you were in my place?" This is a legitimate question, and it deserves an answer. Having been a consistent critic of our Vietnam policies for more than four years, I have tried to answer that question before and am glad to do so again.

Mr. President, I would say, you must choose between two alternative policies. You can start with the assumption that in Vietnam the credibility of the United States and its prestige as a great power are irrevocably engaged; that the war in Vietnam is a test case for all "wars of national liberation"; and that in consequence, the fate of Asia, and perhaps even of the non-Communist world at large, might well be decided in Vietnam. If you believe this, then you must see the war through to victory. That is to say, you must escalate the war both in the South and in the North by committing what will amount (according to authoritative estimates) to a million American combat troops and by bombing, without restrictions, the industrial and population centers of North Vietnam. By doing this, you will destroy Vietnam, North and South, and risk a military confrontation with China or the Soviet Union

or both. Yet these risks are justified by the magnitude of the issues at stake.

This is the policy that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been advocating and that you have pursued since February, 1965, even though you have been anxious to differentiate your policy from that of the Joint Chiefs. In truth, the difference between the two has not been one of kind but rather of degree. You have been escalating the war at a slower pace than the Joint Chiefs recommended. But escalate you did, and you will continue escalating because the assumptions from which you have started leave you no choice.

There is another policy, Mr. President, which you could and, in my view, should have pursued. This policy assumes that the war is primarily a civil war; that its global significance is remote; that, far from containing China and communism, it opens the gates to both—by destroying the social fabric of Vietnamese nationalism, which is implacably hostile to China; and that, in consequence, the risks we are taking in the pursuit of victory are out of all proportion to the interests at stake.

We should never have gotten involved in this war, but we are deeply involved in it. The aim of our policy must be to avoid getting more deeply involved in it and to extricate ourselves from it while minimizing our losses. Recent events in Vietnam offer us the opportunity of initiating such a new policy of disengagement.

These events have clearly demonstrated two facts: The Saigon government is hardly worthy of the name; and the great mass of the people of South Vietnam prefer an end to the war rather than a fight to the finish with the Vietcong. The two main arguments with which our involvement has been justified have thus been demolished: that we have a commitment to the government of Saigon to assist it in the fight against the Vietcong; and that the people of South Vietnam want to be saved by us from the Vietcong—even at the risk of their own destruction. The prospect of elections to be held in South Vietnam provides us with the chance to use these new facts for the initiation of a new policy of disengagement. Such a policy would proceed on two fronts, the political and the military.

Politically, we ought to work for the achievement of four goals.

1. We must promote the establishment of a broadly-based government in which the elements seeking an end to the war would have decisive influence. This government would have the task of organizing elections for a constituent assembly and a legislature at an early date. It must be recognized that such elections will neither be representative nor "free." The group that organizes them is likely to win them. Hence, the crucial importance of the composition of the government presiding over the elections.

2. We must see to it that the government that emerges from these elections will negotiate with the Vietcong for a *modus vivendi*. Such a settlement would no doubt increase the risk of a complete takeover by the Vietcong. However, it is quite possible to visualize a coalition government under which different sections of the country, after the model of the Laotian settlement, would be governed by different factions. One can even visualize a South Vietnamese government that would be anxious to maintain its independence *vis-à-vis* the North.

3. We should put United States military forces stationed in South Vietnam at the disposal of the government that emerges from the elections, to be used as bargaining counters in negotiations with the Vietcong. In other words, we would honor our commitments and would leave it to the South Vietnamese Government to interpret them—in order to bring the war to an end.

4. Our ultimate goal would be the withdrawal of our armed forces from South Vietnam. Such a withdrawal would be coor-

16640

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1966

minated with the progress of negotiations between the government of South Vietnam and the Vietcong. Our military forces would be gradually withdrawn, and our military presence would always be commensurate with the political purposes it is intended to serve.

Pending such a withdrawal, our military policy would come in three parts:

1. We would stop both the bombing of North Vietnam and the search-and-destroy operations in South Vietnam that seek to kill the Vietcong and occupy territory controlled by them. For the continuation of such operations in the North and South is compatible only with a policy aiming at victory, not with one seeking a negotiated settlement among the Vietnamese factions.

2. We would hold the cities and coastal enclaves that we and the South Vietnamese military now control. That is to say, we would be satisfied with a de facto division of South Vietnam.

3. We would expect the Vietcong to reciprocate by ceasing attacks upon the perimeter of our positions and by stopping sabotage within them. It can be assumed that we and the Vietcong have a reciprocal interest in maintaining the military status quo pending negotiations.

The policy here advocated, Mr. President, is anathema to the men who advise you. Yet it has always been supported by officials fairly high in your administration. It now has the support of a number of senators who in the past have been "hawks" rather than "doves."

You, Mr. President, will have to decide whether the present policy—morally dubious, militarily hopeless and risky, politically aimless and counterproductive—shall be continued or whether a better policy shall take its place. You aspire to be a great President. Whether you remain the prisoner of past mistakes or have the courage to correct them will be the test of your greatness.

(By Henry Kissinger, professor of government, Harvard, and member of the Center for International Affairs; consultant to the National Security Council under President Kennedy; author of "The Troubled Partnership," "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," etc.)

The war in Vietnam is dominated by two factors: Withdrawal would be disastrous, and negotiations are inevitable. American policy must take both of these realities into account.

1. The impossibility of withdrawal. An American withdrawal under conditions that could plausibly be represented as a Communist victory would be disastrous for these reasons:

Within the Communist world, Chinese attacks on Soviet "revisionism" have focused on the Russian doctrine of peaceful coexistence. A victory by a third-class Communist peasant state over the United States must strengthen the most bellicose factions in the interecline Communist struggles around the world.

In Southeast Asia, it would demoralize those countries—especially Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand—that have supported our effort.

The long-term orientation of such countries as India and Japan will reflect to a considerable extent their assessment of America's willingness and ability to honor its commitments. For example, whether or not India decides to become a nuclear power depends crucially on its confidence in American support against Chinese nuclear blackmail.

A demonstration of American impotence in Asia cannot fail to lessen the credibility of American pledges in other fields. The stability of areas geographically far removed from Vietnam will be basically affected by the outcome there.

In short, we are no longer fighting in Vietnam only for the Vietnamese. We are also

fighting for ourselves and for international stability.

2. The inevitability of negotiation. Historically, the goal of a war, for the United States, has been the destruction of enemy forces. Negotiations could start only after the enemy had been crushed. But the primary issue in Vietnam is political and psychological, not military.

What makes the war so complicated is the existence of a Communist "shadow government," permeating every aspect of Vietnamese life. A favorable outcome depends on the ability to create a political structure that can command the loyalties of the Vietnamese people.

A purely military solution is impossible also because Vietnam directly engages the interests and the prestige of so many major powers. Finally, the Administration has stressed its unconditional readiness to respond to any overture by Hanoi for negotiations.

In these circumstances, the political program—both within Vietnam and for negotiations—is crucial. Military victories will prove empty if they are not coupled with an effort to build political structures. Negotiations will be sterile or dangerous unless we enter them with significant areas of the country substantially free of terror.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

1. Negotiations are likely when Hanoi realizes that its political apparatus in the countryside is being systematically reduced, and that this process will accelerate the longer the war lasts. It follows that the primary goal of military operations should be the creation of secure areas. It is better to have 100-percent control in 40 percent of the country than 40-percent control in 100 percent of the country. This is not to say that we should adopt a static "enclave" theory, which would leave us with three Hong Kongs and two Berlins in the midst of hostile populations. Nor does it mean that we must write off all the territory that we cannot securely control. We will always retain a capacity for preventing the consolidation of Communist control even in areas that we do not control ourselves. It does mean that the highest priority must be given to creating "secure" zones that contain a maximum of population—zones that can be expanded if the war continues and that will give us reliable negotiating counters at a conference.

2. We must understand that political instability in Vietnam reflects the transformation of an essentially feudal structure into a modern state—a process that took centuries in the West. Such a process involves a profound shift of loyalties—a task that would be searing in the best of circumstances, but is compounded by the pressures of civil war. This imposes two requirements on us: (a) We must have compassion for the travail of a society that has been wracked by war for two decades and not use its agony as an alibi for falling in our duty; and (b) we must give special emphasis to building political structures from the ground up.

3. The notion drawn from our experience in Europe, that economic assistance automatically produces political stability, does not apply in Vietnam. On the contrary, there is a danger that our enthusiasm and our concern with technical refinements will overwhelm slender administrative resources and compound political demoralization. The test should be whether a program can enlist local support and thus give the rural population an incentive to defend it. Efforts should be concentrated in areas of maximum military security and spread out from there.

4. It may prove impossible to settle the war at a large conference that deals with all issues simultaneously. If the negotiations are conducted in a forum consisting of many nations that are already rivals (e.g., the U.S.S.R. and Communist China, or the U.S. and France), energies may be dissipated in

political jockeying that is peripheral to the central problems in Vietnam. It may be wiser to separate the issues into their component elements, each to be settled by the parties primarily involved. A larger conference could then work out guarantees for settlements already achieved in other forums.

5. The war in Vietnam is a crucial test of American maturity. In the lives of nations, as of individuals, there comes a point when future options are limited by past actions. The choices of 1966 are not those of 1961. We must recognize that to be on the defensive often forces us to be engaged in places chosen by opponents for their difficulty and ambiguity.

We do not have the privilege of deciding to meet only those challenges that most flatter our moral preconceptions. If we cannot deal with political, economic and military problems as an integrated whole, we will not be able to deal with them individually.

(By Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, Pulitzer Prize winner for journalism, graduate of Annapolis, war correspondent in the South Pacific, North Africa, Normandy, Korea, Vietnam)

It's the eleventh hour in Vietnam. The United States must decide to win or get out. It is not too late to win, but it soon may be.

Victory means, first of all, a Governmental and national determination to win.

Congress should declare a state of national emergency and authorize a limited mobilization. Our trained and ready military power is spread thin all over the world. Limited mobilization would provide—more quickly than any other means—a pool of at least partially trained manpower and organized logistical training and combat units to sustain a rapid buildup in Vietnam and, ultimately, to strengthen our weakened positions in other parts of the world.

The President should be authorized to mobilize up to 500,000 reserves for two-year service. Draft calls should be increased as necessary. All enlistments should be extended for a minimum of six months.

South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand must be regarded as a strategic whole. The war in South Vietnam is clearly nourished from outside. Soldiers, medicines, supplies, and especially arms and ammunition, today reach South Vietnam by sea, from Cambodia, through Laos, and from North Vietnam by any and all methods. Most of the small arms now used by the Vietcong "main-force" units are standardized on the Soviet 7.62-mm caliber basis and are Chinese-manufactured. All of the heavy arms—mortars, antiaircraft guns, SAM missiles, MIG's, IL-28 bombers, and the world's largest helicopter, the Mi-6—are either Chinese- or Russian-manufactured.

We must shut off, to the best of our ability, the stream of Communist supplies into North Vietnam. We should turn off the faucet, not merely put a stopper in the drain. This means blocking the seaborne arms traffic to North Vietnam—by mining, bombing, naval gunfire; the sinking of a dredge in the narrow, silted ship channel to Haiphong; by so-called "pacific blockade" or "quarantine" or other means.

The land supply routes, even more important to the Communist war effort, must also be interrupted. Past limitations upon the bombing of railroads and roads, and of the choke points and communications bottlenecks in North Vietnam's extensive road network, must be removed. We must reduce the flow of supplies from North Vietnam through Laos and Cambodia. Many of these supplies move partway by truck; we have been bombing the trucks but, until recently, not the fuel-oil supplies that power them. We should bomb all the fuel-oil depots in North Vietnam. Electric power plants, which provide power for a variety of war purposes, should also be bombed.

Interdiction of the many branches of the Ho Chi Minh Trail (which leads over various

July 28, 1966

passes from North Vietnam through Laos or Cambodia into South Vietnam) must be improved—by eliminating some of the restrictions that now hamper bombing and particularly by assigning more trained Forward Air Controllers, both on the ground and in the air.

Air cavalry raids by helicopter against Laotian bottlenecks on the supply route should be undertaken whenever possible. The doctrine of "hot pursuit" must be applied to any guerrilla forces that use Cambodia as a sanctuary.

At sea, the Navy's coastal surveillance and river patrols must be extended and tightened—to stop Vietcong gunrunning by junks and sampans. This will require more air and small-craft bases in South Vietnam and Thailand.

U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam should be doubled to a figure of 500,000 to 700,000 men, to enable U.S. and South Vietnamese forces to patrol areas that have been Communist sanctuaries for years. We must find and fix the main force of the enemy, and force him to expend his supplies in action, if possible. An enemy "body count" is not the proper yardstick by which to judge success in this kind of war. Even if the enemy refuses action and fades away into the jungles, or into the shadows of the U Minh Forest, the capture and destruction of his base camps, or his rice and food supplies, of his medicines and weapons and ammunition will reduce his combat capabilities. The war must ultimately be won on the ground by destroying or breaking up the main-force units of the Vietcong, and especially by destroying the enemy's bases of operations.

The final part of the strategy for victory—the part that will shape the peace—is the pacification program. The American and South Vietnamese military can launch search-and-destroy and search-and-clear operations; but only specially trained South Vietnamese administrative and paramilitary forces can hold the areas that are cleared. The pacification program—in the past mishandled and underemphasized—has this year started slowly but well; it must be pushed to the maximum. For one can confirm victory in a guerrilla war only if one wins the people over and protects them against the enemy.

This is a slow, a comprehensive, a tedious process. The administrative, police, educational and health authority of the central government must be built up from what Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge calls "the precinct level."

The enemy cannot win in a military sense; he is stymied on the field of battle. But political instability in Saigon, and U.S. impatience at home, may cause us to lose the struggle—politically and psychologically.

We have no easy choices—only grim alternatives. Victory, which means making it possible for a South Vietnamese government to govern without interference from outside, is possible; but it may not be possible soon.

The victory road will be long and hard and bloody. But defeat or stalemate in Vietnam will gravely impair the U.S. position in Asia and in the world; and if we lose, our children and grandchildren will face tomorrow a far worse problem than we face today.

(By Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute (a nonprofit organization conducting research in the area of national security and international order); former member of the Rand Corporation; author of "Thinking About the Unthinkable, On Thermonuclear War, On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios")

I have been asked by Look to describe my personal position, rather than give an analysis of the pros and cons. The first and overwhelming point is that whether or not one agrees with the steps that led to it, our present commitment to oppose force and terror by the National Liberation Front in

South Vietnam is as solemn an engagement as any modern nation has made. I do not believe that commitments must be blindly kept, regardless of costs; but just as we should be careful about making commitments, we should be very careful about honoring them.

Maintaining the credibility of our commitments is not just a matter of "saving face." Our ability to support world peace and security, particularly without using excessive force, depends in great measure upon the faith that other nations repose in American commitments. (Germany, Japan, India and Israel, for example, restrain their activities in obtaining nuclear weapons partly because of American commitments.)

To renege on commitments as serious as those we have made in Southeast Asia could be a major step in a disastrous erosion of faith in the United States. If faith in our commitments became so weak that we would have to give excessive commitments in order to make them believable—for example, giving minor states control over our policy (as the British had to do with Poland in 1939)—then the likelihood of major escalation, such as a war with China, would be dangerously increased.

The United States also has a crucial interest in dispelling two illusions that have grown up since World War II: that radical terrorists almost always win; and that radical regimes can subvert, or intervene in, a neighboring area with little risk. History is replete with examples of how a victory by terrorists in one area powerfully influenced the likelihood and the tactics of subversion in other areas. The invalidity of oversimplified "domino theories" should not lead us to underestimate the worldwide costs of letting the Vietcong succeed with their resort to violence. In addition, I am seriously concerned about the political and moral repercussions within the United States were we to "pull out" of Vietnam.

Our cause in South Vietnam is not immoral. Many think we are creating more destruction, more death, more human suffering than our cause justifies. But what would happen were we to let South Vietnam fall into the hands of the National Liberation Front? It is not likely that a victorious NLF would treat with restraint: the Cao Dai, the Hoa Hao, the Catholics (each a community of about 1,000,000 human beings); the 500,000 South Vietnamese soldiers; the many other groups that have demonstrated they are anti-Communist; the tens of thousands who would probably be labeled enemies of a Communist state. Those who dismiss this likelihood need only look at how the Chinese Communists and the Indonesian Army treated their opponents, and might ask themselves if the victorious NLF is likely to be more restrained. Nor should the West view with equanimity 15,000,000 people passing behind a Communist Iron Curtain.

What, then, should we do in Vietnam now?

1. An important aspect of the battle for "the hearts and minds of men" is this: Which side will succeed in symbolizing national identity? Many Vietnamese prefer good government to bad government, but even more prefer self-government to foreign control. We should encourage self-government, and should minimize our nonmilitary role.

2. Thus, we should accept and encourage more independence by the South Vietnamese in handling their political and economic problems. Even if a Buddhist nationalist comes to power, he is likely to be more opposed to the NLF than to the Americans; and if his government does not want our protection, or makes it impossible, we can then leave with honor—having fully honored our solemn commitment. (I assume we would not have connived at his election or policy.)

3. To the extent that it can be encouraged

to, the Saigon government should compete with the Vietcong in promises of social reform, should launch selective but significant social-reform programs now, and should carry out pacification programs in a legal and humane way.

4. We should replace the present system of four levels of American advisers in the Vietnamese Army (which tends to result in four levels of double veto) with a simpler, more unified system.

5. We should urge the South Vietnamese Army to make promotions and assignments on the basis of merit. The efficiency of the fighting forces would be greatly increased if the army adopted the simple expedient of promotions on the battlefield, raising enlisted men to officer rank, regardless of education—rewarding proven ability, aggressiveness and dedication.

6. The amnesty programs offered to the Vietcong should be broadened and liberalized. The counterinsurgency wars that have been won since World War II often involved generous, well-publicized amnesty programs. (The Philippine Government, for instance, promised and gave farms to many Huk guerrillas who surrendered.) Although the South Vietnamese think it wrong to treat rebels better than loyal peasants, it is clearly worth a good deal to South Vietnam to make surrender safe and attractive, and to guarantee a decent, useful life to the man who surrenders.

7. We probably do not need to escalate military activities against North Vietnam. The military tactics we have introduced—aggressive patrolling to carry out search-and-destroy and clear-and-hold operations—contain many significant benefits that have not yet been fully realized, but should soon show important results.

8. I believe we can pacify Vietnam. A stable, reasonable government there is possible. Although the political situation looks bad today, many current political problems are likely to be solved following, and as the result of, military victories. The political difficulties in South Vietnam are likely to be diminished when and after elections are held—especially if the elections follow military victories.

Our present policy is the only realistic alternative the United States really has. It is a hopeful policy. If we are patient, resolute, realistic, that policy can probably realize our goals. I have yet to hear of an alternative that is not likely to involve costs far greater, far more deplorable, far more inhumane in both the short and long run.

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Albert Schweitzer professor of the humanities, City University of New York; professor of history, Harvard, 1954–61; twice winner, Pulitzer Prize; winner, National Book Award; assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; author of "A Thousand Days," etc.)

The moderate critics of the administration's Vietnam policy do not question its proclaimed purposes; resistance to Communist aggression, self-determination for South Vietnam, a negotiated settlement in Southeast Asia. They do question, with the greatest urgency, the theory that the way to achieve these objectives is to intensify the war. The more we destroy Vietnam, North and South, in their judgment, the less chance there will ever be of attaining our objectives. The course of widening the war, moreover, will mire our nation in a hopeless and endless conflict on the mainland of Asia, beyond the effective use of our national power and the range of our primary interests—and may well end in nuclear war with China.

And the alternatives? Instead of supposing that a guerrilla movement can be crushed by strategic bombing, instead of using military methods to solve a political problem, we must adapt the means we employ to the end we seek.

16642

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1966

1. Stop the Americanization of the war. The bitter fact is that the war in Vietnam can never be won as a war of white men against Asians. It cannot be won "unless the people [of South Vietnam] support the effort. . . . We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam" (President Kennedy, 1963). The more we Americanize the war—by increasing our military presence, by summing Saigon leaders, like vassals, to conferences in an American state, by transforming a local war in Vietnam into a global test between America and China—the more we make the war unwinnable.

2. A civilian government in Saigon. We have never had a government in Saigon that could enlist the active loyalty of the countryside, and we certainly do not have one in Marshal Ky's military junta. Instead of identifying American interests with Marshal Ky, and rebuffing the broader political impulses of the South, we should long since have encouraged a movement toward a civilian regime that represents the significant political forces of the country and is capable both of rallying the army and carrying out programs of social reform. If such a government should favor the neutralization of South Vietnam, if it should want to negotiate with Vietnam, even if it should wish to release us from our commitment to stay in Vietnam, we cannot and should not object.

3. Reconvene the Geneva Conference. We should persevere in the quest for negotiation. Since the Vietcong are a principal party to the conflict, it would appear obvious that peace talks at Geneva are meaningless without their participation. And since they will never talk if the only topic is their unconditional surrender, we must, unless we plan to exterminate them, hold out to them a prospect of a say in the future political life of South Vietnam—conditioned on their laying down their arms, opening up their territories and abiding by the ground rules of democratic elections, preferably under international supervision.

4. Hold the line in South Vietnam. Obviously, Hanoi and the Vietcong will not negotiate so long as they think they can win. Since stalemate is thus a precondition to negotiation, we must have enough American ground forces in South Vietnam to demonstrate that our adversaries cannot hope for military victory. I believe that we have more than enough troops and installations there now to make this point.

It is an illusion to suppose that by increasing the size of the American Army we can ever gain a reliable margin of superiority; for, by the Pentagon's preferred 10:1 ratio in fighting guerrillas, every time we add 100,000 men, the enemy has only to add 10,000, and we are all even again.

Nor does "digging in" mean a static strategy with initiative relinquished to the enemy. The South Vietnamese Army of half a million men is better suited in many ways than are Americans to search operations in the villages.

We should also limit our bombing in the South. Have we really no better way to deal with guerrilla warfare than the aerial obliteration of the country in which it is taking place? If this is our best idea of "protecting" a country against communism, what other country, seeing the devastation we have wrought in Vietnam, will ever wish for American protection?

5. Taper off the bombing of North Vietnam. Secretary McNamara has candidly said, "We never believed that bombing would destroy North Vietnam's will," and thus far, bombing the North has neither brought Hanoi to the conference table, demoralized the people nor stopped infiltration. As a result, pressure arise for ever-wider strikes—first oil depots, then harbors, factories, cities the Chinese border. But these won't work either. As we move down this road, we will

only solidify the people of North Vietnam behind their government, make negotiation impossible and eventually assure the entry of China into the war. And even if we bombed North Vietnam back to the Stone Age and earned thereby the hatred of the civilized world, this still would not settle the present war—which, after all, is taking place not in North but in South Vietnam.

6. A long-run program for Southeast Asia. We should discuss with Russia, France, China and other interested countries a neutralization program, under international guarantee, for Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam. If these states could work out forms of economic collaboration, as in the development of the Mekong Valley, the guarantors should make economic and technical assistance available to them.

A program of limiting our forces, actions and objectives still holds out the possibility of an honorable resolution of a tragic situation. A program of indefinite escalation offers nothing but disaster; for our adversaries can, in their own way, match our every step up to nuclear war—and nuclear war would be just as much a moral and political catastrophe for us as it would be a physical catastrophe for the Far East and the whole world.

THE MIRANDA CASE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of his column, "Capitol Punishment," Art Buchwald has made some observations in jesting guise which seem quite appropriate to the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Miranda case. Properly construed, the majority opinion in the Miranda case attempts to lay down some artificial rules which an arresting officer must repeat by rote like a parrot in order to make admissible in a criminal case the voluntary confession of the defendant that he is the party who committed the crime with which he is charged. I ask unanimous consent that Art Buchwald's observations may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. Buchwald's observations were ordered to be printed, as follows:

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: BABY FACE—A REMAKE
(By Art Buchwald)

Ever since the Supreme Court ruling concerning the protection of a defendant's constitutional rights at the time of his arrest, the motion picture people have been in a dither. Almost every gangster movie of the last 40 years is now outdated, and will have to be remade with the rights of the defendant kept in mind.

This is probably what the remarks of Baby Face Nelson will look like. Baby Face has been betrayed by his jealous girl friend and the cops have his farm hideout surrounded. The Chief of Police says over his loudspeaker, "Now hear this, Baby Face. The farmhouse is surrounded and you don't have a chance. Come out with your hands up."

"Drop dead, copper," Baby Face shouts from the window, firing a shot at the same time. "I must warn you, Baby Face," the Chief says, "that anything you say will be held against you."

Baby Face lets go with a burst of a machine gun. "I don't intend to be taken alive, you dirty finks."

The Chief ducks behind his car. Kneeling, he says, "Baby Face, I have to advise you that you may either have a choice of your own lawyer or we will provide you with a public defender, and you do not have to say anything to us when you come out of the farmhouse with your hands up if you do not want to."

"I got lots to say," Baby Face shouts from the window. "Ha, ha, ha."

He lets go with another burst from the machine gun.

"If you're going to talk to us, Baby Face, you'll have to sign a waiver that no one made you say anything against your will."

"I'm signing nothing, copper. I know my rights. Like the case of Gonzalez vs. the State of Oklahoma, no one can lay a finger on me until I'm brought before a magistrate and given a hot meal and a bubble bath."

"Now listen carefully, Baby Face," the Police Chief says. "We know you've killed 12 bank tellers and robbed six post offices, but constitutionally you have nothing to fear. Even if we can prove our case, you can always appeal on the grounds that, because of this gun fight, you received adverse publicity in the newspapers, and could not get a fair trial."

Baby Face fires another burst from his machine gun. "That's what you say now. I haven't forgotten what happened in the Glutz vs. the People of Peoria, Illinois, case when the coppers tricked Glutz into a confession by giving him two tickets to the Green Bay Packers-Baltimore Colts football game."

"The Third Circuit Court threw out the Glutz conviction, Baby Face," the Chief shouts over the loudspeaker. "Didn't you read about the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in Nashville vs. Virginia Woolf?"

"I haven't seen the newspapers lately," Baby Face shouts. "I've been holed up here, and if you want me you're going to have to come and get me." Rat-a-tat-tat.

"Okay, Baby Face, have it your way, but don't say we're violating your constitutional rights."

The Chief gives the signal to charge and a hailstorm of lead fills the air. When the smoke clears, Baby Face is lying mortally wounded.

His mother rushes up to him and puts his head in her lap.

"They got me, ma. Tell Melvin Belli the cops cheated him out of a fee," Baby Face gasps.

"Don't talk, son. If the police doctor does not patch you up, we can sue him for malpractice."

"But how, ma?"

"Don't you remember, son, Dillinger vs. the People of Malibu Beach, California?"

VISIT ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is in the nature of a special report on a single tourist attraction in my native Alabama. As many Senators know, I have been urging visits to Alabama to see what my State really is like. I repeat that invitation today, and I want to invite attention to one of the newest national monuments, Russell Cave.

I say "newest," but this is only because this remarkable place has been a national monument for only a few years and because it is planned to open the monument formally this fall. In this cave, experts from the Smithsonian Institution and the National Geographic Society have found a record of the lives of people who lived there for about 8,000 years. We know from these records that people were living in Russell Cave 4,000 years before the building of the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

In the excavations which have been made thus far archeologists have found spearheads, arrowheads, pottery, tools, and other artifacts to recreate the lives of these people as they progressed in the degree of their civilization. The Na-

16626

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1966

PRIME MINISTER KY

in our streets and also toward some innocent bystanders.

The junior Senator from Ohio, throughout his rather long life, has never liked people who push other people around. There were, in some instances, individual policemen who acted irresponsibly.

For instance, in Newsweek of August 1 is pictured a Negro woman seated in an automobile, riddled by police bullets. Caption of the lady with blood streaming from her face is "Hough: Police Bullets Riddled a Car and Wounded a Young Mother." Surely that is evidence of irresponsible action by police.

Mr. President, I stand by my statement of last Tuesday. We have a fine police department in Cleveland. We have a fine fire department. In my statement of last Tuesday I was careful to state it was a minority of policemen who did not conduct themselves as responsibly as they should under the circumstances. The great majority of the Cleveland police force is to be commended on its restraint during that difficult time.

Years ago I was a private in the Ohio National Guard. Those guardsmen called from their civilian vocations performed an unpleasant duty in a highly creditable manner. It is a fact as stated by me, and I reaffirm every statement I made last Tuesday, some of these guardsmen, most of them very young men, are unaccustomed to handling weapons in combat. A few appeared "trigger happy," as the saying is; and in a couple of instances their guns were fired accidentally. Fortunately, they injured no one.

For instance, the Cleveland Press reported an incident in which a National Guardsman fired several rounds from a machinegun at East 55th and Harlem Court when he thought he heard prowlers. Firing several rounds from a machinegun in a heavily populated neighborhood appears to me to have been the act of a trigger-happy guardsman.

I do assert that there was no nationwide conspiracy or Communist conspiracy, so-called, involved. While there may have been organized bands of hoodlums who took advantage of the riots to pillage and loot; while there may have been extremist groups who grasped the opportunity to exploit the violence for their own selfish ends; I am convinced that the riots themselves did not begin as a result of any conspiracy or organized plan. To state the riots were Communist, or otherwise, inspired appears to me to be a lame excuse to save the consciences of those who do not want to, or refuse to, face the conditions that precipitated this disaster and similar ones in other great cities of our Nation—rat-infested slums, unemployment, poverty, hopelessness, frustration, and despair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for an additional 3 minutes on another matter.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon regime, has been in power since June 1965, when 10 generals conspired and overthrew the civilian government of South Vietnam.

I realize that at the Honolulu Conference, earlier this year, our President embraced him and made a sort of sweet-smelling geranium of him. Evidently power has gone to the head of this flamboyant so-called air marshal.

Shortly after the 10 generals made him Prime Minister, in an interview by an American reporter he was asked:

Who are your heroes, Marshal Ky?

His answer was:

I have only one—Hitler. I admire Hitler because he pulled his country together when it was in a terrible state in the early thirties. The situation here in South Vietnam is so desperate that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam.

When his fellow countrymen were fighting for liberation against the French colonial oppressors from 1946 to September 1954, where was Ky? Not only was Ky one of the Tories in the war for liberation in Vietnam at that time, as he was being trained in the French Air Force, but the startling fact is that 9 of the 10 generals who overthrew the civilian regime at Saigon served with the French, fighting against the forces of the National Liberation Front, or Vietminh.

We Americans have regarded ourselves as the most revolutionary people in the world. We revere those patriots who won the Revolutionary War against England. We have always held low opinions of the American Tories of that time who opposed those Americans who fought for the liberation of our country from colonial oppressors. However, we seem to be adhering at the present time to the Tories in Vietnam.

Unfortunately at present time our Nation in the estimation of heads of state of most Asiatic countries has become the neocolonial oppressor. We are carrying on with our military might where the French left off. The United States has long been regarded as the most revolutionary nation in the world. We Americans revere the memory of those patriots who won the war for independence and then demanded that the first Congress write into our Constitution the first 10 amendments which we affectionately term our Bill of Rights. In our Revolutionary War the Tories fought against the patriots.

We have alined ourselves directly with the Tories of Vietnam in the civil war that is raging there. It is my hope that our President would disassociate himself from his involvement with Prime Minister Ky. Ever since the Honolulu conference earlier this year where the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces embraced this egotistical Prime Minister he has been too big for his britches.

Last October I interviewed him personally and I have followed his operations as best I can. Now this man, who himself was born in Hanoi and presently holds a position of power in Saigon which was usurped by the general's coup,

apparently wants to go home. He has even had the effrontery to state that war between the United States and Red China is inevitable within 5 or 10 years. Why wait, he says. Talking as a native of what is termed North Vietnam he said ultimately the people of the North would overthrow the Communist regime there. Then he posed the question:

Does the free world have the patience to aid and build South Vietnam for the necessary period of waiting? If not, we must destroy the Communists in their lair—

He said. Then he said that he did not believe that the Chinese Communists would intervene directly in the Vietnamese war at this time. He said, however, it was certain they would intervene directly in Vietnam or elsewhere in Asia in 5 or 10 years unless they were stopped.

Very definitely Ky should be removed as Prime Minister of South Vietnam. We Americans should repudiate his statement that the U.S. Government should join in an allied invasion of North Vietnam and an armed conflict now with Communist China. Administration officials and Secretary of State Rusk should immediately dissociate our Government from the irresponsible statements made by our South Vietnam puppet Ky. If he wants so badly to return to Hanoi, let him do it on his own two feet and not by reason of the untimely death of thousands of killed and wounded young American fighting men presently involved in a miserable civil war in Vietnam, a far-off country which is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

FORTUNE MAGAZINE WARNS THAT ECONOMY IS SLOWING DOWN

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, our economy is slowing down. Despite a lingering tendency for prices to creep upward, the overall pace of economic activity is slowing dramatically.

Instead of being worried about whether to impose a restraint in the form of a tax increase, as so many were this spring, we ought to be making sure we do not sit on our hands as we head into a recession.

In recent statements, I have cataloged in detail the movement of several economic indicators showing clearly that the steam is going out of the boom. Consumer demand has fallen. The Index of Industrial Production and the gross national product have been increasing at far slower rates. Housing starts have plunged sharply.

An excellent, thorough review of the current economic situation has just been published in the August issue of Fortune magazine. It begins:

The change in the pace of economic expansion is now unmistakable. Most people welcome it as a relief from inflationary pressure. Many of the readjustments looming up, however, look to be more painful than has been generally recognized. Each month's new business statistics are revealing further deterioration in the prospects for underlying demand in the domestic economy. The figures begin to suggest a change in direction, not just a change in pace.

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16625

see for raising this question of interest rates. The rates are getting very much out of line, and have created an almost impossible burden upon many segments of the American economy. The building industry, particularly, is becoming almost completely stagnated; and that industry is one of America's largest employers.

It seems to me that the situation requires a number of remedial actions. First, I do not believe we can carry on a war in Vietnam that is costing about \$2 billion a month, and continually expand welfare programs of all types in this country. Some of those programs, under ordinary conditions, may be highly desirable; but we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We must put first things first.

Then, as has been repeatedly pointed out by some Senators, we have almost six divisions in Western Europe at the present time, and that, as one of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee says, is costing our country \$2.3 billion a year—much of it being converted into a dollar deficit and a gold drain—while at the same time we are continuing to draft more of our American sons to send them to South Vietnam.

It seems to me that we should reduce our troop commitments in Europe very drastically, and call on those countries which have greater gold reserves than we to assume a greater responsibility and a greater share of the burden in defending themselves.

Those are two things which can be done immediately. Those things can be done, in my judgment, by executive decision; and then whatever is necessary in addition to that to bring some semblance of order into the high interest rates that are slowing down the economy of our country, and in my judgment will place hundreds of thousands of people out of jobs in the not too distant future, certainly should be done.

I compliment and commend my distinguished fellow Senators for raising their voices in this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, interest rates are of concern, or at least should be of concern, to every American. But we should not overlook the fact that interest represents the cost of money, and when a commodity is in short supply, prices rise. It so happens that there is a greater demand for money than the existing supply.

One great contribution this Federal Government could make to reduce that excessive demand and thereby reduce interest rates, is in line with what the Senator from Georgia has just said; and that is, to stop trying to carry on all of the expansive Great Society spending programs and financing them with deficit spending.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration, in the last 5 years, has spent \$30 billion more than it has taken in, and \$1.5 billion of our interest burden today goes to pay the interest costs on the deficits created by the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

There is one difference between the high interest rates today and the records of high interest rates in previous admin-

istrations. In other administrations they at least let the small investors join in reaping the benefits of the higher interest. This administration is placing a ceiling of 4.15 percent on E-bonds. It now proposes a ceiling on certificates of deposit for the small depositors while leaving the lid off for the larger ones.

I do not know why an administration that is always talking about wishing to help the smaller people is trying to penalize them on this point. It is sheer hypocrisy. The best thing this administration could do in the way of finding a solution to relieve the cost of interest and this excessive demand for money, would be to stop advocating the expansion of every Great Society idea. Many of these programs may be meritorious if we had the money to pay for them, but they are certainly not meritorious when we are borrowing money at 5¼ percent interest rates to defray their costs.

The Government should set the example of fiscal responsibility.

RACE RIOTS IN CLEVELAND

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have here a letter dated July 24, from an Edward A. Spelic, 2848 Lorain Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. The letter is a simple expression of what seems to be a humble citizen's view of problems confronting our metropolitan areas. I wish to read the letter:

Hon. Senator FRANK LAUSCHE: I would like to know if you could recommend medals for bravery for all the police and firemen of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, because the police and firemen this last week have been through hell because of these Communist-led race riots. Also, if you are going to take up a collection for the President's daughter's wedding, how about a collection for the police and firemen who are trying to help save an American city called Cleveland, Ohio, from being destroyed?

This letter has great significance to me in the thought that it expresses. Throughout the country, all too frequently, at the end of every riot, the charge is made of police brutality.

It has been sought to lead public opinion into the belief that the culprits of the riots are innocent, and that the firemen and especially the police are the guilty ones.

On Tuesday, July 19, at a meeting in what is known as the J.F.K. Club, in the Hough Avenue area of Cleveland, a group was assembled. In that group was present an individual who was a friend of the Government.

The subject of discussion of the group was the development of ways and means to snipe at firemen trying to put out blazes, and at policemen maintaining law and order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. While the meeting was in progress, policemen entered. With the policemen's entry, the gathering was dispersed. Hence it is not known what ultimately happened in the development of a design and plan for sniping at police

and firemen. All we know is that while the firemen were facing the fire in the buildings, they were also facing the fire sent forth from the gun barrels of the rioters.

The time has come, Mr. President, when we had better stop denouncing police and firemen. At this point, I wish to take exception to what my colleague from Ohio stated about the Ohio National Guard. He stated that some of the members of the Ohio National Guard were trigger happy.

It is a tragedy that we had to bring them in. They were there in the face of danger. They performed valiant and proper service for the maintenance of law and order.

I thank Mr. Spelic for his letter. I cannot start a collection for the police or the firemen. I cannot secure awards for them for their courage and their adherence to duty.

I bow and express my gratitude as a citizen of Cleveland to the police, the firemen, and the National Guard, who brought order to Cleveland, after 96 buildings had been destroyed, some wholly and others partially, after violence had run rampant, and Government had been defied.

I regret to say this, but, in my opinion, Cleveland, Rochester, and Brooklyn are clearly training grounds for the worst that is yet to come. There are drills, trials, and maneuvers. Unless we back our Government and demand that the full force of law be used, including the police, the firemen, the National Guard, and the morale of the people, there is no foretelling what the end will be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, some years ago I was chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

I believed then and I believe now that punishment, like a shadow, should follow the commission of any offense against law and order in our country.

I am, of course, opposed to mob violence, whether it be in Mississippi, Alabama, Ohio, or any other place in our Nation. On Tuesday of this week, I spoke out at some length on the disorders in Cleveland and on the frustrations, the helplessness, and hopelessness of those who live in what we term the Hough Avenue area of Cleveland. I mentioned their pent up frustrations which finally erupted in violence.

We in Cleveland have always been proud of our great city. It is a melting pot of all ethnic groups which have come here from the old country, seeking liberty and seeking to free themselves from oppression and to escape the hopeless situation they faced in the old country.

I stand by every statement I made on Tuesday in a rather lengthy speech which was referred to by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio. I shall be happy to have any of my colleagues read that speech in its entirety, and not just take one sentence out of context:

In my opinion, the police of the city of Cleveland in some instances were guilty of acts of violence and of unnecessary brutality toward those who were violating the laws, burning buildings, rioting

16648

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1966

Confronted with such self-evident facts, the civil rights leaders tend to retort with the argument that if they did not promote civil disobedience, nothing would be done to improve the squalid surroundings in which many Negroes live. Anyone contemplating civil disobedience, however, in a society whose existence depends on respect for law is obligated to ask himself what alternatives exist before he turns to that last resort.

Here again, the President put it well: "The ballot box, the neighborhood communities, the political and civil rights organizations—are the means by which Americans express their resentment against intolerable conditions. They are designed to reform society, not to rip it apart."

And the truth is that many individual Negroes, even before the past decade's civil rights legislation, have come up from poverty and gotten out of the "ghetto." (The term, incidentally, is a loaded one; by connotation if not denotation it suggests the falsehood that some governmental authority is compelling Negroes to stay in segregated, walled-in areas.)

Many more can be expected to make a decent living for themselves without the leaders having to rip up society. What cannot be stressed too often, and what the romanticists fail to understand, is that for the most part they will have to do it on their own; the leaders would be better occupied helping them help themselves than in creating the climate for riots. Even then, there will be some members of any society, regardless of color, who for one reason or another will not be able to make a go of life.

It's time, we think, for a little bit of common sense and candor. Neither the society at large nor the Federal Government is responsible for the violence. Those responsible are the rioters and the teachers of casual disregard for law and order.

U.S. OBLIGATIONS IN ASIA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Nation's press is being heard on President Johnson's significant speech on our obligations in Asia, and the early reaction is strongly favorable.

I have here editorials from three newspapers—the Baltimore Sun, Philadelphia Inquirer, and Washington Evening Star—praising various aspects of the President's speech to the American Alumni Council.

Each comments with approval on his call to Communist China for an atmosphere of conciliation.

There is firm agreement with his declaration that the United States is a Pacific power with responsibilities that cannot be shirked in Asia.

And there is hope that Hanoi and Peking will get the point.

This was a message reflecting our determination and our fervent desire for peace.

I ask that these editorials discussing the President's speech be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
July 14, 1966]

THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA

That the United States is a Pacific power, as President Johnson called in his speech on Asia, must be obvious to everybody, including the Chinese. We did not at some moment make a decision to become a Pacific power; we were forced into becoming one by the interests of our own national

security, and by the vacuum left in that part of the globe after World War II. If a date is to be set, we can say that on December 7, 1941, the Japanese made inevitable the emergence of the United States as a major factor in all developments in the Pacific, among the islands of its seas and on the mainlands that border it.

It was on the fact of American power that the President built his examination of Asia and his view of its future. It is true, as he said, that Asia is now the crucial arena of "man's striving for independence and order," and true that if peace cannot be established there it cannot be secure anywhere. Mr. Johnson's listing of heartening signs in Asia, from Indonesia through Japan, and of examples of Asian cooperation, from Manila to the valley of the Mekong, was an impressive list. And his call to China to accept an atmosphere of conciliation was fervent and eloquent.

If the Chinese cannot be expected to see the sense of this, and to respond soon in the same spirit, still most of our allies will follow the President this far, in thorough agreement. What they might argue about is his statement that the Asia he sees so well "is the new Asia that is taking shape behind our defense of South Vietnam."

In the eyes of some of our allies, the defense of South Vietnam, while it may be necessary, is but one element of many in the Asian condition today. And then there is a question of how power is to be applied. Some of our allies believe that the very fact of the existence of vast American power, by sea and air, and if worst should come to worst, in nuclear terms, might suffice as a deterrent to the Chinese, without an American ground presence.

But would it serve further to persuade the Chinese toward conciliation? And where lies the point beyond which American efforts at conciliation would be taken by the Chinese as a sign of weakness, and by now-friendlier Asians as a signal of betrayal? This is the kind of tortured question the makers of policy have constantly to ask themselves. To pretend that the answers are easy is to assume an omniscience no one can possess.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer,
July 14, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFER OF PEACE

President Johnson's call for reconciliation with Communist China and for peace with North Vietnam marks an important turn in U.S. policy in Asia. The President, in his televised address, made it clear that, if the proffer of peace is rejected by Hanoi and Peking, the war in Vietnam may last a long time.

Mr. Johnson, it is evident, is stepping beyond the previously stressed policy of "containment without isolation" of Red China and is looking beyond the present conflict in Vietnam to the situation in Asia after the war ends.

"A peaceful mainland China is essential to a peaceful Asia," he said. "A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation."

"The peace we seek in Asia," he said further, "is a peace of conciliation." He added that he did not mean a peace of conquest, or the simple absence of armed hostilities, but a settlement based on a broader concept of international relations.

He talked of the peace that could be sustained through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through "the full participation by all nations in an international community under law."

Meanwhile, there is the war in Vietnam. The President defined the American position in blunt terms directed at Hanoi: "Victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot

drive us from South Vietnam by force. The minute that you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting. We want to bring our men home."

President Johnson's message to the Communists was one of peace, backed by determination to press on in Vietnam, if our peace offers get nowhere.

Will Hanoi and Peking get the message? Past history furnishes little ground for optimism. We still must make the effort.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
July 14, 1966]

AMERICA IN ASIA

President Johnson has held out the hand of conciliation to Red China, but the chances are that the response will continue to be hostile as long as the Mao Tze-tung hardliners remain in power. Not until a younger, less doctrinaire group takes over will a change for the better in Sino-American relations be likely.

Meanwhile, however, as the President has indicated to the American Alumni Council, measures can be taken by the United States, in concert with the free Asians, to prove that aggression is a losing game and to bring nearer the day when the Chinese Communists will be persuaded to come out of their self-imposed isolation, abandon force and cooperate with neighboring lands—and with America—to promote peace and economic progress throughout Asia. Among other things, our government might well go along with proposals offering Peking a seat in the United Nations, provided of course that this would not affect the membership or security of the other China, Taiwan.

In any event, with more emphasis than any of his predecessors, Mr. Johnson has proclaimed to the Chinese and the rest of the world that the United States is a Pacific power determined to meet its obligations in Asia. He has pretty well demolished the arguments of those domestic critics who hold that Europe, not the Far East, is America's main "sphere of interest" and that the Asians can be safely forgotten. In the President's words, "We are bounded not by one but by two oceans—and whether by aircraft or ship, satellite or missile, the Pacific is as crossable as the Atlantic. . . . The economic network of this shrinking globe is too intertwined—the basic hopes of men are too related—and the possibility of common disaster is too real—for us to ignore threats to peace in Asia. . . . Asia is no longer sitting outside the door of the Twentieth Century. She is here, in the same world with us, to be either our partner or our problem."

The President, in effect, has given Asia a status at least equal to Europe's in terms of its bearing on our country's well-being. Other Americans have made the same point in the past, but not so effectively. We think Mr. Johnson is altogether right.

POLITICS AND THE FBI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a great deal has been said in recent months about the attempted eavesdropping by agents of the Federal Government in my State of Nevada and many other places. These incidents have been carefully and systematically brought to the surface largely through the efforts of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri and the staff of the subcommittee he heads which has been holding hearings on the subject.

Of late, a distinction has been made between the term "wiretapping" which was the term used in the 1934 law and the term "bugging" which represents an

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16647

with recognition of the existing cultural values to be preserved.

When I first announced that a grant had been received for public housing here at Leech Lake, one commentator raised the question whether such an effort did not mistakenly create an enclave of Indians on the reservation. He asked whether we weren't making reservation life too attractive, and whether we might not better build the houses in cities to which Indians were migrating. I think that these questions miss the point.

Some of Minnesota's Indians want to leave the reservation now, and some will want to leave in the future. Our Government ought to be able to help house and train them for life off of the reservation. But many others want to stay on the reservation, and I don't think that Indians or any other citizen of this country ought to be told that they have to leave their home environment and move a few hundred miles to enjoy the basics of good housing and good education and a job. We shouldn't treat any citizen that way.

There is even more to it. Legally, the Indian has been free to leave the reservation for years. But this is a terribly hollow right when the life he leaves has failed—by lack of housing, education, health and social services—to prepare him for life in the modern economy of our cities. The sad unemployment figures of Minnesota's Indians both on and off the reservation testify to that fact. So far, the Indian has been "free" to remain in poverty on the reservation, or to go to live unemployed in a city slum. This choice is the indefensible product of a bankrupt policy.

So I think that there is only one reasonable direction open to us. It is to build on the reservations the kind of economy which will support jobs for Indians, the kind of housing which will permit a healthy life, and, above all, the kind of education which will motivate and provide skills for a productive job.

Our effort must place the reservation itself, and the Indians on it, in the mainstream of our economy. Then there will be real freedom. Freedom to leave the reservation, or to stay on it. And all America will be the better for it.

Such a program of economic and educational development will have to come, but it is not here yet. It can't be worked out from a distance, but must be done with initiative and cooperation of the Indian community here. It can't be the Washington plan; it has to be your plan. And let's not fool ourselves—it isn't going to happen overnight. It will take long, hard work by all of us, Indian and non-Indian. I want to help, and hope that you will ask me to. It is a hard job, but it can be done. And it will be worth it to make the reservation a good place to live and work. We'd better get to it. As President Kennedy said in 1963: "The American Indians hold a romantic grip on our imaginations, but I hope that they also hold a practical grip upon our efforts."

REMEDIAL READING RECOMMENDED FOR JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, on June 6, I informed the Senate that I saw no need to go to extremes to discredit the John Birch Society because I thought that that organization was perfectly capable of discrediting itself.

The occasion for that remark was the receipt of a letter from a John Birch Society official who accused me of going to extremes in an attempt to discredit the society. The extreme to which I had allegedly gone was the insertion in the RECORD of an editorial published in a

newspaper in my State, the Rochester Courier, of Rochester, N.H., commenting on the aims of the John Birch Society.

It was my opinion at that time that the John Birch Society could be relied upon to discredit itself, and my opinion turned out to be justified. I had the letter which I had received printed in the RECORD for June 6, and commented upon one phrase which seemed to me to illustrate the society's philosophy. That phrase was:

A benevolent dictatorship clearly implies complete justice and complete freedom.

Mr. President, the letter writers of the John Birch Society seem to want to amuse themselves in their idle time, and this morning my mail contained yet another letter from the same society official who had written me before.

It is addressed to:

DEAR SENATOR MCINTYRE'S GHOST READER—

And it goes, in relevant part, as follows:

On May 24, 1966, Senator MCINTYRE inserted a scurrilous newspaper editorial in the RECORD. It was from the Rochester (New Hampshire) Courier, and in essence accused the John Birch Society of proposing "dictatorship" as the ideal form of government for the United States of America.

I replied to the newspaper with a correction, and sent a copy to the Senator, which he inserted in the RECORD on June sixth, together with his own strange remarks. Since the Senator obviously cannot read, and I do not know your name, please excuse the anonymous salutation.

The letter then goes on to some more material which is not particularly informative, and concludes as follows:

Enclosed is \$1, which I hope will initiate a fund to send Senator MCINTYRE to a remedial reading class.

Now, I happen to think this is a most intriguing contribution. I am particularly interested in the fact that the John Birch Society recommends remedial reading, in view of the very clear fact that the John Birch Society official who wrote to me is apparently unable to read the text of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As can be noted from the first paragraph of his letter to me, he refers to a newspaper editorial from the Rochester, N.H., Record. I am certain that, with only the most rudimentary reading ability, this gentleman would have been able to glean from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of either May 24 or June 6 that the editorial in question came from the Rochester, N.H., Courier.

As this letter indicates, it is the John Birch Society official who has trouble reading.

I stated a few weeks ago, as I restated today, that the John Birch Society was perfectly capable of discrediting itself. Once again, the society has proved its own point, by sending me a letter about remedial reading which conclusively shows the society's own problems with reading. I feel that this is the most generous interpretation which can be placed on this matter, although at least one member of my staff has suggested that this error merely shows the John Birch Society's careless attitude toward facts.

In any event, I emerge from this correspondence \$1 the richer, and, consid-

ering the source of the contribution, I feel that this is truly an embarrassment of riches. I have decided to donate this contribution to the Anti-Defamation League, where the funds gleaned from the dues of John Birch Society members, I am certain, may be used to help stem oncoming waves of extremism.

A TIME FOR CANDOR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for July 27, 1966, carried an editorial in which the writer made some timely observations in respect to the rioting and looting which has been going on in some of our major cities and the attempts of some persons to justify it. I ask unanimous consent that such article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A TIME FOR CANDOR

This summer's harvest of horror—murder, arson, looting in city after city, week after week—is prompting ever more insistent questioning. Why? Who is to blame? Strangely enough, the response of a good many people is that it is not the fault of the rioters but of the general society and, if you please, the Federal Government.

One editorialist was moved to express the sentiment in the following extremist fashion: "The (Federal) housing program is too small. The poverty program is too small. It is not the riots in the slums, but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth."

We submit that attitudes of that sort are an unmerited rebuke to America and the millions whose hard work and hard thinking have made it the most abundant and just nation on earth. We are glad that President Johnson, at least, is not thus beguiled; while commiserating with the plight of slum-dwellers, he is forthright in his condemnation of riots that tear at the very fabric of the community. "Our country can abide civil protest . . . it cannot abide civil violence."

Let us look a little more closely at the catalog of charges against the "inadequacy" of Federal efforts.

Large-scale Federal housing aid for low-income families has been going on for many years at a cost of many billions in tax dollars. It has failed indeed, but its inadequacy is not in terms of cost but in terms of concept. The same applies to the bulk of the activities launched by the more recent antipoverty program.

The fundamental conceptual flaw is a sentimental view, reminiscent of Rousseau, of the nature of man. According to this interpretation, man is inherently good and perfectible and is held down only by the external forces of society. Put him in pleasant surroundings, or give him enough money, and all will be well.

The inescapable corollary is that the society rather than the individual is responsible for his behavior, however ambitionless, venal or criminal. The doctrine has been preached with so much vigor, and not only in connection with civil rights, in contemporary America that it is hardly surprising to find some of the listeners taking it literally.

Experience, to put it mildly, lends little credence to the romantic view of man's nature; left entirely to our own devices, relatively few of us would qualify for sainthood. In that context, the political triumph of the American design of 200 years ago is that it engineered a maximum of personal liberty with a minimum of governmental compulsion. But the order is there, and it has to be, else the design fails.

16650

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 28, 1966

telephone company after graduation from high school.

Instead, she joined the Smithsonian program and was an instant success. Her first job was in the botany library—where she found a confused jumble of scientific books, magazines and pamphlets. Within two weeks, she and Lola Bundy "brought order out of chaos," Whitelaw said.

Diana then was hired as a research assistant by Dr. Floyd A. McClure, one of the world's authorities on bamboo who is working at the Smithsonian. Diana dissects plants and prepares slides for the scientist, freeing him from routine.

BLACKBOARD LECTURES

Diana is a favorite around the botany lab. Dr. Thomas R. Soderstrom, curator of grasses at the Smithsonian and custodian of the largest grass collection in the world, and Dr. Cleofe E. Calderon of Buenos Aires, teach Diana new techniques and give blackboard lectures that very few college students are lucky enough to get.

"It's very good for us," said Dr. Soderstrom. "We are able to find some really top-notch people. Instead of searching in the open market, we have trained assistants here that we can hire."

Regusters said the youths working in the Smithsonian's exhibits section are learning skills that can be transferred to private industry. Some are making models, others learn silk screening.

CAPTURED U.S. PILOTS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, another indication of public outrage over Hanoi's mistreatment of captured U.S. pilots appears in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The North Vietnamese have paraded these valiant airmen through the streets of Hanoi and threatened to execute them as war criminals. Should they think such a monstrous act would discourage the American military effort, the Inquirer asserts in an editorial, they would be making one of history's monumental errors.

Secretary of State Rusk has warned that we would consider the abuse of prisoners held in North Vietnam as a very grave development. The newspaper suggests it would unite the country behind a hugely stepped-up policy of force in Vietnam.

I request that its editorial be included in the RECORD.

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

IF THEY KILL CAPTURED FLIERS

The North Vietnamese should have it spelled out for them in unmistakable terms just what the consequences will be if they carry out their threats to try and to execute captured American fliers as war criminals.

If they think for one moment that such a monstrous act of reprisal would put a stop to American bombings and otherwise discourage American military effort, they are making one of history's monumental errors.

The American public has already been shocked by the mistreatment given captured fliers by the North Vietnamese Communists. It has been angered by pictures showing the shackled prisoners paraded through menacing crowds on the streets of Hanoi.

But this reaction will be nothing compared to the horror that will sweep this country if the helpless captives are thrown to the firing squads after drumhead trials.

Secretary of State Rusk has warned that the U.S. would view as a "grave development indeed" the abuse of prisoners held in North Vietnam, and will insist on humane treatment under the Geneva accords.

If Ho Chi Minh does not want this country united behind a hugely stepped-up policy of force in Vietnam, he had better call off his would-be killers of prisoners before it is too late.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, pursuant to a request made of me by it, I wrote a letter to the Forensic Quarterly on April 26, 1966, in which I set forth my views in respect to foreign aid. A copy of this letter was printed in the Forensic Quarterly for May 1966.

By way of explanation of my vote against the foreign aid authorization bill, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE OPINION OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

American opinion is now forcing a close reappraisal of our foreign aid policies. The time has come when the American people must adopt a harsh test of self-interest in dealing with foreign aid. Earlier, American aid sought nothing greater than to provide the war-torn countries of the world with greater economic stability in order to help these nations resist Communist pressures. At that time this policy served our self-interest and the interest of humanity. However, now that the program of rehabilitation of Western Europe and Japan has been completed, there is no reason, twenty years after the Second World War, for the United States to be giving away over three billion dollars annually for foreign aid.

Under our Constitution the power to tax and to appropriate monies raised by taxation can be exercised by the Congress only for a public purpose. Congress does not have the power to spend beyond the ambit of this constitutional authorization. Therefore, in order to justify the Congressional appropriations for foreign aid programs on the grounds that they are for a valid public purpose, these programs must strengthen either the economic, or military, or international position of the United States. Our present foreign aid program does not have a valid public purpose because it cannot be justified on either of these grounds, and for this reason I cannot support the Administration's present foreign aid policies. I maintain that our foreign aid programs do not aid the United States or the free world. On the contrary, the economy of the United States on which the defense of the free world depends, is actually weakened by these expenditures.

Foreign aid amounts to a substantial part of our federal budget. Therefore, because of our seemingly permanent policy of deficit financing, our government has actually borrowed a substantial amount of the money which the administrators of post-war foreign aid programs have scattered among the nations of this earth. By increasing our budget deficits, foreign aid dollars have contributed to monetary inflation in this country. The buying power of our dollar constantly is being eroded. If this continues, our economy will be irreparably damaged.

Our dollars have found their way into many foreign treasuries and now these foreign governments are clamoring at our doors demanding gold in repayment for these dollars. These foreign aid dollars are claims on the goods and services produced by the industries of the United States and no one can

say that the resources of this country are not being drained when we give away dollars abroad and they return as demands on our nation's wealth.

For example, since World War II we have given France approximately nine billion dollars in foreign aid. This does not include the other billions which ground their way into the French economy through the maintenance of our military forces in France. Now the French government is demanding payment of gold for this money which has been drained from our economy and added to our national debt. Our balance of payments dilemma which has largely resulted from our foreign aid policies, weakens the value of the dollar and the public welfare of the country is, of course, damaged. This is in direct violation of the requirement that money Congress appropriates for any purpose, including foreign aid, must be spent in a way to aid the public welfare.

No matter what the currently fashionable Keynesian economists say, there is a limit to government spending and if we are to continue budget deficits, certainly we have an obligation to our own poor superior to any obligation we assume year after year to care for the poor of other nations. We should satisfy this superior obligation before we look for other countries to assist.

Foreign aid does not strengthen the military position of the United States. Actually, it impairs the build-up of our own forces on which the survival of the United States and the free world may depend. Many times military leaders have come before the Congress and requested authorizations for national defense purposes in excess of those asked by the civilian authorities. They felt the appropriations were necessary to maintain our ground forces at proper levels and to equip them with modern weapons. Civilian authorities have always said on these occasions that the Congress ought not take any such action because it was essential to keep the United States fiscally sound and the actions urged by the military men were beyond the financial capacity of the United States. For example, we have been told that the United States was not financially able to develop both the B70 bomber and intercontinental ballistic missiles. The B70 project was dropped and while no one doubts the necessity for the developing intercontinental ballistic missiles, it is also a military fact that the B70 bomber had a very necessary place in our arsenal because of its flexibility. Another example is our parsimonious development of an anti-missile missile which would be so vital to our defense against a hostile intercontinental ballistic missile attack.

Every time members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services have insisted on these projects, the response of the Department of Defense has been that the United States does not have even the financial resources available to provide our ground forces with modernized weapons. In reality, the money that has not been available for maintaining adequate ground forces and obtaining essential weapons has been devoted to foreign aid.

The inevitable conclusions one must draw from these facts is that foreign aid has actually prevented the United States from building up the armed forces and acquiring weapons which are absolutely essential for the survival of the United States and the free world.

Also, running directly against our military strength is the military and economic aid we have given our non-allies. Millions of dollars have been given to aid countries such as Yugoslavia and Egypt. This aid could certainly come back to haunt us much as the scrap metal we gave Japan before the Second World War.

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16649

application of a more sophisticated technology in the electronic age. It is clear to all that by any name or method we are talking about the same obnoxious and undesirable violation of the basic right of privacy which the Government should be guarding for all citizens. I will refrain from speculating on the negative effect in our war on crime which such lawbreaking by Federal officials engenders.

I can think of no more effective or proper move to end this practice than a law which would ban all eavesdropping or surreptitious listening whether by mechanical or other means except in cases of national security upon the issuance of a proper court order. The subject is one which demands proper clarification and I believe that the executive department should come forward with their recommendation for a law which would deal fairly and constitutionally with the rights of the public and the obligation of policing agencies to protect society.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject which appeared in the Washington Daily News on July 27, 1966, appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 27, 1966]

POLITICS AND THE FBI
(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The FBI is in trouble because an agent in Las Vegas bugged a suspected criminal back in 1963 and Sen. BOBBY KENNEDY, asked on a network television program whether he knew, as Attorney General at the time, that the gentleman in Las Vegas was being wiretapped, replied that he did not. That reply raised the question whether the FBI had acted illegally. If so, the situation is scandalous indeed, it being the job of the FBI to enforce the law, not to break it.

The relevant background: There is, under the law, a distinction between "wiretapping" and "bugging." There is no reason why this should be so, except that wiretapping was the earlier of the two inventions, and Congress acted on it, but has not got around to acting on the other.

In 1934, Congress passed a law regulating the use of the wiretap by Federal crime-prevention agencies. The law was defined by supplementary executive decrees in 1940, and again in 1965. The governing regulations are that the FBI may use a wiretap only in cases involving the national security (e.g., spies), threatening bodily harm (e.g., Murder, Inc.), or life and limb (e.g., kidnaping). But in each case the Attorney General must personally authorize the wiretap, and any prosecutions that develop as the result of overheard evidence may not introduce that evidence in any court of law.

Not knowing that technology would come around with sophisticated devices that would permit eavesdropping through the olive in a suspect's martini, Congress dealt exclusively with the wiretap. The FBI, however, has proceeded all along on the assumption that the rules governing the wiretap ought to regulate the use of the bug; i.e., the FBI has not taken advantage of the opening left by Congress. But this does not mean that Sen. KENNEDY failed to take advantage of that difference. Indeed, there are those who believe that that is exactly what the Senator did when asked whether he had authorized the Las Vegas "wiretap." No, he said—a technically correct answer inasmuch as there never had been a wiretap. It was a bug.

In the absence of an elucidation from the former Attorney General, one is left to speculate. It is reasonable to suppose that J. Edgar Hoover would not jeopardize his reputation or that of the FBI in pursuit of a felon in Las Vegas, and it is unreasonable to suppose that if asked permission to use the bug, Attorney General KENNEDY would have denied it, since he has never denied using the tap during his tenure.

Perhaps the Senator's memory is defective. Perhaps he sought refuge in the technicality. In due course the matter should be cleared up. One supposes that the FBI, which is a highly efficient organization, could, if absolutely necessary, prove that Attorney General KENNEDY had knowledge of the Las Vegas incident. One doubts it will come to that.

There is left a general issue of considerable importance. Reasonable folk agree that the FBI should utilize all technological inventions available to it in order to safeguard the national security and to frustrate the assassin or the kidnaper. The trouble is that once it sets up a bug, the FBI becomes a sort of omnium-gatherum, because the bug does not distinguish between conversation about how to steal a state secret, and conversation about how to make contact with a lady of easy virtue.

Inevitably, other branches of the Federal Government hunger to know whether the bug has picked up information of particular interest to it. For instance, Internal Revenue.

At the moment a petitioner, Fred Black Jr., has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn his conviction as a tax dodger on grounds that the prosecution had available to it information gleaned by an FBI bug. The Government has maintained that nothing got up by the bug was used in the Government's case. All very well. But the fact remains that the Attorney General authorized the transmission of FBI-bugged information to Internal Revenue, and that flouts the intent of the 1934 law.

One can hardly blame Mr. Hoover for the communication of the bugged information. He did only what his superior—once again, Attorney General KENNEDY—ordered. But surely a law should be passed, and one assumes the FBI would welcome it, to the effect that no information should be given to collateral divisions of the Government which is picked up by wire tap, unless it is necessary to prevent acts of violence.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, employment figures for the month of June show a heartening rise in the number of jobs held by teenagers. The more than 2 million youths who found jobs last month will be learning skills and accumulating earnings to help themselves and their families and in many cases, to enable the youths to return to school in the fall.

Part of this success can be traced to the Federal Government's efforts to encourage private industry, community organizations and public agencies to hire youths. The most outstanding of these efforts has been the Neighborhood Youth Corps program which put 575,000 youngsters to work in the past year.

Neighborhood Youth Corps is making it possible for young people who cannot afford to stay in school to continue on with their education by offering them part-time jobs. It helps those who have had to drop out of school to get a job and develop a useful and needed skill.

One small but highly significant project to develop such skills is being carried out by the Smithsonian Institution here

in Washington. Under a Neighborhood Youth Corps grant and in cooperation with Washington's United Planning Organization, the Smithsonian is training 40 youths in skills needed in museums and laboratories.

The Washington Post recently published an article about the program. This kind of project demonstrates that training of this kind is needed, can be used, and will offer many of our youngsters an exciting and rich future. I ask unanimous consent that the Post article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 31, 1966]

SMITHSONIAN OPERATES ANTIPOVERTY UNIT, Too

(By Stuart Auerbach)

A 19-year-old Washington girl whose horizons once stretched no farther than a clerical job bent over a microscope in a laboratory at the Smithsonian Institution and tossed out \$50 words that only a botanist could understand.

On another floor in the same building, several youths were making silk screen prints for some of the Smithsonian's new exhibits and two sisters were carving up a penguin with scalpels to prepare it for scientific study.

They are among 40 youths being trained in skills that are in great demand by museums and laboratories in a small but remarkably successful anti-poverty program.

STARTED LAST JULY

The program was started last July by S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Institution, under a Neighborhood Youth Corps grant and in cooperation with the United Planning Organization.

The Labor Department supplied funds for 26 youths to work at the Smithsonian. Trainees work 32 hours a week and earn \$1.25 an hour.

Many officials were dubious that the youths could fit into the Smithsonian's atmosphere.

Now, however, officials at both the Smithsonian and UPO are loud in praise of the program.

"Rather than bring these kids in and have them cut grass and pull weeds, we decided we would give them meaningful jobs," said Jack Whitelaw, who heads the program for the Smithsonian.

FEW DROP OUT

Most of the 26 who started at the Institution last July have graduated to other jobs as a result of their experience. Very few have dropped from the program.

"There is some kind of adhesive here that seems to hold people," said Don Regusters, coordinator of out-of-school programs for UPO who was counselor for the Smithsonian project.

The training given at the Smithsonian prepares the youths for jobs in other museums, store display departments and in scientific laboratories, Regusters said.

"It not only helps them find jobs," said Whitelaw, "it gives them a sense of working on something important. When they are ready to go out and get a job, they can offer references from some of the Nation's leading scientists. It's a bit different than giving the name of a couple of high school teachers."

RAISES ASPIRATION

Regusters called the Smithsonian program "the best in Washington" and said he knows of no equivalent in the United States.

"It raises the general aspiration level," he said. "Most kids never even knew these jobs existed."

Diana Newman, 19, who started with the program last July, hoped to work for the

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16755

In the position that the United States now occupies in the world we cannot know when a confrontation may occur. We cannot focus on any one particular period in the future. Rather, we must maintain the highest possible state of readiness now and over the long term.

I refer my colleagues to the magazine "Grumman Horizons," volume 6, No. 1, for 1966, which presents a complete outline of the submarine threat, our present efforts and future needs. We are dealing with survival—and there can be no greater priority in our defense posture.

CONGRESS SHOULD DENOUNCE POSSIBLE TRIAL OF AMERICAN AIRMEN IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, of grave concern to Members of Congress and, indeed, every American citizen is the news that U.S. military personnel are being help captive in Vietnam. It has been implied that the captured American airmen might be brought to trial by the Communist regime of North Vietnam. For this reason I have joined my colleagues in introducing a House concurrent resolution to make clear that the people of the United States condemn any trial, punishment, or execution of these servicemen.

Our strong and unwavering position in this matter must be forthrightly communicated to the leadership of North Vietnam and to the governments of foreign countries which lend aid and comfort to Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Unless the Communist regime of North Vietnam adheres to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, the accepted concepts of international law and standards of international behavior, the opportunity for achievement of a just and secure peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia will be diminished.

Therefore, every effort must be made to prevent Hanoi from undertaking inhumanitarian acts in connection with the captured American servicemen. It is my earnest desire that the Congress will take expeditious action to dramatize the conviction and concern of the American people in this crucial situation.

NEW YORK MEDICAID — "THE GREAT TREASURY ROBBERY OF 1966"

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

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter of June 24, 1966, I discussed the New York State Medicaid program. Since that time I have had numerous requests for copies and under unanimous consent I place it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Dear Friends: The total welfare state may be nearer than we think. A bulletin published by the Mount Sinai Hospital of New York announces that "for most New Yorkers,

the finest complete medical care is now free!" A note in the bulletin adds that:

"This is new and in addition to the Medicare Program of the Federal Government."

The bulletin goes into minute detail of how most New Yorkers "unless your income is considerably above the national average" will be entitled to the total cost of almost all medical care, services and supplies which will be "fully paid for by your state."

Any person of any age may apply under the new state law which the bulletin points out enacts a "dramatic change in the traditional relationships between patients, doctors, hospital and state." It also proclaims the (apparent) glad tidings that "from now on, you are financially responsible only for your wife or husband and children under 21 years old. You are no longer financially responsible for the medical expenses of your parents."

Also in the announcement was a breakdown of wage brackets and eligibility which extended to a family of six with a net income of \$8,550 and this was net income less Federal and state income taxes and health insurance premiums.

Actually, New York has had a very liberal state medical assistance program for some time, but has now lowered the eligibility requirements and added almost complete medical benefits including the cost of transportation necessary to obtain care and services.

Under provisions of the Medicare bill passed last year, the Federal government will pay a good part of the New York State program. Several other states have similar programs although none are as extensive as the New York plan. Other states have applied and, unless Congress plugs some loopholes in the Federal assistance provisions of the Medicare legislation, original estimates of the cost to the Treasury will have to be revised upward by more than \$500 million a year, and that could be only a start.

The New York plan does not completely socialize medicine, but leaves little to be done before those who must foot the bill will demand at least equal treatment. The expanded New York program alone will add something like \$100 million in Federal cost to the Medicare program. Other states are not likely to stand by and watch as New York drains the Treasury but will, as several already have, demand their shares.

Of course this plan is also costing the State of New York a tremendous amount in tax money in a state where taxes and more taxes seem to be the order of the day.

New York subway riders are subsidized by the state and city government and business and industry, including the New York Stock Exchange, threaten to leave the area if taxes continue to rise. But rather than providing necessary medical assistance to those who cannot afford to pay, New York law extends total benefits to millions who have an annual income of about three times what the President has set as the poverty level in the Great Society war on poverty.

The New York plan should be called the great Treasury robbery of 1966 and if adopted by other states could break the Treasury.

Sincerely,

JIM BATTIN.

FLEXIBLE LEAD-ZINC QUOTA BILL

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, for a good many years we have asked for, been promised, and still await a long-range minerals policy for our natural resource industries. In the meantime, an indus-

try in my State and one important to many States, the mining of lead and zinc, has suffered from rapidly changing cycles of price and supply caused by a lack of appropriate import controls. We have proposed to correct this with legislation but, to date, have had no encouragement from executive agencies.

Today I join with other interested colleagues in introducing a flexible lead-zinc import quota bill designed to serve as a deterrent should we again face the possibility of excessive imports. We do this as an action necessary while we await the enactment of a minerals policy by our Government.

The industry has operated during the last 1½ years at reasonable and stabilized prices that encouraged both production and consumption of both metals. We hope this continues but, with expansion of supplies abroad and particularly for zinc in Canada, we can see the need for a quota plan on the books now, to become effective when or if metal stocks in the United States reach abnormal levels. The bill we introduce today does this and has the active endorsement of essentially all the domestic mining and smelting industry. Furthermore, the legislation has a term of 5 years to give the Congress and the executive department an opportunity to examine the need for continuing the plan and also to assess its operation if called into action. I urge speedy consideration and approval to assure continuing stability of this important industry.

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) as granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

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

THE INDIANS' STAKE IN GRAND CANYON

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in a desperate effort to gain sympathy for their scheme to sacrifice the beauty of the Grand Canyon in exchange for two unnecessary and uneconomic hydroelectric projects, promoters of the central Arizona project have resorted to blue sky promises designed to attract the support of American Indians.

So far as substance is concerned, the picture as presented may as well have been etched on the shifting sands, and those of us who through the years have fought for better opportunities for our Indian friends are resentful of this tactic.

In response to the appeal, which included the generous offer to change the name of Bridge Canyon to Hualapai, Mr. George Rocha, chairman of the Hualapai Council, wrote an excellent letter based upon the information given to him by propagandists for the proposed dams. I include this letter, along with a reply from Mr. Jeffrey Ingram, Southwest rep-

16756

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 28, 1966

representative of the Sierra Club, in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to peruse the contents of both letters very carefully.

The letters follow:

HUALAPAI TRIBAL COUNCIL,
Peach Springs, Ariz., June 30, 1966.

DEAR FRIEND: My people have lived in isolation and poverty so long that we have almost forgotten how to hope for a better way. The progress and prosperity of the Nation have not touched our lives. Our world is the canyon country of the Colorado River in Arizona. There are no jobs for us. We have no business to run and no resources to sell, but now there is a new hope for us. I will tell you about it because we need your help to make the dreams of my people come true.

The Congress of the United States has a bill before it to build a dam on the Colorado River in Bridge Canyon, a part of our Reservation. It will be called Hualapai Dam and it will make a beautiful lake in our canyon, far removed from the Grand Canyon National Park. A good road will be built from Peach Springs to the lake. Thousands of people will come to take boat rides on the lake and to fish in it, and we plan to make a fine place for them to stay and to sell them the supplies they will need. This will make jobs and business for us and we will not be a poor and forgotten people any longer. The dam and the lake and the road across our Reservation are the only hope we have of ever being able to help ourselves out of our ancient misery into a better life and into the main stream of our Great America.

All we ask you to do if you want to help us is to write a letter to your Congressmen and ask them to vote "Yes" for Hualapai Dam. It is in a Bill called H.R. 4671—The Colorado River Basin Project Act.

We need your help now.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROCHA,
Chairman.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
July 8, 1966.

Mr. GEORGE ROCHA,
Chairman, Hualapai Tribal Council,
Peach Springs, Ariz.

DEAR MR. ROCHA: Your recent letter has touched me and many others in the Sierra Club deeply. I feel that you should know of what we believe to be our basic agreement.

We are both concerned about people; we are both moved by a reverence for the land, and a belief that man loses contact with the natural world at the peril of his spiritual health. It is quite possible that the Indians in the Southwest have much to teach Americans in general about this belief. The Taos Pueblo in its effort to regain title of its sacred land around Blue Lake, the Navajos in their determination to open their land without lowering its value, the White Mountain Apaches in their decision to devote a section of their reservation to wilderness; these are current examples of the way that the Southwestern Indians have demonstrated, in the midst of a world too often devoted to short-term gain, their hope that the land and the people can mutually benefit each other.

The Sierra Club holds this hope firmly: The land can be enhanced by the love of people who respect it; people can be refreshed by land which has not been wounded or scarred for limited purposes.

In this particular case, I do not believe our conflict to be basic. The condition of your tribe as you describe it is deplorable. It is shameful that those who knew of your plight and might have helped you in past years turned their faces away from you. I sincerely hope that those who rush in with their help now have more than their own ends in view.

I do wish that the National Park for the Grand Canyon could originally have included the whole of the Canyon. As you know, the

Peach Springs-Diamond Creek Canyon was once a mecca for visitors to the Canyon before the South Rim was chosen for full development. What a difference it would have made to your people if instead of closing off the lower part of the Grand Canyon, the Federal Government had opened it up back in 1920.

That is a lost opportunity; now there is a new one—the hope that you can benefit from the construction of Hualapai Bridge Canyon dam & reservoir. But this new opportunity is hollow. Hollow because by destroying part of a unique piece of Creation, the dam will be destructive of those spiritual values that, as you know so well, can come only from land which affords peace and the chance for man to conceive of his wholeness. You above all must feel that since recreation in the reservoir will be in motorboats, that their mechanical racket in that narrow gorge will cut off forever the chance to enjoy the quiet of the Canyon & the chance to enjoy the sounds that are natural to it. Surely you must know, with your long history in the region, how foolish it would be to sacrifice that part of the inner gorge, when in only about a century—a moment to your tribe—the reservoir area will be silted in, becoming a phreatophyte jungle. Thus would all people be deprived of opportunity to know this land as it should be.

Let me emphasize my anger at the shoddy treatment you have received up to this point. Let me also strongly state that I believe that both your tribe and the Canyon can be saved, and therefore I urge, in the name of all the people—who need this piece of undefiled land—that we work together. I believe that your entranceway to the Canyon need not be spoiled for you and all other Americans to benefit from it. I therefore ask you to turn away from those who tell you that this destructive, unnecessary project will help you; to realize that these are the same people who ignored you for so long; to turn to the Canyon itself, which if it is left unimpaired, can forever be a tangible resource for your people and a spiritual resource for all people.

JEFFREY INGRAM,

Southwest Representative, Sierra Club.

URGENCY AT TOCKS ISLAND

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress approved the establishment of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, commonly referred to as Tocks Island, which is the first national park to be established east of the Mississippi River.

The approval of this park has touched off a land speculation war among developers which is most regrettable since they are fully aware of the Federal Government's intention to acquire the entire area for creation of the new park.

Plans to develop the area have been widely publicized, and maps showing the boundaries of the park and the area of the dam to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers are available to all concerned.

Unfortunately, these park plans seem to have given impetus to some real estate men and land developers eager to make a "fast buck" at Uncle Sam's expense, knowing full well that it will take 6 to 10 years for the Federal Government to complete acquisition of the land involved.

They are pushing ahead with development plans, subdividing more land than their sales warrant, in preparation for the time that they will be able to demand a higher price from the Federal Government.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an article pointing out the problem evolving out of the delay in obtaining the necessary funds for acquisition of lands for the park. Also, the Sunday Star-Ledger of Newark, N.J., has expressed concern about making Tocks Island a paradise for promoters. These articles are included as a part of my remarks and I commend them to you for careful reading.

In an effort to ease this situation, I have introduced a bill which would permit the Delaware River Basin Commission, being composed of representatives from the States of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, to enter into a contract with the Department of the Interior, to advance funds to the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of expediting land acquisition at Tocks Island, which would be repaid to the Commission from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act over a period of years.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will consider this bill, H.R. 15193, prior to the adjournment of this Congress.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

COSTLY PLAYGROUNDS—DEVELOPERS DRIVE UP PRICE OF LAND PICKED FOR NEW NATIONAL PARKS—FUNDS NOW AUTHORIZED LIKELY TO FALL SHORT; REAL ESTATE MEN CALL U.S. PLANS VAGUE—SUBDIVISIONS AT TOCKS ISLAND

(By Douglas Bedell)

WALLPAC CENTER, N.J.—This sylvan community is at the heart of an area that is scheduled to become a national park within easy reach of 30 million Eastern seaboard residents. Officially designated the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area but commonly called Tocks Island, the park will embrace 72,000 acres of lakes, forests and hills. It will offer city dwellers swimming, boating, trout fishing, camping, hiking and glimpses of white-tailed deer, beaver and raccoon.

Pay a visit here today, however, and you would never know a national park was in the making. Up on nearby Blue Ridge Mountain, within the boundaries of the planned park, private developers are bulldozing a new road and clearing homesites. A hemlock swamp, envisioned by park planners as the climax of a hiking trail, has just been drained as the basin for a lake for the use of cottage owners. Salesmen are peddling choice lakefront lots in the growing summer colony of Blue Mountain Lakes for \$5,500 each, and the developers are registering new blocks of subdivisions with the Wallpack township clerk.

All this activity is causing frustration and deep concern in Washington. While Federal planners have picked sites for a series of new recreation areas near urban centers to round out the national park system, funds for land acquisition have been slow in coming.

PRESIDENT ACTS

Meanwhile, speculation and continued development of the very acreage the Government hopes to buy have become so extensive that U.S. officials fear rapidly rising costs may force cutbacks in plans for the parks unless a lid can be put on prices or the Government can move faster to buy the park-

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16767

fended the desecration of the American flag. In an article in yesterday's New York Times which I am including with these remarks, the ACLU is reported to have defended flag burning as "a constitutionally protected activity" akin to sit-ins and other forms of civil disobedience. As if to reach for a straw in the manner of the proverbial drowning man, the ACLU spoke out of the side of its mouth and said, in effect, "After all, the law provides that old flags shall be destroyed in a dignified way."

What contempt for our flag and our Nation? It is unconscionable that anyone except Communist sympathizers and those who would destroy our Nation should advocate a theory that it is a proper means of protest to desecrate the stars and stripes. The ACLU adds one more footnote to a history which already is full of questionable chapters.

It is groups like the ACLU which gives a rationale to those who advocate disobedience, rioting and contempt for authority. I wonder where they will ever draw the line. One of these days they will be telling us that academic freedom includes the right of indecent exposure in the classroom. Their questionable position is in totally bad taste, Mr. Speaker, and I strenuously object to their views. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court will probably uphold their twisted, wierd theory which they propound in this offensive unpatriotic and despicable beatnik-type protest.

The article in the Times indicates the immediate need for the Congress to act. I am joining many of my colleagues in signing the discharge petition offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH]. His bill would make the desecration of the flag a crime and I have introduced a companion bill on this same subject. It is high time we call a halt to these people who flaunt law and order by desecrating its symbol, old glory.

The article from the Times follows:

**BURNING OF FLAG IS DEFENDED HERE—BUT
ACLU FAILS TO SWAY COURT ON CIVIL-
RIGHTS ISSUE**

(By David Anderson)

The New York Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union contended yesterday in a Brooklyn courtroom that burning an American flag on a street corner could be "a most practical and effective way" to demonstrate for civil rights.

Flag-burning, it was argued, is "a constitutionally protected activity" akin to sit-ins and other forms of civil disobedience. Furthermore, the organization asserted, the law provides that old flags "shall be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning."

On trial before Judge Ludwig Glowa in Criminal Court was Sidney Street, a 47-year-old bus driver who won the Bronze Star in World War II. Defending him was David T. Goldstick of the Civil Liberties Union. Here is the story, as was given in court:

Last June 6 Mr. Street was sitting in his home at 309 Lafayette Avenue, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, listening to the radio. Suddenly there came the news that James Meredith, the Negro who was leading a civil-rights march, had been shot in Mississippi.

BONFIRE IN THE STREET

Outraged, Mr. Street took the 48-star American flag that had covered the coffin of

his father-in-law, Fernandez Decora, a World War I veteran, at his funeral 20 years ago, and on the corner of Lafayette Avenue and St. James Place, Mr. Street lit a bonfire of newspapers topped with the flag.

Patrolman James Copeland drove up in a squad car around 7 P.M. and demanded: "What the hell's going on here?"

"If they did that to Meredith," Mr. Street replied, "we don't need an American flag." Mr. Street was arrested and charged with malicious mischief and disorderly conduct.

Mr. Goldstick, the lawyer, said to the court: "This man was enjoying a constitutionally protected activity to be equated with civil rights protests. He adopted a most practical and effective way of calling attention to a very grievous deed. It was no act of desecration; he did not defile the flag but burned it with all dignity, not contempt."

Mr. Street, the defense said, was "engaged in symbolic speech, protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution." According to the Civil Liberties Union, this is the first prosecution in New York under a Penal Law provision, enacted in 1892, prohibiting public mutilation of the flag.

Judge Glowa found Mr. Street guilty on the malicious-mischief charge, but dismissed the disorderly-conduct count because everyone agreed that the few people who had witnessed the flag-burning paid it little heed. Mr. Street, who could receive the maximum penalty of \$500 and three years in prison, will be sentenced Aug. 9. The Civil Liberties Union said it would appeal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MILITARY PERSONNEL HELD CAP- TIVE IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently urged the President and the Congress to maintain a "stern cool" in the crisis created by the threat of Hanoi to try American pilots as war criminals. In order that Hanoi may fully appreciate the impact of the trials of American fliers on public opinion, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution stating that our military personnel held captive in Vietnam are prisoners of war entitled to all the benefits of the Geneva Convention of 1949, and that the trial, punishment, or execution of these prisoners by the

Communists would seriously diminish the opportunity for achievement of a just and secure peace in Vietnam, which is the objective of our Nation.

We should not take any action, however, that is not carefully considered to be in the best interest of the United States, regardless of the trials. If it is not sound policy to step up the bombing of North Vietnam, we should not let ourselves be stampeded into unwise action. If it is sound policy, we should do it anyway.

I was delighted to have the President's reassurance the other day that enemy provocations have not driven our Government to such frustration that major decisions affecting the war might be made in haste and passion. The Baltimore Sun has commented on the President's statement in the thoughtful editorial which follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
July 22, 1966]

PRESS CONFERENCE

The value of the presidential press conference, not of the impromptu sort but on a rather formal basis, was well demonstrated in Mr. Johnson's meeting with the press, and through television with the country, on Wednesday afternoon. The President called this gathering at a moment when the nation was much agitated over the issue of the American fliers held captive by the North Vietnamese, and was fearful and uncertain as to what might happen next. Also part of the background were Mr. Johnson's speeches of three weeks ago in Omaha and Des Moines, which had seemed to some to suggest that the United States, in a change of policy, had decided to seek a military solution in Vietnam. It was a moment when the country needed information, and reassurance.

These the President provided, with the information that in the face of great difficulties our policy remains the same, and with reassurance that severe enemy provocations had not driven our Government to such a degree of frustration that major and perhaps irrevocable decisions might be made hastily and in passion. The President's demonstration of the profound concern we all share and at the same time of the thoughtful steadiness his office calls for especially at the hardest times was healthy for the country, and helpful to the press and to our friends elsewhere in the world. We venture to believe that Mr. Johnson for his part may have found the exchanges of this meeting useful.

DOMENIC ANNOTTI

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Rhode Islander recently ran a feature article concerning one of the young men and women of this Nation who is making a major contribution to the war on poverty. This young man comes from my district and I have personally known him for many years.

His name is Domenic Annotti, and he is a 27-year-old former marine from Providence, who is now spending a year of his life in service to Americans. In fact, he is helping some of the most deprived and isolated Americans in the Nation—the Alaskans who live in Emmonak.

In an article by Douglas R. Riggs which appeared in the Providence Journal, it was pointed out that selling refrigerators to the Eskimos is no joke, for that is exactly what young Don Annotti is doing. He is trying to build a cold storage plant which will enable the people of this small village to preserve their fish so that they can sell them at the peak of the season.

Don Annotti is typical of the VISTA volunteers who have chosen to spend a year of their lives helping those who are in need: those who are termed economically impoverished, but whom I choose to call poor. Today, there are 13 men and women from Rhode Island who have dedicated a year of their lives to serving their fellow Americans. They range in age from 19 to 74, and are serving in all the major areas of poverty in this country. One serves in Alaska. Another in an Appalachian hollow. These men and women of Rhode Island are working and living in migrant camps and on Indian reservations in the Far West.

Rhode Island also benefits from the work of VISTA volunteers. Jack Donovan, one of the volunteers who worked with the poor in Providence was so successful that when he finished his service he was hired by Rhode Island University to supervise an antipoverty project.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that these persons who serve in VISTA for a minimum financial reward are the unsung heroes of the war on poverty. They go where they are needed to serve those in need. Their return is an immense amount of personal satisfaction.

I am proud that a former marine from my State, a personal friend of mine, has chosen to devote yet another year of his life to the service of his country. His story deserves wide attention because it is the story of VISTA. It is a story which contains the essence of the war on poverty—of helping those in need to help themselves:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal,
July 24, 1966]

VISTA COMES TO EMMONAK—DON'S MOTHER
WONDERS: WILL HE EVER COME HOME?

(By Douglas R. Riggs)

What is a 26-year-old ex-Marine from Providence doing in Emmonak, Alaska (pop. 400) this summer? Why, building a refrigeration plant for the Eskimos, of course.

That old canard about selling refrigerators to the Eskimos is no joke to Domenic Annotti, son of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Annotti of Providence, and the three other VISTA volunteers in Emmonak. Nor to the Eskimos, who desperately need refrigeration equipment to keep the fish they catch in June from spoiling before they can get them to a cannery. And it's no gag to the U.S. government, which is footing 80 per cent of the equipment's cost, nor to VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America), which is sponsoring the whole project.

According to reports reaching Rhode Island from Emmonak and VISTA headquarters in Washington, D.C., Don (everyone calls him that) not only enjoys what he is doing but has fit in so well with village life that his mother, an employe of the state Board of Elections who lives at 443 River Avenue, is beginning to wonder if he will ever come back. Actually, according to a recent letter to the *Sunday Journal*, Don's plans are to remain in Emmonak during the summer months, even though his year's tour with

VISTA is up, to supervise completion of the \$100,000 refrigeration plant and electric generator.

His letter started out in a coffee can, Emmonak's only post office. The weather was good, so a plane was able to land on the frozen Yukon River and pick it up, delivering it to Nome and thence to "Outside" (Alaskans' word for the Lower 48—or anywhere else, for that matter). Nome is about half an hour away by plane in good weather. In bad weather, it might as well be a million miles away.

Alaska, which never did quite live up to its myths, has undergone vast changes in the last several years. Not only do Eskimos have refrigerators, but there are more than 500 air conditioned homes in the state—and why not, when the summertime temperature sometimes soars into the nineties?

But Emmonak, a virtually all-Eskimo village on a spur of land jutting into the Yukon River, hasn't seen much of this change. Igloos, are no longer found there, but the best of the one-room wooden shacks in which most of the natives live probably would be condemned under any number of minimum housing regulations found in most American cities. Emmonak is a city, the natives insist, with a general store, city council and all. But plumbing of any kind is virtually unknown. It has some electric power, but when the VISTA team tried to show slides while a film was playing at the town's only movie house, they overloaded the generator.

The new generating plant will augment the supply, and the new refrigeration plant is expected to augment the Eskimos' incomes, which average about \$1,500 during the month of June, virtually nothing the rest of the year. June is when the King Salmon run up the Yukon and Emmonak's one industry—fishing goes into high gear. The rest of the year the Eskimos hunt, trap, haul logs for fuel across miles of ice and snow, and generally do what Eskimos have done for generations, living off the almost-barren land and the money they made in June.

Don Annotti and his three VISTA companions (another young man and two girls) are helping to change the pattern of community life in Emmonak, even as they become a part of it. The Eskimos get a low price for their fish, and the prices they pay for goods are "outrageous," according to Don. Much of the catch, furthermore, is lost due to spoilage. The new freezing plant is expected to change all that. "That way we won't have the spoilage and waste and we'll be able to get higher prices by cutting out the middle man and selling directly to canneries," Don said.

His use of the word "we" is no pose. Bundled in his fur-trimmed parka and mukluks (knee-high seal skin boots), he often goes on hunting, fishing and logging expeditions with the Eskimos at their invitation, and pitches in whenever anything needs doing.

"Don has the personality," said one of his VISTA companions. "Everyone in Emmonak comes to him. The Eskimos love his sense of humor and a great rapport has sprung up." The Eskimos even invited him to dance in their *luknok*, a traditional dancing contest given for a neighboring village. "If we have a *gussick* (white man) dancing for us, we can't lose," they explained. Don has become proficient in the stylized dances performed to the rhythmic beat of Eskimo drums.

Don and Carl Berger, the other male member of the team, spearheaded the building of a community saw mill as one of their first projects. "It was all there, the saw, everything. Had been for a year," Don said. "We just started building it. Pretty soon everyone pitched in to help." The VISTA men made their dining room table from the saw's packing crate. The two VISTA girls, meanwhile, set up a Head Start program for pre-

school Eskimo children and an adult education program for their parents, along with other community activities.

Don and Carl share a cramped trailer and join the two girls in their cottage for meals. Their living quarters are nearly as Spartan as those of the Eskimos. Likewise their menu: homemade bread and fish for the most part, with an occasional rabbit, seal or walrus steak, leavened with packages from home and as much store-bought food as their financial resources and transportation will allow.

Transportation, in descending order of reliability, is by foot, dog sled, skidoo (a motorized dog sled), motor boat (during the summer) and airplane, weather permitting. Often, the weather doesn't permit anything at all.

Mrs. Joan Larson, a community relations official at VISTA headquarters in Washington, from whom much of the information in this article came, was "weathered in" at Emmonak for four days during a tour of several of the 30 VISTA outposts in Alaska earlier this year. The Yukon River is the only airstrip: the bush planes, which drop in once or twice a week in good weather, can land on either water or ice. But when the ice breaks up during the spring thaw, there is a period of about three weeks when no planes can land. The flight schedule may also be interrupted (and frequently is) by rain, snow or fog. Temperatures in the winter go down to 40 or 50 degrees below zero.

Don never dreamed he'd be heading for Alaska when he joined VISTA: he was supposed to work in the slums of Chicago. He joined the domestic Peace Corps last June, after a three-year hitch in the Marines and a year at Hartford University. (He had a scholarship to Providence College when he graduated from La Salle Academy, and went there for a year, but left to join the Marines at the age of 18.) But when they asked him to go to Alaska, Don said sure, if that's where they wanted him. In the Marines, he was stationed in Hawaii. Going from there to Alaska was "a pretty cold transition," as his mother put it.

But he seems to have no regrets. He was interested in social work, his mother reported, so when he felt he wasn't getting anywhere in college, joining VISTA seemed the natural thing to do. "This suits me," Don said. "I like these people. They're good, honest and intelligent. They're not complex. They're eager to please." He also spoke admiringly of the Eskimos' ability with their hands.

According to his mother, Don is no slouch in that department himself. He was a radar technician in the Marines, and between his schooling and hitch in the service he worked at various trades, from landscaping, stone wall and cesspool building to short order cook, turret lathe operator and surveyor. Once in VISTA, his skills were sharpened by six weeks of intensive training at the University of Alaska and Fort Yukon. He learned the basics of the Eskimo language there and is picking up more all the time from the villagers. Several of the Eskimos knew English already, and others are learning it from the VISTA team.

VISTA is winding up its first year in the 49th state with 60 volunteers, some of them working alone in villages even smaller than Emmonak. The state has now requested 200 volunteers, and it looks as though Don will still be there when the new group comes in. His mother wants him to come back and finish college. But thoughts of college seem far from his mind when Don starts talking: "We get into the homes of these people and get to know them and their problems. That's what VISTA really is." And that's why Don Annotti is building a refrigerator for the Eskimos this summer.

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16771

paratory to a determination of specific changes in existing wage rates.

The bill which I have submitted would assure these employees uniformity in various differentials as well as in basic wage rates. It would provide for uniform application of the night differential, the differential for hazardous duties, the differential for holiday work as well as the overtime rate of 1½ times the basic rate for work in excess of 8 hours in any one day. I believe the enactment of this bill would be the most progressive forward step made by the Government since it authorized the fixing of wage rates in the navy yards as long ago as 1862.

PEACE IN ASIA

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

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker the Atlanta Constitution reviews editorially President Johnson's policy for peace on Asia and concludes that he has clarified an evolving policy toward Red China aimed at ending the isolation of its 700 million people.

In the words of the newspaper:

He has pointed the way to peace in a forthright expression of this country's national will.

If the Red Chinese accept, the Constitution believes, they could indeed open the door to lasting peace in Asia.

I include the editorial in the RECORD:

LASTING PEACE IN ASIA

President Johnson has spelled out a four-point policy for peace in Asia, combining U.S. commitment against aggression there with a continuing effort for improved relations with Red China. Such overtures have been rejected in the past but the President is trying to open a door looking to an end of Peking's isolation and Red China's paranoid tendencies.

"The peace we seek in Asia," the President declared in a speech Tuesday night to the American Alumni Council, "is a peace of conciliation. Communists in Asia still believe in force to achieve their goals and the United States, as a Pacific power, will not retreat from the obligations of freedom and security in Asia" and particularly in Viet Nam.

His proposals for achieving lasting peace in Asia included international trade, the free flow of people and ideas, the full participation of all nations in an international community and a common dedication to human progress and development.

A peaceful mainland China is central to a peaceful Asia, the President declared, and Peking must be discouraged from aggressive hostility and encouraged toward peaceful cooperation with others. He cited U.S. efforts to open up travel between the United States and mainland China—efforts which so far have been unsuccessful. He will continue such initiatives in spite of rebuffs.

Referring to the U.S. effort in Viet Nam as part of the four essentials he cited for peace in Asia, he said our purpose there is "to prove to aggressive nations that the use of force to conquer others is a losing game." His other three points were:

"The determination of the United States to meet our obligations in Asia as a Pacific power, . . . the building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia" and "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies."

The President thus has clarified an evolving policy toward Red China aimed at ending the isolation of the country's 700 million people from the outside world. He has pointed the way to peace in a forthright expression of this country's national will. Acceptance by the Red Chinese could indeed open the door to lasting peace in Asia.

APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

(Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. REES) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include tables.)

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

WATCH THOSE INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the current period of high interest rates is causing serious dislocations in our economy.

One of the results of the rising interest rates has been to divert funds from savings banks and savings and loan associations to commercial banks or to other forms of investment. As a result of this flow, the institutions which normally provide money for the homebuilding industry are discovering that their deposits which provide the funds for lending are sharply reduced from last year. The results of this policy have already been seen in the movement of loaned money from home mortgage to short-term and commercial loans.

This heating of the economy must be met on many fronts. There must be determination to control spending on the part of the Congress, there must be restraint in the appropriation requests on the part of the executive branch, and there must be a broad national policy to discourage abnormal threats to the stability of the economy.

In addition, the Congress can and should take prompt action by legislation to redress the balance between commercial and savings institutions and keep their dual operation functioning efficiently without undue discrimination. In this way the housing industry can continue to provide employment and economic activity, as well as furnish the necessary homes for our growing population.

I urge the House Committee on Banking and Currency to take prompt action to deal effectively with this problem.

RUBBER FOOTWEAR DEVELOPMENTS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the meeting of the New England delegation which convened on May 24 to formulate plans for action on the Treasury Department's recent reduction of the

tariff on rubber-soled footwear imports, several important steps have been taken in pursuit of this objective.

As chairman of the committee which was appointed to coordinate House and Senate efforts in this matter, I am pleased to inform the Members of this body that our committee members have been joined by other Members of Congress in our response to the Treasury Department action.

Through the committee, we were able to mobilize substantial congressional participation and representation at the June 8 Tariff Commission hearings on the American selling price system of tariff evaluation of rubber-soled footwear. At this hearing, through the testimony and statements of Senators PELL and EDWARD KENNEDY, and Representative BOLAND, as well as my own, the economic consequences of the tariff change were firmly presented to the Commission.

Immediately following this hearing, on June 9, the committee called for discussion with Assistant Secretary of the Treasury True Davis, Commissioner of Customs Lester D. Johnson, and Mr. Edwin F. Rains of the Customs Bureau, and requested administrative restoration of the original tariff.

The presence at this meeting of 14 Members and their representatives from a cross section of New England and Midwestern States including Representatives BATES, BURKE, O'NEILL, FOGARTY, MONAGAN, Senator RIBICOFF, and representatives of Speaker McCORMACK, Senators EDWARD KENNEDY, MUSKIE, and SALTONSTALL, and Representatives MORSE, THOMPSON of Wisconsin, and ADAIR emphasized the importance of this issue to the Congress.

It should be noted that a complaint against the new appraisal procedure has been made to the Customs Bureau by nine of the major footwear firms, and the Commissioner of Customs has assured the committee that in this proceeding a thorough reexamination of the Bureau's previous decision will be made and the points made by the Committee will be considered.

In addition to these measures, we have sent to the President the letter proposed by Senator RIBICOFF and signed by 37 Members, protesting the Treasury Department's unilateral tariff reduction and emphasizing the threat that this action poses to the domestic footwear industry and its workers.

We have recently received a reply to this letter from Secretary Fowler on behalf of the President which raises some doubt that administrative relief from the Treasury Department's decision will be forthcoming and from it the inference may be drawn that corrective legislation or judicial relief may be necessary. Having noted the disregard of the Treasury Department for the evidence of the actual and potential impact of increased imports and the dismissal of this argument by the Department as "not persuasive," it is difficult not to conclude that legislative action will provide the only practical solution of this problem.

Many members of the committee and other Members of Congress have sponsored legislation identical to my bill, H.R. 12983, which would reverse the

16772

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 28, 1966

Treasury Department's decision. This legislation is pending before the Ways and Means Committee and we have made and will continue to make organized attempts to bring these bills to a hearing.

Also, Chairman DENT of the General Subcommittee on Labor has planned to schedule hearings next month on the impact of imports on American industry and employment.

Although the task we have undertaken is a difficult one, the broad support that our efforts have received from workers and management of the industry has been rewarding and greatly encouraging. As an example of the enthusiastic approval the committee's labors have received, I offer the following letters of interested parties and a resolution adopted by District No. 2 of the United Rubber Workers for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.,
Naugatuck, Conn., July 25, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Room 1314, Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks for the work you are doing on our fabric shoe tariff problem. We at the Naugatuck Footwear Plant know that this has taken a great amount of time and effort on your part, and I am certain that without your interest and the interest of Senators DODD and RIBICOFF and others, there would be very little hope for eventual success. I was particularly impressed with the work that you did as a result of the meeting with the New England Congressional Delegation and although there have been no tangible results as yet, I hope that something beneficial will come of this.

Your activity on our behalf in this matter convinces me that our district is very well represented in Congress.

Very truly yours,

P. G. BROWN,
Factory Manager.

UNITED RUBBER, CORK, LINOLEUM,
AND PLASTIC WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Akron, Ohio, June 15, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: I want to extend to you my thanks and deep appreciation for the extensive effort you have put forth to protect domestic rubber footwear jobs through continuation of a fair tariff practice. Although this matter can affect your own State, much is at stake in other areas of the country.

As President of the United Rubber Workers International Union I am greatly concerned about this matter. I intend to keep in personal contact with it and devote personal attention to it where necessary.

I have made our position very clear in opposing the change in tariff structure and it is certainly encouraging to have the support of someone like yourself in this matter.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE BURDON,
International President.

B. F. GOODRICH FOOTWEAR CO.,
Watertown, Mass., March 25, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: The management and employees of the B. F. Goodrich Footwear Company and Federal Local No. 21914, AFL-CIO wishes to express their appreciation for your efforts in our behalf by submission of H.R. 12983, a bill to amend

the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics.

We are wholeheartedly in favor of this legislation and hereby offer to help you in your efforts to pass the bill.

Please do not hesitate to call on us if we can be of service to you.

Thank you and kindest regards.

WILLIAM R. WARD,

Manager, Trade and Community Relations.

UNITED RUBBER, CORK, LINOLEUM
AND PLASTIC WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Akron, Ohio, June 16, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: May I express sincere appreciation for your efforts to assure the job security of rubber footwear workers in the State of Connecticut.

Your appearance before the United States Tariff Commission on June 8 aided substantially our efforts to convince the Commission that the domestic rubber-soled footwear industry has already been adversely affected by mounting imports of foreign-made shoes.

We are well aware of the yeoman efforts which you and a number of your colleagues in the House have made to secure, by legislative action, a rescission of the Treasury Department's recent cut in the effective rate of the tariff on imported footwear.

Be assured of the continued support of the United Rubber Workers for the leadership which you have demonstrated in attempting to resolve a problem vital to all of us.

Very truly yours,

P. BOMMARITO,
International Vice President.

BRISTOL MANUFACTURING CORP.,
Bristol, R.I., June 6, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MR. DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: We appreciate very much your letter of May 27, 1966 to which you attached a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1966 outlining your remarks on the subject of reduction of tariff on imported rubber-soled canvas footwear.

This letter also included the notice of the June 8 hearing by the U.S. Tariff Commission and the minutes of the meeting of May 24, 1966 called by Speaker McCORMACK.

It is our intention to be represented at the Tariff Commission hearing and hope that this hearing will result in rates of duty that will protect our industry.

We are appreciative of the support you gave us and our industry at the meeting of May 24, 1966 and in Congress by your H.R. 12983 that rescind the Customers Bureau's recent reduction on imported rubber-soled canvas footwear.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. SOUSA.

THE NAUGATUCK COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Naugatuck, Conn., March 2, 1966.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: We wish to advise you that at the March 1 meeting of the Executive Committee of the Naugatuck Council of Churches a resolution was adopted expressing support for the legislation which you introduced in Congress last week calling for retention of higher tariffs on imported rubber soled-canvas footwear. It is our earnest hope that this bill will be passed.

Very truly yours,

E. M. WADELICH,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION No. 7, URW DISTRICT No. 2
COUNCIL MEETING, APRIL 23, 1966, BOSTON,
MASS., ON TARIFF DUTY ON IMPORTED RUBBER-SOLED FOOTWEAR

Whereas: The approach of the AFL-CIO to the participation of the United States in Foreign Trade, and to the inevitable problem of competition of imports with domestically produced goods, has been to support, on the one hand, the maximum flow of goods between countries via Foreign Trade—while insisting, at the same time, that those industries and those workers adversely affected by foreign imports be protected via tariff duties and import quotas, and/or via government subsidy or retraining and displacement allowances; and

Whereas: Imports of rubber-soled footwear with canvass or fabric uppers began to enter the American domestic market in increasing numbers in the decade following World War II—and in recent years have risen to the point where such imports now command a substantial segment of the domestic market (particularly at the low end of the price scale); and

Whereas: Such imports of rubber-soled footwear have adversely affected both present and future employment opportunities for United Rubber Worker Members—and members of sister AFL-CIO Unions—engaged in the domestic production of rubber-soled footwear. Foreign competition at low wage levels is particularly severe in the case of rubber-soled footwear, because of the relatively high labor content of such production which is approximately 45%; and

Whereas: Imports of rubber-soled footwear continued to inundate the American domestic market in spite of tariff duties imposed on the basis of the highest American Selling Price for a comparable domestically produced shoe; and

Whereas: The unilateral action of the Bureau of Customs of the U.S. Treasury Department, in February, 1966, in effectively reducing the tariff on imported rubber-soled footwear by 20-25%, by establishing the American Selling Price basis for valuation of such imports on the lowest-priced comparable domestic shoe—compounded by making such reduction retroactive for three years—can only result in even more serious effects on the market for domestically produced footwear—and, therefore, on the job security of United Rubber Workers and other AFL-CIO members. The effect of this change has been to establish non-union shoes, purchased by low paid American workers, as a basis for levying the tariff on imported shoes. This is a further and flagrant affront to the American Labor Movement and to its union label problem, geared to encouraging the purchase of products made under decent wages and working conditions; and

Whereas: The announcement by a responsible spokesman for the American negotiating group, which will go to Geneva this spring for the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations under General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), indicating that the American Selling Price basis for valuation of imports is subject to negotiation during the Geneva meetings, can only lead to a further reduction in the tariff duties on imported rubber-soled footwear; and

Whereas: Congressman JOHN MONAGAN (D-Conn.) has introduced a bill in the United States House of Representatives (the bill, H.R. 12983, is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee) whose purpose is to reverse—by legislative action of the Congress—the decision of the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Customs. This bill would re-establish the use of the highest comparable American Selling Price as a basis for valuation of imported rubber-soled footwear. We note with appreciation the bills introduced by other friendly Congressmen to accomplish this same purpose,

July 28, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3991

and mailers on the ZIP code program, and it is most gratifying to find such cooperation among a major mail user organization.

IRS and the Grand Canyon**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, action by the Internal Revenue Service has threatened to block exposition of conversation groups' views on the proposed Grand Canyon dams.

The appearance early this week of an advertisement in the New York Times, sponsored by the Sierra Club and presenting the reasons for the club's opposition to the Grand Canyon dams, is an encouraging sign.

Discriminatory action by the Internal Revenue Service has failed to stop the defense of Grand Canyon, and I am glad of it.

An editorial in the Idaho Statesman of June 14, 1966, raises the question of whether the IRS action may result, in effect, in taxation of free speech:

THE "CLUB" OVER TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

A provision in the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to tax-exempt organizations prohibits such groups from attempting to influence legislation. If they take political action, the Internal Revenue Service is charged with enforcing the law and withdrawing the tax-exemption status.

It is assumed that federal agents investigate organizations before granting such status in the first place. However, the procedures they entertain in removing organizations from tax-exempt classifications may be questionable.

As an example, the Sierra Club, a California-based organization which promotes studies and programs on preservation of wilderness and national scenic monuments, has a public record of intervening in conservation acts, such as wilderness, wild rivers, sea-shore, redwood forest preservation and preventing damage to certain national scenic monuments.

Last Thursday, the club placed ads in the New York Times and Washington Post, recruiting public opposition to the construction of two federal reclamation dams in the Grand Canyon as now proposed in Congress. Twenty-four hours later the Internal Revenue Service issued a summons to the club declaring its advertising was an attempt to influence Congress. Thus the club is to lose its tax-exempt status, unless a hearing produces a different interpretation.

There is no intent here to argue the pros or cons of the Sierra Club's stand on the Grand Canyon project.

But if the IRS grants tax-exemption, knowing the purpose of an organization—religious, charitable, public service, political, business or conservation—is to comment and stir opinion on public issues, has the government the right to take away such a status because of influential and capricious complaints from opposing interests.

The law must not be enforced by "shotgun" tactics.

Most prized in this nation is the ability of the people to speak out and organize to protest or support various actions of government.

This is the service the Sierra Club and other foundations perform. If the IRS holds a club over their activities and threatens, possibly the law should be changed to provide that a modest tax be imposed. If any organization operates commercially in competition with private business or holds income property, then it should be taxed in a comparable manner to assessment of private interests.

As it is now, the IRS code can be unjustly enforced on groups which have taken position on public matters, while allowing other organizations to continue without punishment.

Congress should inquire into the intent of the tax-exempt law and whether it is being administered fairly or not, or whether free speech is being taxed.

Arabs To Fight Against American Troops in Vietnam?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY recently spoke before the American Jewish Press Association here in Washington and during the course of his address pointed out that American tax dollars are going to support the members of an Arab army being organized to fight against Israel and whose officers are being sent to Vietnam to fight against our troops as training for an eventual attack upon Israel.

This incredible story is reported editorially in the July-August 1966 edition of the National Jewish Monthly and I commend that editorial to the attention of our colleagues:

ARABS WE ARE FEEDING ARE PREPARING TO KILL AMERICANS IN VIET NAM AND TO INVADE ISRAEL

To the overwhelming majority of our readers, who are American citizens, we address this question: Are you aware that part of your tax money is now being used to support men who are in an army that is openly preparing to fight against Americans in Viet Nam and later attack the State of Israel?

This shocking statement is literally true. The army referred to is the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.), which the notorious Arab opportunist Ahmed Shukairy has formed with Arab refugees from Palestine. That army is receiving weapons from Communist China, and some of its officers are being sent to North Viet Nam to fight against the Americans defending South Viet Nam—and at the same time to receive training in guerrilla warfare, to be applied later against Israel. These soldiers in the P.L.O., and their families, are living in the Arab refugee camps in Egypt and Syria which are supported by the United Nations. And the United States contribution to the support of those camps is 70% of the total.

This is no idle theory; Shukairy himself boasts of it. During the recent annual convention of the American Jewish Press Association in Washington, B'nai B'rith tendered the delegates a reception in the B'nai B'rith Building. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was the speaker, and he brought out the facts mentioned above. His remarks were reported to Shukairy, who declared in a speech at a P.L.O. camp in Syria: "The Liberation Army and the P.L.O. are proceeding with determi-

nation. We receive arms from the Chinese People's Republic. The P.L.O. has military officers being trained in the arms of liberation and the experience of the Chinese." He added: "We and our army are a threat to Israel." Shukairy, usually unreliable, may be telling the truth now.

THE UN SHOULD STOP SUPPORTING AN ARMY OF AGGRESSORS

The U.S. Government has now urged the UN to remove from its relief rolls all Arab refugees who are involved in such military activities. All we can say to that is: it's about time! Sen. EDWARD KENNEDY heads a Senate subcommittee which has been investigating UN relief activities in general in Egypt, Lebanon, and Jordan, and he has estimated that between 10,000 and 14,000 Arab refugees are in the P.L.O.—all of them receiving food and supplies from the UN. We welcome his demand that they be stricken from the relief rolls. "It is incompatible with United States policy and with the fundamental concept of the United Nations," he declared, "to supply aid in any way to members of any army whose purpose is to work against a member nation of the UN."

We also welcome the action of King Hussein of Jordan, who has banned the P.L.O. in his country. He called it "an extremist group," and was promptly attacked by Egypt and Syria. But the King went even further, and made a statement of the utmost significance: he demanded that all the Arab refugee camps now being maintained by the UN be liquidated, and that those living in them should be integrated in the countries where those camps are located.

This is, of course, the policy which Israel and many leaders in other countries throughout the world have been advocating for years. It just does not make sense—nor is it humanitarian—to keep on maintaining hundreds of thousands of refugees in "temporary" enclaves, supported by the charity of the world—when the vast empty stretches of Arab territories are crying out for manpower to develop them—and especially manpower of their own religious and linguistic kind. King Hussein himself has shown the way; almost half of all the Arab refugees are living in his kingdom, and he has incorporated them into his country. If Egypt and Syria were to do the same, the problem would be solved. But Egypt and Syria have found the "refugee problem" too convenient for their political purposes to do that, so far.

It is now more than 18 years since the Palestine Arabs fled from the new State of Israel, after being told by their leaders that following an Arab victory they could return and seize all the Jewish property for themselves. The intolerable refugee camps should be closed, and their inmates integrated into the countries of their Arab brothers.

That cannot be done overnight. But what can and should be done at once is to remove from the UN relief rolls every Arab refugee who, through the Palestine Liberation Organization, is being supported by American tax dollars while he trains to fight against Americans in Viet Nam and prepares to invade Israel.

Power of Nonsense**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in an editorial Monday, July 25, very properly noted the passing of Konrad Heiden, and their very appropriate editorial with its fascinating his-

A3992

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 28, 1966

torical recollection attracted my attention. I would therefore like to include it in the RECORD at this point.

POWER OF NONSENSE

Konrad Heiden was so early an anti-Nazi publicist that his first book, "History of National Socialism" [1932], was published in Germany and publicly burned by Nazis there before Hitler's party came to power. Heiden's death in New York the other day has reminded the public that it was he who first popularized the term Nazi, in place of the earlier current Naso.

The expression "National Socialist" was naturally first abbreviated to the first two letters in each of the two words—Naso. As a satiric thrust, Heiden preferred to use the first four letters in the German word meaning "national," as in Bavarian slang *Nazi* had the established meaning of "bumpkin" or "simpleton." Some say that the Nasos quickly adopted the term *Nazi*, successfully seeking by their acceptance of the word to blur the bite it had in Heiden's first use of it.

In writing of Hitler's speeches, which he heard as early as 1920, Heiden said they impressed him as a "flood of nonsense."

The Trial of American Fliers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 27, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed welcome news that the regime in North Vietnam has reconsidered its previously announced intentions to try American pilots shot down over their territory as war criminals.

Such a step would have produced an increase of tensions and probably escalation of the war itself. The execution of American fliers, as the Milwaukee Journal said in a recent editorial, would be a "calamity."

The Journal pointed out that the restraint which has marked the conflict thus far might be snapped by such trials and executions. For that reason, such actions not only would violate international law on the treatment of prisoners, but also would imperil world peace.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD the thoughtful comments of the newspaper's editorial:

TRIAL OF AMERICAN FLIERS CERTAIN TO
ESCALATE WAR

Captured and handcuffed United States airmen have been paraded through the streets of Hanoi under armed guard and through hostile crowds. Now North Vietnam has threatened to try the airmen as criminals for participating in bombings which killed North Vietnam citizens. Hanoi reportedly feels that the Americans are not prisoners of war because there has been no declaration of war.

Vicious as this undeclared war is, the mass trial and execution of American fliers would be a calamity. "We have had many tragic miscalculations on both sides in this war," columnist James Reston declared, "but none more ominous or dangerous than this."

International agreement on treatment of prisoners of war, such as it is, has evolved painfully. Article 2 of the Geneva convention of 1929 declared that war prisoners "must at all times be humanely treated and protected, particularly against acts of vio-

lence, insults and public curiosity. Measures of reprisal against them are prohibited." The United States ratified the convention in 1932. Russia, Communist China and North Vietnam have never signed it.

The 1949 Geneva convention, signed by 61 nations including the United States, specifically provides that war prisoners be protected against intimidation and reprisal for acts of war performed in the line of duty. And it forbids reprisals against prisoners in "all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." Among the signers was North Vietnam. The date: June 5, 1957.

The history of this conflict is ugly enough already. At least one American prisoner of war has been murdered by the Vietcong. There also have been published reports of atrocities, some against prisoners of war, by the South Vietnamese.

This is no polite gentleman's game covered by polite rules. The only rules observed at all are those imposed by the fear that if one side breaks them, the other will retaliate and thus escalate brutality with more brutality.

It would be disastrous if this slender thread of sanity in the midst of war should be snapped by the trial and execution of American airmen, or of any prisoners of war on either side. It could result in an even more ominous threat to the peace of the whole world.

New Mexico Democrats Oppose Grand
Canyon DamsEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Canyon dam proposal resembles a steamroller in the way it has responded to opposition.

For this reason it is particularly significant when people in the Colorado River Basin raise their voices against the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams.

The New Mexico State Democratic Party recently took a stand in opposition to the dams and in support of national park status for the entire Grand Canyon.

About the dams they say:

Particularly we oppose construction of any dams on the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon Area between Lee's Ferry and Lake Mead.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of the resolution adopted by the New Mexico Democrats at their convention on July 16, 1966:

Be it resolved, That the New Mexico Congressional delegation explore all possibilities of providing electric power to the Central Arizona Project and that the members of the delegation seek all alternates to the building of large multi-purpose dams which would deface or destroy the beauty of the Grand Canyon, particularly we oppose construction of any dams on the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon Area between Lee's Ferry and Lake Mead. This specifically concerns the present congressional legislation for Marble Gorge and Bridge Canyon (Walapl) dams.

We support giving National Park status or its equivalent to the entire Grand Canyon.

Right or Wrong, the Readers Always
WriteEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 28, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, July 6, in the Daily Olympian is a letter written by a very articulate and thoughtful man in my district which expresses the thoughts, spirit, and decency of a sizable number of people in my district.

It is a distinct pleasure to place this in the RECORD today so that others may have the opportunity of reading his message.

May I particularly call attention to the last paragraph:

RIGHT OR WRONG, THE READERS ALWAYS WRITE:
WHOSE RIGHTS?

EDITOR, THE DAILY OLYMPIAN:

I am angered, nowadays, every time I hear the word "rights." Whose rights? The rights of a tiny minority to scorn, abuse, and undermine the welfare, peace, and safety of the vast majority?

This nation was founded on a Bill of Rights, but those rights were, and are, designed to protect the majority and the nation as well as the individual or the few. When the sometimes mistaken, often deliberate, assertion of so-called "rights" by a comparatively small minority take away from the large majority of our citizenry the latter's own rights—just whose "rights" are we talking about?

Is it too "reactionary" to say that the youth of America have the right to peaceably and orderly attend our universities without being obstructed, annoyed, and insulted by a few protesting, obscene malcontents—who contribute nothing to the national welfare? Many, not students at all, but merely idle agitators. Is it too much to say that the average American has the right to traverse our streets without the hazard of riots and lethal lawlessness on the part of those who seek to take the law into their own hands under the pretense of fighting for some assumed right?

How long must we stand idly by and see our police, whom we empower to maintain law and order, attacked, abused, undermined and ridiculed by the criminal few, and those who choose to prostitute the meaning of the word rights? Our Supreme Court recently split 5 to 4 in deciding the "rights" of the criminal suspect and the resulting decision brought the strong protest of the minority judges as well as the near complete dismay of a very sizeable segment of our law enforcement agencies.

Just how far ARE we going to carry this "rights" thing? Exactly whose rights are of primary importance—those of the criminal few, or those of our vast majority of law abiding citizens? If we render our law enforcement agencies powerless to maintain peace and order; if the average citizen is thereby not safe in his home or on the streets via this mistaken, overzealous witch-hunt towards overliberality in protection of dubious "rights" of the lawless few—Isn't it about time that we decide whose and what rights are paramount? Are the rights of our very vast majority—unprotesting, peaceable, ordinary citizens—so obscure that these can be dismissed, overlooked, or trod upon by a relative few who choose to riot, burn, obstruct, loot, and abuse at will under the fictitious claim of so-called pro-